

FAILING GRADES

**HOW THE SENATE ENERGY BILL FAILS TO SECURE
A NEW ENERGY FUTURE**



SENATE REPORT CARD

**REDUCE DEPENDENCE ON
IMPORTED OIL**

**SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE
ENERGY SECURITY**

FAILING

**PROTECT ELECTRICITY
CONSUMERS**

SAFEGUARD ENVIRONMENT

**◆ THE STATE PIRGS ◆ SIERRA CLUB ◆
DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE ◆ NATURAL
RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL**

MARCH 2002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Written by Alison Cassady, Research Director at U.S. Public Interest Research Group (U.S. PIRG), and Anna Aurilio, Legislative Director at U.S. PIRG with inputs from Pierre Sadik, Katherine Morrison, Emily Figdor, Athan Manuel, Kate Abend and Matt Hollamby at U.S. PIRG; Alyssandra Campaigne, Legislative Director and Faith Weiss, Legislative Attorney for the Natural Resources Defense Council; Debbie Boger, Debbie Sease, Dan Becker, and Alex Veitch of the Sierra Club; and Robert Dewey of Defenders of Wildlife.

 **U.S. PIRG**
U.S. Public Interest Research Group
218 D Street SE
Washington, DC 20003
(202) 546-9707
www.pirg.org


Sierra Club, DC Legislative Office
408 C Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 547-6009
www.sierraclub.org


Natural Resources Defense Council
1200 New York Ave., NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 289-6868
www.nrdc.org


Defenders of Wildlife
1101 14th Street, NW #1400
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 682-9400
www.defenders.org

Failing Grades:

How the Senate Energy Bill Fails to Secure a New Energy Future

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
The Problem: We Are Too Dependent on Polluting and Unreliable Energy Sources.....	3
The Solution: A Responsible Energy Future.....	4
The Bush-Cheney and House Energy Plans are Dirty, Dangerous and Do Not Deliver for Consumers	5
Senate Energy Bill Has Been Plundered by Polluters' Amendments	5
Principle 1: Reduce consumption of oil	5
Principle 2: Protect the Arctic Refuge and other wild places.....	6
Principle 3: Guarantee 10% renewable energy by 2020.....	7
Principle 4: Cut subsidies to dirty energy sources.....	8
Principle 5: Decrease pollution to our air, land and water.....	10
Principle 6: Provide a reliable electricity system.....	11
The Senate's Dirty Energy Report Card.....	12
Conclusion.....	16
Attachments:	
A. Comparison of the Bush-Cheney Energy Plan, House Energy Bill and Senate Energy Bill.....	17
B. Trade Associations and Corporations Formally Opposing A Renewable Portfolio Standard.....	18
C. Trade Associations and Corporations Formally Opposing Higher Fuel Economy Standards.....	19

INTRODUCTION

The Senate energy bill began, under Senator Daschle's leadership, as a promising vehicle for meeting our nation's energy needs, cutting oil dependence, diversifying our energy portfolio, saving consumers money and otherwise forging a path to a clean energy future. It contained important provisions to boost fuel economy standards, address global warming, improve energy efficiency and increase the use of renewable energy sources. But as it stands today, the bill has been weakened by a series of amendments supported by industries that stand in the way of technology and progress. Several Senators and their industry allies are crafting additional amendments to make the bill even worse. In its current form, the Senate energy bill fails to reduce our dependence on imported oil, fails to significantly increase our nation's overall energy security, fails to protect electricity consumers, and fails to safeguard our environment.

At a minimum, comprehensive energy legislation should adhere to the following core principles:

- ◆ Reduce consumption of oil by at least one million barrels a day by 2013;
- ◆ Protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, roadless areas in our public lands, and other wild places from oil and gas development;

- ◆ Guarantee that at least 10 percent of our electricity supplies come from new, clean renewable energy resources by 2020;
- ◆ Cut taxpayer-funded handouts to dirty energy industries;
- ◆ Decrease pollution to our air, land and water; and
- ◆ Provide a reliable electricity system with adequate consumer protections that will save consumers money and increase energy efficiency.

This bill does not meet those minimum, basic standards. It takes us backward, not forward. The Senate energy bill is unacceptable in its current form. We call upon Senators to oppose further attempts to pollute this bill with amendments to drill in one of our last pristine wilderness areas, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, increase dirty energy subsidies, or weaken environmental protections. Instead, a forward-thinking energy policy should advance America's energy security by curtailing our dependence on dirty and unreliable energy sources, tapping into our vast potential for clean renewable energy, and dramatically increasing energy efficiency.

THE PROBLEM: WE ARE TOO DEPENDENT ON POLLUTING AND UNRELIABLE ENERGY SOURCES

Decades of reliance on fossil fuels and nuclear power for our energy needs has come at a great cost to public health and the environment. The U.S. should use its technological know-how to create a new energy future in which we produce more energy from clean renewable sources such as solar and wind energy and drive farther on a gallon of gasoline. Without a shift in policy, Americans will continue to suffer the side effects of a dirty and unreliable energy policy, such as market price fluctuations, harmful air pollution and a growing litany of environmental problems.

Coal. There is no such thing as "clean" coal. Coal is the dirtiest of fossil fuels, polluting the

environment from the point of mining to combustion and damaging human health. Although coal plants make up only 56 percent of power plants in the country, they are responsible for 93 percent of the power industry's smog-forming nitrogen oxide emissions, 96 percent of the industry's soot emissions, and 99 percent of the industry's toxic mercury emissions. Recent studies have conclusively linked smog and soot pollution from power plants to asthma, lung cancer and heart disease; children exposed to mercury while in the womb or in early childhood can suffer from delayed development and cognitive deficits, language difficulties, and problems with motor function, attention and memory. In addition, coal-fired power plants

accounted for approximately one-third of U.S. global warming emissions in 2000.

Oil and Gas. The oil and gas industry is a dirty business, from the point of extraction to combustion. Oil and gas drilling destroys pristine wildlands, pollutes the air and damages delicate marine habitat. With billions of gallons of oil stored and transported throughout the country, oil spills are a regular occurrence; an estimated 31,000 gallons of oil spill into U.S. waterways every day. For offshore areas, a government study found that three million gallons of oil spilled between 1980 and 1999 in more than 70 separate incidents. Oil refineries pose a different set of environmental and public health hazards, emitting soot pollution—which causes asthma and other respiratory ailments and is the primary precursor to acid rain—and other volatile organic compounds. The burning of oil

and gas to power cars and trucks causes additional releases of smog- and soot-forming pollution, global warming pollution and a host of cancer-causing toxic chemicals such as benzene and formaldehyde.

