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Renewable Energy: Tax Credit, Budget, and Electricity Restructuring Issues

SUMMARY

Debate over renewable energy programs is focused on the FY2001 budget request, the Clinton Administration’s Climate Change Technology Initiative (CCTI), and proposals for restructuring the electricity industry. Energy security, a major driver of federal energy efficiency programs in the past, is now somewhat less of an issue.

On the other hand, worldwide emphasis on environmental problems of air and water pollution and global climate change, and the related development of clean energy technologies in western Europe and Japan especially, have emerged as important influences on renewable energy policymaking.

The Clinton Administration views renewable energy as the key part of its energy supply policy, both for environmental and technology competitiveness reasons.

The FY2001 request for the Department of Energy’s (DOE’s) Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy’s (EERE’s) Renewable Energy Programs is $456.6 million, an increase of $100.0 million (32%) over the FY2000 level. This includes $409.5 million for DOE’s Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE), an increase of $100.0 million, and $47.1 million for the Office of Science (OS), which is the same as for FY2000. The EERE amount includes $31.7 million more for biofuels, $18.0 million more for wind, $16.1 million more for photovoltaics, $10.2 million more for electric and storage programs, and $7.7 million more for international renewable energy programs. (See Table 2 at the end of this brief.)

For the FY2001 Energy and Water Appropriations bill (H.R. 4733), the Senate approved (S. Rept. 106-395) $444.1 million (including $47.1 million for programs under the Office of Science) for the DOE Renewable Energy Program. Relative to the House level, the Senate would provide an increase of $53.6 million, or 14%, in current dollar terms. In the House, the Salmon/Udall/Boehlert/Kaptur floor amendment added $40 million, bringing the House-passed total to $392.8 million (including $47.1 million for OS programs).

Several electricity industry restructuring bills propose to eliminate the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA), which requires utilities to purchase power from qualified renewable energy providers. PURPA has been key to the growth of renewable power facilities. Bills intended to ensure a continuing role for renewables in this industry include some combination of renewable energy portfolio standard (RPS), public benefits fund (PBF), and/or an information disclosure requirement that supports green power. Some states and electric utility companies have already instituted such measures. Debate is focused on whether there should be a federal role in restructuring generally and in creating incentives for renewables specifically.

The Senate is considering S. 2557, The National Energy Security Act of 2000, which contains provisions for increasing federal hydropower capacity, streamlining hydropower licensing, extending wind and biomass electricity production tax credits, and creating a residential solar tax credit.
**MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENTS**

On September 22, the Senate approved a motion to proceed to consider S. 2557, *The National Energy Security Act of 2000*. The bill contains provisions for adding federal hydropower capacity, streamlining hydropower licensing, extending wind and biomass electricity production tax credits, and creating a residential solar tax credit. On September 7, the Senate approved $444.1 million for the DOE Renewable Energy Program, under the FY2001 Energy and Water Appropriations bill. Seven floor amendments created earmarks for various renewable energy programs, but none of the amendments modified the level of appropriations. On July 18, the Senate Appropriations Committee recommended (S. Rept. 106-395) $444.1 million (including $47.1 million for programs under the Office of Science) for the DOE Renewable Energy Program. Relative to the House level, the Senate would provide an increase of $53.6 million, or 14.0%, in current dollar terms. On February 7, 2000, the Administration issued its FY2001 budget proposal. For FY2001, DOE proposes to boost solar and renewables funding to $456.6 million — an increase of $100.0 million (32%) over the FY2000 level. (The budget request documents are available on DOE’s web site [http://www.cfo.doe.gov/budget/01budget/index.htm].)

**BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS**

**Renewable Energy Concept**

Renewable energy is derived from resources that are generally not depleted by human use, such as the sun, wind, and water movement. These primary sources of energy can be converted into heat, electricity and mechanical energy in several ways. There are some mature technologies for conversion of renewable energy such as hydropower, biomass, and waste combustion. Other conversion technologies, such as wind turbines and photovoltaics, are already well-developed, but have not achieved the technological efficiency and market penetration which many expect they will ultimately reach. Although geothermal energy is produced from geological rather than solar sources, it is often included as a renewable energy resource and this brief treats it as one. Commercial nuclear power is not considered to be a renewable energy resource. (For further definitions of renewable energy, see the National Renewable Energy Laboratory’s web site information on “Clean Energy 101” [http://www.nrel.gov/ceb.html].)