Nuclear Power. Since its inception, nuclear power has been nurtured by exorbitant taxpayer subsidies at the expense of investment in cleaner, safer and more affordable energy options. Nuclear power is dirty and dangerous. Nuclear power plants and their waste significantly increase the risk of nuclear proliferation. Each nuclear reactor produces an average of 20 tons of highly radioactive waste each year, which remains hazardous for more than a quarter of a million years. No nation has developed a safe long-term solution for its disposal.

THE SOLUTION: A RESPONSIBLE ENERGY FUTURE

America deserves a safe, clean, affordable energy future. We can create jobs and secure our energy future by using America's technological know-how to increase our energy efficiency, manufacture cars and light trucks that go farther on a gallon of gas, and boost electricity production from clean renewable energy sources.

Energy Efficiency. Improving energy efficiency is the quickest, cheapest, cleanest way to help improve national security, save energy and reduce pollution. Using energy wisely reduces demand and decreases our overall dependence on fossil fuels, including imported oil; protects the environment by reducing demand from dirty power plants; and saves consumers money. Energy efficiency policies enacted over the past 25 years saved consumers \$260 billion on their energy bills in 2000 alone. Moreover, energy efficiency sparks economic growth by redirecting dollars spent on energy into local economies.

Fuel Economy. Fuel economy is now at a 21 year low as auto-makers sell more SUVs and other light trucks, which are allowed to meet lower miles-per-gallon standards than cars. Enacting a 35 miles-per-gallon standard by 2013—well within the range of the National Academy of Sciences' recommendation—would conserve one million barrels of oil each day in 2013; save American consumers \$4 billion

annually by 2013; and cut global warming pollution from transportation sources by 16 percent by 2020.

Renewable Energy. Currently, only two percent of our energy comes from non-hydroelectric renewable resources. However, the United States has the technical potential to generate more than *four times* the electricity from clean renewables than it currently generates from all energy sources combined. A recent analysis by the Bush administration's Energy Information Administration found that a clean energy standard achieving 20 percent electricity generation from renewables by 2020 is reasonable and attainable.

By increasing the efficiency of our cars, homes and businesses and boosting electricity generation from renewable sources, the United States not only will protect public health and the environment but will advance America's energy security as well. A more diverse portfolio of energy sources and reduced demand will make our electricity system more robust and self-reliant, decreasing our dependence on energy sources that tend to fluctuate wildly in price, such as natural gas and oil. Similarly, reducing our oil consumption will stem our dependence on foreign oil and the unstable regimes that provide it.

THE BUSH-CHENEY AND HOUSE ENERGY PLANS ARE DIRTY, DANGEROUS AND DO NOT DELIVER FOR CONSUMERS

In his second week in office, President George W. Bush established the National Energy Policy Development (NEPD) Group, directing it to “develop a national energy policy designed to help the private sector, and, as necessary and appropriate, state and local governments, promote dependable, affordable, and environmentally sound production and distribution of energy for the future.” After a series of closed door meetings between Vice-President Cheney and energy industry representatives, the NEPD released its report entitled *Reliable, Affordable and Environmentally Sound Energy for America’s Future*.

Unfortunately, the plan that the NEPD Group produced is neither “affordable” nor “environmentally sound.” The administration’s energy plan threatens the environment both at home and abroad by promoting “drilling and digging” over efficiency and conservation and favoring outmoded dirty energy sources over renewable energy. The plan’s emphasis on

resurrecting the nuclear power industry and boosting electricity generation from coal-fired power plants represents a step back in energy policy.

On August 2, 2001, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4, the Securing America’s Future Energy (SAFE) Act — closely following the Bush administration’s lead. H.R. 4 opens up the pristine Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas drilling and would give polluting energy companies an unprecedented \$38 billion in many new or expanded taxpayer handouts. These tax breaks and subsidies to polluters would increase air, water and land pollution from coal-fired power plants, oil derricks and refineries and expose Americans to tons of additional radioactive nuclear waste.

See Attachment A for a comparison of the Bush-Cheney energy plan, the House energy bill and the Senate energy bill.

THE SENATE ENERGY BILL HAS BEEN PLUNDERED BY POLLUTERS’ AMENDMENTS

While H.R. 4 is a blatant giveaway to traditional polluting energy interests, the Senate energy bill (S. 517), as it was introduced on March 12, 2002, offered a promising step in the right direction. The original language included a 35 mile-per-gallon fuel economy standard, which would reduce our reliance on foreign oil by one million barrels of oil per day by 2013 and save consumers millions at the gas pump. In addition, the Senate energy bill included a renewable energy standard to reach 10 percent electricity generation from new renewable sources by 2020. Although this is about half of what the Energy Information Administration reported as technologically and economically feasible, it represented an important step in the right direction on the path to a cleaner energy future. In addition, in contrast to the Bush-Cheney energy plan and the House energy bill, the Senate bill did not

open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas drilling.

Unfortunately, what started out as a forward-looking framework for a sound energy policy has been waylaid by the energy and auto industries, which have spent millions exercising their political muscle in the halls of Congress. We need an energy plan that is smarter than the Senate energy bill as it stands today. We need an energy plan that adheres to the following principles:

Principle #1: Reduce consumption of oil by at least one million barrels a day by 2013.

The Bush-Cheney energy plan failed to include any meaningful provisions to reduce America’s dependence on foreign oil by cutting

consumption. The House energy bill, H.R. 4, purported to increase fuel economy standards for cars and trucks by directing the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA) to reduce the gasoline consumption of the light truck fleet by 5 billion gallons by 2010. However, H.R. 4 widens a loophole for flexible fuel vehicles, which would produce a projected increase in gasoline use of nine billion gallons – resulting in a net increase in gasoline consumption of four billion gallons by 2010.

As introduced, the Senate energy bill contained a provision proposed by Senators Kerry (D-MA) and Hollings (D-SC) to increase the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standard to 35 miles-per-gallon by 2013, which would have conserved one million barrels of oil each day in 2013; this is more than 12 times the projected daily yield from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in the same year. Unfortunately, the Senate passed two harmful amendments that not only stripped this beneficial provision from the underlying bill but actually weakened current law.

Amendments with a Recorded Vote

During the first few weeks of debate, the Senate voted on several amendments related to fuel economy standards.

Levin-Bond Amendment to Weaken the Fuel Economy Provision (SA 2997): Senators Levin (D-MI) and Bond (R-MO) successfully offered an amendment to remove language in the energy bill that would have increased fuel economy standards to 35 miles-per-gallon by 2013. The Levin-Bond amendment does nothing more than direct the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to study the need for higher fuel economy standards. The amendment also strikes key vehicle safety provisions from the underlying bill. The Levin-Bond amendment passed the Senate by a 62-38 margin.

Miller Pickup Truck Exemption to Weaken Current Law (SA 2998): The amendment offered by Senator Miller (D-GA) weakens existing law by freezing Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards for pickups—left undefined in the amendment’s language—at 20.7 miles-per-gallon. Currently, the CAFE law allows light trucks, including SUVs, minivans, and pickups, to meet a lower standard than

passenger cars. By exploiting this light truck loophole, automakers have dragged vehicle fuel economy down to a 21-year-low. The Miller amendment creates a new loophole that encourages automakers to manufacture more vehicles that fit into the "pickup" category but function as passenger cars. The Miller amendment passed the Senate with a vote of 56-44.

Principle #2: Protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, roadless areas in our public lands, and other wild places from oil and gas development.

The Bush-Cheney energy plan and the House energy bill call for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and increasing domestic drilling. The Bush-Cheney energy plan also recommends reviewing the protected status of some of our most precious public lands as well as the environmental safeguards that protect wildlife, water and other resources on these lands.

The House energy bill followed suit, opening additional public lands to oil and gas development and weakening environmental safeguards in place to protect these lands from pollution. To date, the Senate has not offered any amendments to open special places to oil and gas development. However, Senator Craig (R-ID) was successful in adding an amendment that could increase logging in our national forests (see next section). When Congress returns from spring recess, the Senate is expected to vote on an amendment to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling.

The U.S. cannot drill its way out of its dependence on foreign oil; it holds only three percent of the world’s known oil reserves. Drilling in the Arctic Refuge would increase world reserves by less than one-third of one percent. The fastest and cheapest way to reduce dependence on oil is to cut consumption.

Looking Ahead

The dirty and dangerous House energy bill, H.R. 4, opens the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge up to oil and gas drilling. Senator Murkowski (R-AK) has threatened to introduce a series of amendments to the underlying Senate energy

bill to allow oil and gas development in this pristine wilderness.

Similarly, the House energy bill includes a series of provisions to weaken environmental protections on public lands and open up public lands to oil and gas drilling. Several Senators have indicated they will file similar amendments. Senator Voinovich (R-OH) is poised to introduce an amendment to undermine the environmental review procedures required under the National Environmental Policy Act for oil and gas drilling on public lands and numerous other energy related actions. We oppose any amendment to open up wild places on our public lands to oil and gas drilling and to weaken our cornerstone environmental laws.

Principle #3: Guarantee that at least 10 percent of our electricity supplies come from new, clean renewable energy resources by 2020.

According to the latest analysis compiled by the Energy Information Administration, a 10 percent renewable energy standard could save consumers at least \$13.2 billion on their energy bills. The Bush-Cheney energy plan and House energy bill do next to nothing to boost electricity generation from renewable sources.

The Senate energy bill, before it was amended, contained a renewable portfolio standard that would have resulted in up to 7.7 percent new renewable generation by 2020. An amendment by Senator Kyl (R-AZ) to strip any renewable energy standard from the bill and additional amendments by Senators Kyl (R-AZ) and Murkowski (R-AK) to effectively nullify any renewable standard failed. However, the Senate eventually passed without a recorded vote an amendment offered by Senator Bingaman (D-NM), which waters down the underlying renewable standard to achieve only four to five percent new generation from renewables by 2020.

Amendments with a Recorded Vote

During the first few weeks of debate, the Senate voted on several amendments related to renewable energy and a clean energy standard.

Jeffords Amendment to Strengthen the Renewable Energy Standard (SA 3017):

Senator Jeffords (I-VT) introduced an amendment to require all retail electric providers to produce an increasing percentage of their electricity from clean renewable sources, starting at 2.5 percent in 2002 and leveling out at 20 percent in 2020. Studies conducted by the Energy Information Administration show that a national standard to increase the amount of electricity generated by renewable energy to 20 percent by 2020 is reasonable and achievable. Unfortunately, the Senate rejected this measure by a vote of 29-70.

Kyl Amendments to Strip or Weaken the Renewable Energy Standard (SA 3038, SA 3057):

Senator Kyl (R-AZ) offered two amendments intended to eliminate or effectively nullify any clean energy standard in the underlying energy bill. His first amendment (SA 3038) simply stripped the modest renewable energy provision from the underlying bill and replaced it with a voluntary state program that would charge consumers more for “green energy.” The Senate defeated the amendment 40-58. Senator Kyl then offered another amendment (SA 3057), which would have given Governors the authority to opt out of a renewable portfolio standard if they deemed the program too costly for consumers. The Senate defeated this measure 37-58.

Murkowski Amendment to Weaken the Renewable Energy Standard (SA 3052):

After the defeat of Senator Kyl’s amendment (SA 3038) to strip the renewable portfolio standard, Senator Murkowski (R-AK) offered this amendment to exempt any state with a renewable portfolio standard from any national standard. In effect, this would allow a state with a miniscule or meaningless renewables goal to opt out of the national renewable requirement. The Senate defeated this measure 39-57.

Measures Passed by Unanimous Consent

The Senate approved by unanimous consent—without a recorded vote of yeas and nays—several amendments weakening the already modest renewable portfolio standard in the underlying bill.

Bingaman Amendment to Weaken the Renewable Portfolio Standard (SA 3016):

Although efforts to strip a renewable portfolio standard from the bill failed, Senator Bingaman

(D-NM) introduced an amendment to weaken the already modest provision in the underlying bill. The Bingaman amendment, although nominally requiring a 10 percent standard, would in practice require only four to five percent new generation from renewable sources by 2020 after accounting for the exemptions for some utilities. The Bingaman amendment also contains ambiguous language that could allow mercury-emitting garbage incinerators to be counted as renewable energy. The Senate adopted the Bingaman amendment, as amended by Senator Craig (R-ID) (see below), by unanimous consent.

Craig Amendment to Encourage Logging in National Forests (SA 3049): Senator Craig (R-ID) introduced this amendment to Senator Bingaman's (D-NM) watered down amendment on renewable energy. It alters the definition of renewable energy in Senator Bingaman's already weak definition to include "thinnings from trees that are less than 12 inches in diameter." Some trees may be as old as 90 years when they are 12 inches in diameter. In some national forests, this amendment could provide an extra incentive to log nearly 15 percent of the forest as "renewable energy." The amendment was adopted by unanimous consent.

Thomas-Bingaman Amendment to Weaken Federal Clean Energy Purchasing Requirements (SA 3005): The underlying Senate energy bill required the federal government to buy escalating quantities of renewable energy, reaching by 2010 a minimum level of "not less than 7.5% of the total amount of electric energy the federal government consumes during any fiscal year." Senators Thomas (R-WY) and Bingaman (D-NM) offered an amendment to weaken this provision, asking the federal government only to make a "best effort" and only "to the extent economically feasible and technically practical." The amendment was adopted by unanimous consent.