**Contribution to National Energy Supply**

According to the Energy Information Administration’s (EIA’s) *Short-Term Energy Outlook, April 1999*, renewable energy resources supplied about 6.7 Q (quadrillion Btu’s or quads) of the 94.4 Q the nation used in 1998, or about 7.2% of national energy demand. More than half of renewable energy production takes the form of electricity supply. Of this, most is provided by utility hydropower. However, in 1998, declining hydroelectric availability led to a 0.33 Q, or 5%, drop in national renewable energy use and it is projected to result in a further 0.13 Q, or 2%, drop in 1999. Industrial use of renewables, supplied primarily by biofuels, accounts for most of the remaining contribution.
After more than 20 years of federal support, some note that renewable energy has neither achieved a high level of market penetration nor a growing market share among other energy sources. A recent review of renewable energy studies by Resources for the Future, *Renewable Energy: Winner, Loser, or Innocent Victim?*, concludes that the lower-than-projected market penetration and flat market share are due primarily to declining fossil fuel and electricity prices during this period. In contrast, however, it notes that the costs for renewable energy technologies have declined by amounts equal to or exceeding those of earlier projections. Further, it says that the declining price of electricity is likely to continue moving the cost threshold for renewable energy downward, making it difficult for renewables to capture a larger share of the electricity market.

EIA’s 1999 *Annual Energy Outlook* projects that current policies would yield an 0.8% average annual increase through 2020, resulting in a 22% total increase in renewable energy production. This would amount to about 6.8% of the projected 119 Q total demand in 2020. (Detailed breakdowns of renewable energy use appear in EIA’s *Renewable Energy Annual 1998* and *Renewable Energy Issues and Trends 1998*.)

**Role in Long-Term Energy Supply**

*Our Common Future*, the 1987 report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, found that “energy efficiency can only buy time for the world to develop ‘low-energy paths’ based on renewable sources...” Although many renewable energy systems are in a relatively early stage of development, they offer the world “a potentially huge primary energy source, sustainable in perpetuity and available in various forms to every nation on Earth.” It suggested that a Research, Development, and Demonstration (R,D&D) program of renewable energy projects is required to attain the same level of primary energy that is now obtained from a mix of fossil, nuclear, and renewable energy resources.

The *Agenda 21* adopted at the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) concluded that mitigating urban air pollution and the adverse impact of energy use on the atmosphere — such as acid rain, global warming, and climate change — requires an emphasis on “clean and renewable energy sources.” A 1996 report by the President’s Council on Sustainable Development, *Energy and Transportation*, called for raising the renewable energy share of U.S. energy supply to 12% in 2010 and 25% in 2025.

**History**

The oil embargo of 1973 sparked a quadrupling of energy prices, major economic shock, and the establishment of a comprehensive federal energy program to help with the nation’s immediate and long-term energy needs. During the 1970s, the federal renewable energy program grew rapidly to include basic and applied R&D, and joint federal participation with the private sector in demonstration projects, commercialization, and information dissemination. In addition, the federal government instituted market incentives, such as business and residential tax credits, and created a utility market for non-utility produced electric power through the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (P.L. 95-617).
The subsequent failure of the oil cartel and the return of low oil and gas prices in the early 1980s slowed the federal program. Despite Congress’s consistent support for a broader, more aggressive renewable energy program than any Administration, federal spending for these programs fell steadily through 1990. Lacking a sustained, long-range policy from the Administration, Congress first took a major initiative in 1974. Until 1994, Congress led policy development and funding through legislative initiatives and close reviews of annual budget submissions. FY1995 marked a noteworthy shift, with the 103rd Congress for the first time approving less funding than the Administration had requested. The 104th Congress approved 23% less than the Administration request for FY1996 and 8% less for FY1997. However, funding turned upward again during the 105th Congress. (A detailed description of DOE programs appears in DOE’s FY2000 Congressional Budget Request, DOE/CR-0061, v. 2, February 1999.)