Thomas-Bingaman Amendment to Weaken Net Metering Requirements (SA 3003): The underlying Senate energy bill included an important requirement that electric utilities make available upon request net metering service to its customers, ensuring that small-scale renewable energy resources would receive favorable rate treatment from local utilities.

Senators Thomas (R-WY) and Bingaman (D-NM) offered an amendment that essentially eliminates these protections for small scale clean energy sources by making it a strictly voluntary program that would be left to the discretion of state regulators and the boards of publicly owned utilities. The amendment was adopted by unanimous consent.

Looking Ahead

After returning from recess and resuming debate on the energy bill, the Senate likely will vote on several amendments to further water down the renewable energy standard offered by Senator Bingaman or, in turn, address some of the loopholes opened by language in his amendment.

Graham Amendment to Weaken Renewable Energy Definition (SA 3070): Senator Graham (D-FL) has offered an amendment to explicitly classify municipal solid waste incineration as renewable energy. Municipal solid waste incineration is a significant source of dioxin and mercury emissions. Dioxin is a known human carcinogen, and mercury is a neurotoxin. Both threaten human health at extremely low levels of exposure. The Senate should oppose any incentives for municipal solid waste (garbage), incineration. This dangerous and expensive practice should not count towards a renewable energy standard, nor should it be encouraged through taxpayer-funded subsidies. We urge the Senate to reject this amendment.

Fitzgerald Amendment to Improve Renewable Energy Definition (SA 3051): Senator Fitzgerald (R-IL) has offered an amendment to provide a clear, strong definition of biomass that excludes municipal solid waste and forests. This amendment would insert this definition into the national renewable energy standard and into the requirement that the federal government purchase renewable energy. We urge the Senate to adopt this amendment.

Principle #4: Cut subsidies to dirty energy sources.

Every year, the federal government wastes billions of dollars on programs that pollute our air, contribute to global warming, contaminate our water, and scar our public

lands—all at the expense of federal taxpayers. Moreover, these federal tax breaks and subsidies to polluting and profitable industries force clean, renewable energy sources of energy—such as wind and solar—to compete on an uneven playing field. This stifles the innovation and development necessary to advance new technologies. The House energy bill included \$38 billion in tax breaks and subsidies to the nuclear, oil and gas, coal and auto industries. The underlying Senate bill already includes more than \$5.3 billion in subsidies to the polluting oil, gas, coal and nuclear power industries; to date, the Senate has adopted five new amendments to increase subsidies for the nuclear power industry. The Senate will consider an additional tax package after returning from the spring recess.

Amendments with a Recorded Vote

During the first few weeks of debate, the Senate voted on several amendments that offered new handouts to the already heavily-subsidized nuclear power industry.

Voinovich Amendment to Extend Unfair Liability Limit to New Nuclear Power Plants (SA 2983): Senator Voinovich (R-OH) offered an amendment to the Senate energy bill to reauthorize the Price-Anderson Act for ten years. The Price-Anderson Act, originally enacted by Congress in 1957, limits the liability of the nuclear industry in the event of a nuclear reactor accident. The Act caps liability at \$9 billion and does not provide a mechanism for the payment of damages to victims above the \$9 billion cap. A worst-case accident at a U.S. nuclear plant could result in damages of more than \$500 billion. The Act constitutes a subsidy to the nuclear power industry by reducing the cost of obtaining liability insurance and places the industry on an unequal footing in relation to clean energy sources. The Senate adopted the Voinovich amendment 78-21.

Measures Passed By Unanimous Consent

The Senate approved by unanimous consent—without a recorded vote of yeas and nays—several additional amendments to expand the dirty and dangerous nuclear power industry.

Craig Amendment to Increase Subsidy for Nuclear Fusion Research (SA 2987): Senator Craig (R-ID) offered this amendment to the Senate energy bill to increase authorization of

appropriations for the Fusion Energy Sciences Program to \$1.4 billion over four years. Nuclear fusion research focuses on using different forms of hydrogen fuel, such as tritium and deuterium, in an attempt to generate energy that theoretically could be used to provide electricity. The Congressional Research Service reports that a demonstration fusion power reactor will not be completed until the year 2050. Currently, fusion devices consume more energy than they produce and create considerable radioactive waste. The Senate adopted the Craig amendment by unanimous consent.

Craig Amendment to Build New Nuclear Power Plants (SA 2995): Senator Craig (R-ID) offered an amendment to carry out the Nuclear Power 2010 Program, an aggressive program to subsidize the construction and operation of new nuclear plants by 2010. The amendment encourages the study of new regulatory processes for the next generation of nuclear power plants despite the fact that there is no current long term solution for storing nuclear waste. The Senate adopted the amendment by unanimous consent.

Domenici Amendment to Encourage Nuclear Research (SA 3009): The United States has recognized as far back as the Ford administration that the closed nuclear fuel cycle of reprocessing, plutonium separation, and recycling is uneconomical and presents unacceptable proliferation risks. Senator Domenici (R-NM) offered an amendment to the Senate energy bill to establish the Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research within the Office of Nuclear Science and Technology of the Department of Energy (DOE). The Office will subsidize research into development and demonstration programs on technologies for treatment, recycling and disposal of high-level nuclear waste and spent fuel, reversing a decades-old ban on plutonium recycling. This amendment is also an unnecessary duplication of the work of the DOE Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. The Senate adopted the Domenici amendment by unanimous consent.

Landrieu Amendment to Increase Nuclear Energy Subsidies (SA 3011): Senator Landrieu (D-LA) offered this amendment to the Senate energy bill to study designs for a high-temperature nuclear reactor capable of producing hydrogen. Using dangerous nuclear

energy to create hydrogen negates the benefits of hydrogen as a clean fuel source. The Senate adopted the Landrieu amendment by unanimous consent.

Looking Ahead

After returning from recess and resuming debate on the energy bill, the Senate likely will vote on additional amendments to subsidize fossil fuels and nuclear power. The Senate also will vote on adding tax incentives to the bill.

Energy Tax Incentives Act of 2002: On February 28, 2002, the Senate Finance Committee marked up a tax package that the Senate will soon offer as an amendment to the underlying energy bill. Although the Senate's Energy Tax Incentives Act of 2002 provides important tax incentives to encourage energy efficiency and renewable energy sources, it also continues to subsidize polluting energy industries. Of the \$16 billion total, the Act allocates 42 percent (\$6.8 billion) of its tax incentives to clean, renewable energy and energy efficiency and approximately 47 percent (\$7.5 billion) to dirty coal, oil, gas and nuclear power. We will continue to oppose new tax breaks for polluting energy sources and support incentives for clean, renewable energy.