From FY1973 through FY1998, the federal government spent about $11.7 billion (in 1999 constant dollars) for renewable energy R&D. Renewable energy R&D funding grew from less than $1 million per year in the early 1970s to over $1.3 billion in FY1979 and FY1980, then declined steadily to $136 million in FY1990. Spending rose from FY1991 to FY1995, declined in FY1996 and FY1997, then rose again in FY1998, reaching $275 million in 1999 constant dollars.

This spending history can be viewed within the context of DOE spending for the three other major energy R&D programs: nuclear, fossil, and energy efficiency R&D. From FY1948 through FY1972, in 1999 constant dollars, the federal government spent about $22.4 billion for nuclear (fission and fusion) energy R&D and about $5.1 billion for fossil energy R&D. From FY1973 through FY1998, in 1999 constant dollars, the federal government spent $43.2 billion for nuclear, $21.1 billion for fossil, $11.7 billion for renewables, and $8 billion for energy efficiency. Total energy R&D spending from FY1948-FY1998 reached $111.5 billion, including $66 billion, or 59% for nuclear, $26 billion, or 23%, for fossil, $12 billion, or 11%, for renewables, and $8 billion, or 7%, for energy efficiency.

**Tax Credits**

The Energy Tax Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-618) created residential solar credits and the residential and business credits for wind energy installations; it expired on December 31, 1985. However, business investment credits were extended repeatedly through the 1980s. Section 1916 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPACT, P.L. 102-486) extended the 10% business tax credits for solar and geothermal equipment indefinitely. Also, EPACT Section 1914 created an income tax “production” credit of 1.5 cents/kwh for electricity produced by wind and closed-loop biomass systems. P.L. 106-170 expanded this credit to include poultry waste and extended it through December 31, 2001.

**Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act**

The Public Utilities Regulatory Policies Act (P.L. 96-917) required electric utilities to purchase power produced by qualified renewable power facilities. Under PURPA, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) established rules requiring that electric utilities purchase power from windfarms and other small power producers at an “avoided cost” price based on energy and capacity costs that the utility would otherwise incur by generating the power itself or purchasing it elsewhere. However, to receive avoided cost payments, each
renewables facility must file for, and obtain, qualifying facility (QF) status from FERC. EIA’s *Renewable Energy 1998: Issues and Trends* (p. 4-5) reports that, by the end of 1996, nonutility renewable power capacity reached 17,200 MW, of which 12,600 MW came from QFs, including 3,420 MW of small hydropower facilities. These renewable power facilities generated nearly 90 billion kwh, of which 69 billion kwh was produced by QFs, including about 12 billion kwh of small hydropower. Thus, in 1996, QFs accounted for about 73% of nonutility renewable power capacity and about 76% of nonutility renewable power generation. QFs provided about 1.8% of national electric capacity and about 2.2% of national electricity generation.

**DOE’s Strategic and Performance Goals**


**CCTI Tax Credits**

The Administration’s Climate Change Technology Initiative (CCTI) for FY2001 proposes several tax incentives for renewable energy production and equipment. First, it proposes an extension and broadening of the electricity production tax credit. This includes a 2.5-year extension of the 1.5 cent/kwh wind energy and closed-loop biomass production tax credit from its current expiration date of December 31, 2001, through June 30, 2003. It would also broaden the credit to include open-loop biomass from forest and agricultural residues, through 2005. Further, it would create a 0.5 cent/kwh credit for cofiring biomass with coal, through 2005, and a 1.5 cent/kwh credit for using methane from landfills to generate electricity, through 2006. (The CCTI tax proposals are available on the White House web site [http://www.pub.whitehouse.gov/retrieve-documents.html].)
Second, CCTI proposes a 15% investment tax credit for consumers and businesses. For photovoltaic rooftop systems, the credit would be limited to $2,000 and apply through 2007. For solar water heaters, the credit would be limited to $1,000 and apply through 2005. Business taxpayers would have to choose between this credit and the existing 10% investment tax credit for solar water heaters.

Third, CCTI proposes an accelerated 15-year depreciation schedule for distributed power equipment at industrial sites with a rated capacity under 500 kilowatts (or 12,500 pounds per of steam). This incentive is focused primarily on energy efficient system equipment, but may also apply to renewable energy-powered generation equipment.