Principle #5: Decrease pollution to our air, land and water.

The Bush-Cheney energy plan, focused almost entirely on increasing domestic energy production at the expense of the environment and public health, includes numerous provisions that would result in more air, land and water pollution. The Bush-Cheney energy plan would increase offshore oil and gas drilling, threatening marine environments and coastal communities with water pollution; relax emission requirements and siting requirements for refineries; and generate more electricity from dirty coal-fired power plants.

In addition, one key component of this plan is gutting the Clean Air Act's New Source Review (NSR) program by opening as many as nine new loopholes. This program is designed to ensure that old power plants and other industrial facilities eventually install modern pollution controls, which are required at new facilities. Under the Bush-Cheney plan, old, dirty plants

would be allowed to emit 10 times more pollution per year compared to new facilities and may never be required to clean up. The President's plan also would replace clean air programs with much weaker air pollution caps, undoing decades of progress toward cleaner air.

The House energy bill also includes several provisions to increase domestic energy production from coal, oil and gas, and nuclear power at the expense of clean air, clean water and pristine lands.

The underlying Senate energy bill contains \$5.8 billion in subsidies for polluting energy sources. While the Senate passed an amendment to modestly increase the safety of oil and gas pipelines, it also passed several amendments to further exploit energy resources at the expense of the environment.

Amendments with a Recorded Vote

The Senate has voted on a few amendments with implications for the integrity of the nation's drinking water supply and the health of its air, land and waterways.

Bingaman-Inhofe Amendment to Weaken Drinking Water Protections (SA 2986):

Senators Bingaman (D-NM) and Inhofe (R-OK) offered an amendment that weakens Safe Drinking Water Act requirements in order to expand oil and gas exploration and development using hydraulic fracturing. Hydraulic fracturing involves breaking oil and gas bearing rock with high pressure injection of water, sand, and toxic chemicals including benzene, xylene and toluene, which pollute underground sources of drinking water. In effect, the Bingaman-Inhofe amendment blocks regulation of coalbed methane wells for the duration of new studies and potentially suspends existing drinking water regulation of all other oil and gas wells at the end of the studies, despite the fact that courts already have ruled that hydraulic fracturing should be regulated. The Senate voted 78-21 to pass the Bingaman-Inhofe amendment.

McCain Amendment to Increase Pipeline Safety (SA 2979):

Senator McCain (R-AZ) introduced an amendment to enhance pipeline safety. Although this provision requires pipeline inspections at five-year intervals and strengthens enforcement of pipeline safety laws, it fails to include key protections needed to improve pipeline safety. These provisions

include holding polluters liable for releases, requiring meaningful community right-to-know data, and allowing states to mandate stronger protections for interstate pipelines than the federal government requires. The Senate agreed to this amendment with a vote of 94-0.

Measures Passed by Unanimous Consent

The Senate approved by unanimous consent—without a recorded vote of yeas and nays—an amendment to place the burden of certain types of pollution on taxpayers, rather than polluters.

Renewable Fuels Liability Exemption

(Manager’s Amendment, No Number): A gasoline additive known as MTBE (Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether) has contaminated drinking water across the country. This “manager’s amendment” phases out MTBE while strengthening air quality protections through the reformulated gasoline program. However, this amendment also seeks to insulate the oil and renewable fuels industries from liability for damage should other additives made from renewable fuels cause public health or environmental harm. The liability loophole thus eliminates an important disincentive to pollute. The Senate adopted the manager’s amendment by unanimous consent.

Looking Ahead

After returning from recess and resuming debate on the energy bill, the Senate likely will vote on additional amendments with profound implications for our land, air and water.

Closing the Liability Loophole for Renewable Fuels (SA 3021):

Senators Boxer (D-CA) and Feinstein (D-CA) filed an amendment to close the dangerous loophole secured in the manager’s amendment to the energy bill. This amendment would ensure that renewable fuels are held to the same liability standards as other fuels and fuel additives. We urge the Senate to adopt this provision, as polluters should pay for any harm caused to the environment and public health, rather than taxpayers.

Principle #6: Provide a reliable electricity system with adequate consumer protections.

An important component of any energy policy is to ensure that consumers receive reliable

electricity at a fair price. The Bush-Cheney energy plan contains a provision to preempt states’ rights for electricity transmission lines and specifically recommends development of comprehensive electricity legislation that would repeal the pro-consumer Public Utility Holding Company Act. The House energy bill contains no electricity provisions.

The underlying Senate energy bill unfortunately repeals the pro-consumer Public Utility Holding Company Act. The Senate then passed additional amendments to weaken consumer protections and further favor utilities over ratepayers—without a recorded vote.

While moving backward on electricity consumer protections, the Senate bill contains an important energy efficiency provision to help shield consumers from high electricity prices. This provision increases by 30 percent the energy efficiency of our residential air conditioners and heat pumps. This energy efficiency measure could help to reduce peak demand and increase the reliability of the electricity system. In addition, the Senate energy bill establishes a grant program to school districts willing to construct new, energy efficient schools; upgrades the Federal Emergency Management Program to increase energy savings in federal buildings; and gives the Department of Energy statutory authority to set standards for additional commercial and consumer products such as ceiling fans, refrigerators and vending machines.

Measures Passed by Unanimous Consent

Although it passed an amendment to create an Office of Consumer Advocacy, the Senate also approved by unanimous consent—without a recorded vote of yeas and nays—several complicated amendments that would benefit utilities at the expense of ratepayers.

Thomas Amendment to Discourage Energy Efficiency (SA 3000):

One of the fastest, cheapest and cleanest ways to lighten the load on power grids is to adopt programs that reduce electricity demand on the system. In a blow to energy efficiency initiatives, Senator Thomas (R-WY) proposed an amendment to eliminate “the effect of demand response mechanisms” as a factor in determining whether wholesale power markets are competitive enough to justify deregulating power prices. The amendment was adopted by unanimous consent.

Thomas-Bingaman Amendment to Remove Protections for Wind, Solar and Other “Intermittent” Generators (SA 3001): Senators Thomas (R-WY) and Bingaman (D-NM) offered an amendment that strips the energy bill of any assurance that intermittent generators will receive fair and equal treatment from transmission owners. Many renewable energy resources such as wind and solar technologies are used on an “intermittent” basis; meaning, they do not provide continuous power to the energy grid. Current electricity transmission structures sometimes penalize these clean energy resources by charging rates that assume continuous energy generation. The amendment was adopted by unanimous consent.

Wyden Amendment to Create a Pro-Consumer Energy Office (SA 3014): Senator Wyden (D-OR) offered an amendment to create an Office of Consumer Advocacy to handle energy issues within the Department of Justice. This new office will represent the interests of consumers within the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), before the courts and in front of Congress. This amendment was passed by unanimous consent.

Cantwell Amendment to Establish an Efficiency Standard for Traffic Lights (SA 3064): Senator Cantwell (D-WA) offered an amendment to ensure that traffic signal modules meet the performance requirements used under the Energy Star program of the Environmental Protection Agency for traffic signals. The amendment was adopted by voice vote.

Looking Ahead

After returning from recess and resuming debate on the energy bill, the Senate likely will vote on several additional amendments pertaining to the reliability of the nation’s electricity system and consumer protection.

Feinstein Amendment to Re-Regulate Energy Derivatives (SA 2989): Senator Feinstein (D-CA) has offered an amendment to repeal the provisions of the Commodity Futures Modernization Act exempting energy derivatives from regulation, providing price transparency when energy derivatives are traded and giving the Commodity Futures Trading Commission oversight authority for such transactions. This amendment would help ensure that over-the-counter traders of energy derivatives operate with proper federal oversight, fostering a more stable market with transparent transactions. This amendment would help to ensure a reliable electricity market and prevent “another Enron” by providing a safety net for the investing public.

Cochran Amendment to Weaken Residential Air Conditioner (SEER 13) Standard: Senator Cochran (R-MS) is expected to introduce an amendment to weaken the residential air conditioner and heat pump standard from a 30 percent increase to a 20 percent increase. The Department of Energy estimates that the Cochran amendment would cost the nation \$3.6 billion in higher electric bills by 2030, an increase in nine million metric tons of global warming pollution, and the need to build 22 additional power plants. We urge the Senate to oppose this amendment.

Amendment to Strengthen Consumer Protection Provisions in the Senate Energy Bill’s Electricity Title: The original energy bill, as introduced in the Senate, repealed the Public Utility Holding Company Act (PUHCA), which provided important consumer protections and replaced it with a number of more modest consumer protection measures. As outlined above, several amendments have greatly weakened consumer protections within the electricity system; however, PUHCA is still slated for repeal. We urge the Senate to adopt amendments that would strengthen consumer protections in the electricity sector.

THE SENATE’S DIRTY ENERGY REPORT CARD

In a series of high-profile votes, the Senate has dramatically weakened what once was a promising energy bill. As the Senate has postponed further action until the end of the spring recess, this “report card” grades Senators

on five of the top priority votes on the energy bill to date. Although the Senate voted on several additional amendments not included in this report card, the five votes selected and analyzed have the most profound implications for energy

security and the environment. Unfortunately, we were unable to grade Senators on critical amendments that passed by unanimous consent and without a recorded vote.

Only nine Senators received an “A” grade, voting in the public interest on all five of the

amendments analyzed. More than two-thirds of the Senate—68 members—received a “D”, “D-“ or an “F.” Almost half of the Senate—41 members—received a zero percent grade, voting against the public interest on every vote.

THE DIRTY ENERGY REPORT CARD

State	Party	Senator	Oppose Nuclear Subsidies (SA 2983)	Oppose Drinking Water Pollution (SA 2986)	Oppose Striking Fuel Economy (SA 2997)	Support 20% Renewable Standard (SA 3017)	Oppose Striking Renewable Standard (SA 3038)	Grade
CA	D	Boxer	+	+	+	+	+	A
NY	D	Clinton	+	+	+	+	+	A
CA	D	Feinstein	+	+	+	+	+	A
VT	I	Jeffords	+	+	+	+	+	A
MA	D	Kerry	+	+	+	+	+	A
VT	D	Leahy	+	+	+	+	+	A
RI	D	Reed	+	+	+	+	+	A
NY	D	Schumer	+	+	+	+	+	A
MN	D	Wellstone	+	+	+	+	+	A
DE	D	Biden	+	+	+	-	+	B
WA	D	Cantwell	-	+	+	+	+	B
ME	R	Collins	+	-	+	+	+	B
NJ	D	Corzine	-	+	+	+	+	B
MN	D	Dayton	+	+	+	-	+	B
IL	D	Durbin	-	+	+	+	+	B
WI	D	Feingold	+	+	-	+	+	B
IA	D	Harkin	+	-	+	+	+	B
CT	D	Lieberman	-	+	+	+	+	B
WA	D	Murray	-	+	+	+	+	B
NV	D	Reid	+	-	+	+	+	B
MD	D	Sarbanes	-	+	+	+	+	B
ME	R	Snowe	+	-	+	+	+	B
OR	D	Wyden	+	-	+	+	+	B
MT	D	Baucus	+	-	-	+	+	C
RI	R	Chafee	-	-	+	+	+	C

State	Party	Senator	Oppose Nuclear Subsidies (SA 2983)	Oppose Drinking Water Pollution (SA 2986)	Oppose Striking Fuel Economy (SA 2997)	Support 20% Renewable Standard (SA 3017)	Oppose Striking Renewable Standard (SA 3038)	Grade
SD	D	Daschle	-	-	+	+	+	C
CT	D	Dodd	-	-	+	+	+	C
IL	R	Fitzgerald	-	+	-	+	+	C
HI	D	Inouye	+	-	+	-	+	C
MA	D	Kennedy	nv	nv	+	+	+	C
MD	D	Mikulski	-	+	-	+	+	C
WV	D	Rockefeller	+	-	+	-	+	C
HI	D	Akaka	-	-	+	-	+	D
NM	D	Bingaman	-	-	+	-	+	D
NC	D	Edwards	-	-	+	-	+	D
NV	R	Ensign	+	-	-	-	+	D
FL	D	Graham	-	-	+	-	+	D
NH	R	Gregg	-	-	+	-	+	D
SC	D	Hollings	-	-	+	-	+	D
FL	D	Nelson	-	-	+	-	+	D
OR	R	Smith	-	-	+	-	+	D
PA	R	Specter	-	-	-	+	+	D
MI	D	Stabenow	-	+	-	-	+	D
NJ	D	Torricelli	-	-	+	nv	+	D
IN	D	Bayh	-	-	-	-	+	D-
LA	D	Breaux	-	-	-	-	+	D-
KS	R	Brownback	-	-	-	-	+	D-
MO	D	Carnahan	-	-	-	-	+	D-
DE	D	Carper	-	-	-	-	+	D-
ND	D	Conrad	-	-	-	-	+	D-
ND	D	Dorgan	-	-	-	-	+	D-
IA	R	Grassley	-	-	-	-	+	D-
SD	D	Johnson	-	-	-	-	+	D-
WI	D	Kohl	-	-	-	-	+	D-
LA	D	Landrieu	-	-	-	-	+	D-
MI	D	Levin	-	-	-	-	+	D-
AR	D	Lincoln	-	-	-	-	+	D-