The Clinton Administration has estimated the impacts of CCTI credits on revenue at the Department of the Treasury. This is shown in the table below:

| Table 1. CCTI Tax Credits: Projected Revenue Reduction at Treasury Department ($ millions) |
|:---:|---:|---:|
| Production Credits (wind, biomass, landfill) | 91 | 976 |
| Solar Investment Credits | 9 | 132 |
| Accelerated Depreciation (all equipment) | 1 | 10 |
| Total | 101 | 1,118 |


In the first session, there was debate over the recently enacted extension of the wind and closed-loop production tax credit. Extension supporters, such as the American Wind Energy Association, said the credit brings renewable energy costs down, improving competitiveness and enabling industry to improve technology to drive costs down even further. In contrast, opponents, such as the Cato Institute, contended that the production credit has not been successful at encouraging investment and thus its drain on the Treasury is not cost-effective.

At the end of the first session, budget negotiators for the FY2000 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-113) agreed to enact H.R. 1180, which included in Section 507 an energy production tax credit extension for wind and closed-loop biomass, and added a new credit for poultry waste, for 2½ years, retroactive to June 30, 1999, and effective through December 31, 2001. Section 507 of H.R. 1180 incorporated an amended version of the credit extension proposed in S. 1792. H.R. 1180 was enacted into law (P.L. 106-170). The energy production tax credit for wind and certain biomass equipment had expired on June 30, 1999. In 1992, EPACT Section 1914 established an income tax “production” credit of 1.5 cents/kwh (adjusted for inflation) to be paid to businesses for electricity produced by wind and closed-loop biomass systems (biomass used solely for power production). The credit applies to energy produced from new facilities for the first 10 years.

Also, DOE funds a separate Renewable Energy Production Incentive (REPI) that was created with the parallel purpose of encouraging renewable energy use by state and local
governments and by non-profit electric cooperatives. Unlike the tax credit, this incentive must be funded annually, through the appropriations process.

**FY2001 DOE Budget**

**President’s Request.** The FY2001 budget request for the Renewable Energy Program “... will contribute to strengthening the Nation’s energy security, providing a cleaner environment, enhancing global sales of U.S. energy products, and increasing industrial competitiveness and federal technology transfer. The solar and renewable energy program is a major component of the Administration’s activities to address global climate change,” according to the Appendix to the U.S. Government’s FY2001 Budget (p. 403). In accordance with that policy, DOE proposes to boost solar and renewables funding to $456.6 million — an increase of $100.0 million (32%) over the FY2000 level. This includes $409.5 million for DOE’s Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE), an increase of $100.0 million, and $47.1 million for the Office of Science, which is the same as for FY2000. The EERE amount includes $31.7 million more for biofuels, $16.1 million more for photovoltaics, $18.0 million more for wind, $10.2 million more for electric and storage programs, and $7.7 million more for international renewable energy programs.

Under the Biofuels Program, $12 million is sought for the new Integrated Bioenergy Technology Research and Technology Initiative. Its goal is the co-production of power, fuels, chemicals, and other bio-based products from crops, trees, and wastes. This initiative follows from President Clinton’s August 1999 Executive Order 13134, *Developing and Promoting Biobased Products and Bioenergy.* It aims “to develop a comprehensive national strategy, including research development and private sector incentives, to stimulate the creation and early adoption of technologies needed to make biobased products and bioenergy cost-competitive in large national and international markets.” Also, the Biofuels Program seeks an $8.3 million increase for ethanol production, which is focused on converting agricultural and forestry residues to ethanol and electric power.

Under the Wind Program, most of the requested increase is for three new programs: $5 million for a new “Wind Powering America” initiative, which would accelerate use through regionally-based partnership strategies; $5 million for a new “Regional Field Verification” program, which would competitively bid 3-5 projects aimed at unique regional siting, technical, or market barriers; and $4 million for the “International Clean Energy Initiative,” which is focused on competitively bid partnerships to enhance wind energy and wind-hybrid systems use in developing countries.