State	Party	Senator	Oppose Nuclear Subsidies (SA 2983)	Oppose Drinking Water Pollution (SA 2986)	Oppose Striking Fuel Economy (SA 2997)	Support 20% Renewable Standard (SA 3017)	Oppose Striking Renewable Standard (SA 3038)	Grade
AZ	R	McCain	-	-	+	-	-	D-
NE	D	Nelson	-	-	-	-	+	D-
CO	R	Allard	-	-	-	-	-	F
VA	R	Allen	-	-	-	-	-	F
UT	R	Bennett	-	-	-	-	-	F
MO	R	Bond	-	-	-	-	-	F
KY	R	Bunning	-	-	-	-	-	F
MT	R	Burns	-	-	-	-	-	F
WV	D	Byrd	-	-	-	-	-	F
CO	R	Campbell	-	-	-	-	-	F
GA	D	Cleland	-	-	-	-	-	F
MS	R	Cochran	-	-	-	-	-	F
ID	R	Craig	-	-	-	-	-	F
ID	R	Crapo	-	-	-	-	-	F
OH	R	DeWine	-	-	-	-	-	F
NM	R	Domenici	-	-	-	-	-	F
WY	R	Enzi	-	-	-	-	-	F
TN	R	Frist	-	-	-	-	-	F
TX	R	Gramm	-	-	-	-	-	F
NE	R	Hagel	-	-	-	-	-	F
UT	R	Hatch	-	-	-	-	-	F
NC	R	Helms	-	-	-	-	-	F
AR	R	Hutchinson	-	-	-	-	-	F
TX	R	Hutchison	-	-	-	-	-	F
OK	R	Inhofe	-	-	-	-	-	F
AZ	R	Kyl	-	-	-	-	-	F
MS	R	Lott	-	-	-	-	-	F
IN	R	Lugar	-	-	-	-	-	F
KY	R	McConnell	-	-	-	-	-	F
GA	D	Miller	-	-	-	-	-	F
AK	R	Murkowski	-	-	-	-	-	F
OK	R	Nickles	-	-	-	-	-	F

State	Party	Senator	Oppose Nuclear Subsidies (SA 2983)	Oppose Drinking Water Pollution (SA 2986)	Oppose Striking Fuel Economy (SA 2997)	Support 20% Renewable Standard (SA 3017)	Oppose Striking Renewable Standard (SA 3038)	Grade
KS	R	Roberts	-	-	-	-	-	F
PA	R	Santorum	-	-	-	-	-	F
AL	R	Sessions	-	-	-	-	-	F
AL	R	Shelby	-	-	-	-	nv	F
NH	R	Smith	-	-	-	-	-	F
AK	R	Stevens	-	-	-	-	-	F
WY	R	Thomas	-	-	-	-	-	F
TN	R	Thompson	-	-	-	-	-	F
SC	R	Thurmond	-	-	-	-	-	F
OH	R	Voinovich	-	-	-	-	-	F
VA	R	Warner	-	-	-	-	nv	F

Key:

- + indicates a vote for the environment and public interest.
- indicates a vote against the environment and public interest.
- nv indicates that the Senator did not vote.

The table reports on the following votes:

- (1) Reauthorization of the Price-Anderson Act (SA 2983)
- (2) Hydraulic Fracturing/Weakening of Safe Drinking Water Act standards (SA 2986)
- (3) Levin-Bond amendment to strip fuel economy standards from the bill (SA 2997)
- (4) Jeffords 20 percent by 2020 renewable portfolio standard (SA 3017)
- (5) Kyl amendment to strip renewable energy from the bill (SA 3038)

CONCLUSION

The Senate energy bill started off with the potential to guide us towards a cleaner energy future. Unfortunately, the polluting industries with a financial interest in the status quo have plundered this bill and won numerous amendments that will lead to more drilling, more spilling, more pollution and more radioactive waste.

In its present form, this bill is unacceptable. It does not meet the minimum, basic standards of forward-thinking energy legislation. Instead, this bill is a step backwards. We call upon Senators to oppose further attempts to pollute this bill with special interest handouts and efforts to drill in our last pristine wilderness areas, in particular the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

We need an energy plan that is smarter than the Senate energy bill as it stands today. We need an energy policy that leads us down the right path—towards a cleaner, more affordable and more reliable energy future. Instead of relying on energy sources and technologies of the past, a forward-thinking energy policy should advance America’s energy security by curtailing our dependence on dirty and unreliable energy sources, tapping into our vast potential for clean renewable energy and dramatically increasing energy efficiency.

ATTACHMENT A.

COMPARISON OF THE BUSH-CHENEY ENERGY PLAN, THE HOUSE ENERGY BILL AND THE SENATE ENERGY BILL

Issue	Bush-Cheney Energy Plan	H.R. 4 House Energy Bill	Senate Energy Bill (as of 3/21/02)	Notes on Senate bill
Protect Arctic National Wildlife Refuge	Opens Refuge to oil and gas drilling	Opens Refuge to oil and gas drilling	No provision	Amendment Expected Week of April 8-12, 2002
Protect roadless areas and other wild places	Opens more public lands to oil and gas drilling	Weakens existing protections	No provision	
Reduce oil consumption by at least 1 million barrels/day by 2013	No Provision	Fuel economy provision <i>increases</i> oil consumption by 4 billion gallons	Pickup trucks exempted, flexible fuel loophole extended	Good 35 mpg provision stripped from underlying bill by Levin-Bond amendment
At least 10% generation from renewables by 2020	No Provision	No Provision	Bill's original language weakened to between 4-5% of new generation by 2020.	
Cut subsidies to dirty energy sources	Increase subsidies to coal, oil and gas, nuclear power	\$38 billion in dirty energy subsidies and tax breaks	Original bill contains \$5.3 billion in subsidies for dirty energy. Bill amended with five new provisions to subsidize nuclear energy.	Amendment to add Senate tax package expected after spring recess. Contains \$7.5 billion for dirty energy.
Decrease air Pollution	Includes a "review" of key Clean Air Act enforcement rules, relaxes emission rules for oil refineries	Includes subsidies and tax breaks to encourage more production from coal and other fossil fuels.	Bans MTBE while maintaining tough clean air standards.	
Decrease water pollution	Promotes increased domestic oil production, including drilling along coastal California and in the Gulf of Mexico.	Provides subsidies and tax breaks for in situ leach mining and increased oil and gas drilling in the Gulf of Mexico.	Weakens drinking water protections for hydraulic fracturing. Bans water-polluting gasoline additive but exempts other additives from product liability.	Amendment to close the loophole on renewable fuels industry liability expected after spring recess.
Provide a reliable and consumer-friendly electricity system	Preempts states on transmission lines. Deregulates electricity markets with inadequate consumer protections.	No Provisions	Repeals consumer-protective Public Utility Holding Company Act.	Pro-consumer Feinstein amendment to prevent "future Enrons" and anti-consumer Cochran amendment to weaken air conditioner standards expected after spring recess.

ATTACHMENT B.

CORPORATIONS AND TRADE ASSOCIATIONS FORMALLY OPPOSING A RENEWABLE PORTFOLIO STANDARD

On March 19, 2002, Senator Murkowski entered two letters into the public record opposing a renewable portfolio standard and signed by two dozen trade associations. Additional trade associations wrote their own letters to the Senate in opposition to a clean energy standard. The opponents on record include:

The Adhesive and Sealant Council
Alliance for Competitive Electricity
American Chemistry Council
American Iron and Steel Institute
American Lighting Association
American Paper Machinery Association
American Petroleum Institute
American Portland Cement Alliance
American Textile Manufacturers Institute
Association of American Railroads
Carpet and Rug Institute
Coalition for Affordable and Reliable Energy
Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry
Edison Electric Institute
Electricity Consumers Resource Council
Independent Petroleum Association of America
Industrial Energy Consumers of America
International Association of Drilling Contractors
Interstate Natural Gas Association of America
National Association of Manufacturers

National Electrical Manufacturers Association
National Lime Association
National Mining Association
National Ocean Industries Association
National Restaurant Association
Natural Gas Supply Association
North American Association of Food Equipment
Manufacturers
Nuclear Energy Institute
Ohio Manufacturers' Association
Oklahoma State Chamber of Commerce &
Industry
Pennsylvania Foundry Association
Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association
Texas Association of Business and Chambers of
Commerce
U.S. Chamber of Commerce
Utah Manufacturers Association
U.S. Oil & Gas Association
Westbranch Manufacturers Association

ATTACHMENT C.

CORPORATIONS AND TRADE ASSOCIATIONS FORMALLY OPPOSING HIGHER FUEL ECONOMY STANDARDS

The two primary bodies opposing an increase in fuel economy standards are the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers and the Coalition for Vehicle Choice. Member corporations and groups of these trade associations include:

Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers

BMW Group
DaimlerChrysler
Fiat
Ford Motor Company
General Motors
Isuzu
Mazda

Mitsubishi Motors
Nissan
Porsche
Toyota
Volkswagen
Volvo

Coalition for Vehicle Choice (CVC)

In addition to the national member organizations listed below, CVC's membership includes more than 40,000 state and local organizations and individuals.

3M
Agricultural & Industrial Manufacturers
Representatives Association
Air Service Dealers Association
Allied-Signal Automotive
American Automotive Leasing Association
American Bison Association
American Association for Traffic Safety
American Farm Bureau Federation
American Goat Society, Inc.
American Horse Council
American Horse Show Association
American Hospital Association
American International Automobile Dealers
Association
American Iron and Steel Institute
American Legislative Exchange Council
American Meat Institute
American Miniature Horse Association
American Motorcyclist Association
American Recovery Association
American Recreation Coalition
American Red Brangus Association
American Rental Association
American Road and Transportation Builders
Association
American Soybean Association
American Sportfishing Association
Armco, Inc.
Arvin Industries, Inc.
Ashland Chemical, Inc.
Associated Builders & Contractors

Associated General Contractors of America
Association of American Railroads
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company
Auto/Steel Partnership Program
B.A.S.S., Inc.
Beefmaster Breeders Universal
Bethlehem Steel Corporation
BOAT/U.S.
Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc.
Brunswick Marine
Citizens for a Sound Economy
Coalitions for America
Competitive Enterprise Institute
Conrail
Consumer Alert
Contract Services Association of America
Courier Magazine
CSX Corporation
DaimlerChrysler
Dana Corporation
DuPont
Eaton Corporation
Emergency Nurses CARE, Inc.
Ford Motor Company
General Motors Corporation
Glaxo, Inc.
Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company
Holstein Association of America
Independent Electrical Contractors, Inc.
International Association of Chiefs of Police,
Highway Safety Committee
International Brangus Breeders Association

International Drivers' & Enthusiasts' Auto League
International Family Recreation Association
International Professional Rodeo Association
ITT Corporation
Kampgrounds of America
Land Improvement Contractors of America
Limousine Industry Manufacturers Organization
Livestock Marketing Association
LTV Steel Company
Marine Retailers Association of America
Mason Contractors Association of America
Mechanical Contractors Association of America, Inc.
Michelin North America, Inc.
Motorcycle Industry Council
Motorola, Inc.
National Alliance of Senior Citizens, Inc.
National Arborist Association
National Association of Canoe Liveries & Outfitters, Inc.
National Association of Home Builders
National Association of Manufacturers
National Association of Plumbing, Heating, Cooling Contractors
National Association of RV Parks and Campgrounds
National Association of Trailer Manufacturers
National Auto Auction Association
National Automobile Dealers Association
National Cattlemen's Association
National Center for Handicapped Rights
National Concrete Masonry Association
National Electrical Contractors Association
National Grange
National Highway 50 Federation
National Insulation and Abatement Contractors Association
National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association
National Marine Manufacturers Association
National Mining Association

National Motorists Association
National Muscle Car Association
National Parking Association
National Pork Producers Council
National Roofing Contractors Association
National RV Owners Club
National Stone Association
National Traffic Safety Institute
National Truck Equipment Association
Norfolk Southern Corporation
Outboard Marine Corporation
Outdoor Amusement Business Association
Painting & Decorating Contractors of America
Potash & Phosphate Institute, Inc.
R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company
Recreation Vehicle Dealers Association
Recreation Vehicle Industry Association
Reynolds Metals Company
Rubber Manufacturers Association
Santa Gertrudis Breeders Internat
Small Business Survival Committee
Society of Recreation Executives
Southern Pacific Transportation Company
Specialty Equipment Market Association
Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders and Exhibitors Association
The Good Sam Club
The Irrigation Association
The Mustang Club of America, Inc.
The Seniors Coalition
Tire Industry Safety Council
TRW, Inc.
Turfgrass Producers International
Union Pacific Corporation
United Seniors Association
United States Chamber of Commerce
United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
United Technologies Corporation
USX Corporation
Wally Byam Caravan Club International
Women Involved in Farm Economics
World Organization of Automobile Hobbyists