Under the Photovoltaic Program, basic research would increase by $8.4 million, mainly for work on large area thin films, multi-junction concentrator cells, and other topics that could lead to major cost reductions. This appears to be a response to falling U.S. world market share in 1998. Also, the request seeks an increase of $1.5 million for the Million Solar Roofs Initiative.

Under the Electric Energy and Storage Program, $8.0 million of the requested increase aims to ensure and enhance electric power system security and reliability. Of this, a $5.5 million increase targets development of power electronics technology, which would be used
to develop rapid (real-time) measurement and control systems. Also, a $2.5 million increase focuses on competitive bids for distributed power systems, which would include interconnection and control technology for fuel cells, photovoltaics, and other distributed power equipment.

The International Renewable Energy Program aims to support the U.S. International Joint Implementation Initiative (USIJI), equipment exports, and a new “International Clean Energy Initiative (ICEI).” The Program request includes $5.5 million for ICEI, which would focus on regional renewable energy resource assessments that could be integrated into country energy plans and a strategy for private sector partnerships. Also, a $2.2 million increase for USIJI would encourage private sector “clean energy” projects and support national action plan preparation in developing countries as a way of seeking “meaningful participation” in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

**Energy and Water Appropriations Bill.** On June 28, the House passed H.R. 4733, the Energy and Water Appropriations bill for FY2001. The House Appropriations Committee recommended $352.8 million (including $47.1 million for programs under the Office of Science) for the DOE Renewable Energy Program. In contending that the Renewable Energy Program request does not merit a large funding increase, the House Appropriations Committee’s report cites funding constraints, a lack of sufficient program justifications, and a recent critique of Program management by the National Academy of Public Administration. However, voice vote approval of the Salmon/Udall/Boehlert/Kaptur amendment (H.Amdt.920, A006) added $40 million, bringing the House-passed total to $392.8 million. Relative to the FY2000 appropriation, the House level would provide an increase of $30.6 million, or 8%, in current dollar terms. This includes $9.0 million more for Photovoltaics, $6.8 million more for Biofuels-Transportation, $4.3 million more for Wind, and $3.6 million more for Electric/Storage. However, relative to the request, the House level would provide $63.8 million (14%) less for the Program. This includes $14.5 million less for Biofuels-Power, $13.2 million less for Wind, $8.2 million less for Biofuels-Transportation, $7.5 million less for International programs, $6 million less for Photovoltaics, and $6 million less for Electric/Storage.

Relative to the House level, the Senate would provide an increase of $53.6 million, or 14.0%, in current dollar terms. This includes $17.1 million more for Electric/Storage, $14.1 million more for Biofuels-Power, $8.0 million more for Hydrogen, $6.7 million more for Wind, and $4.6 million more for Photovoltaics. However, relative to the request, the Senate would provide a decrease of $10.7 million, or 2.4%, in current dollar terms. This includes $10.4 million less for Biofuels-Transportation, $6.5 million less for Wind, $5.0 million less for Photovoltaics, $5.5 million less for International Renewables, and $3.5 million less for Program Support. However, the Senate level also includes $11.1 million more for Electric/Storage and $8.0 million more for Hydrogen.

**Other Legislation.** S. 2557, The National Energy Security Act of 2000, aims to reduce oil import dependency to 50% of national oil use by 2010, mitigate recent oil price impacts, and encourage energy efficiency and more domestic energy supply, including renewable energy. Section 401 calls for an inventory of federal hydropower facilities and their capability to produce additional electric power. Section 402 directs FERC to study options for reducing the cost and time required for obtaining an hydropower operating license. Section 901 extends the wind and biomass electricity production tax credit from December 31, 2001, to
January 1, 2004. Further, it makes certain power purchase contracts ineligible for the credit. Section 905 creates a 15% residential solar energy tax credit, not to exceed $2,000, available for tax years 2000 through 2004.

S. 935 (and companion bill H.R. 2827) would fund a six-year research effort involving national laboratories, universities, and industry. It would also create a Biomass R&D Board to increase coordination of federal programs to promote biobased products. R&D would cover gasification technologies, including coproduction of power and heat, advanced turbines and fuel cells, and corn-based ethanol research.

**Climate Change**

Since 1988, the federal government has accelerated programs that study the science of global climate change and created programs aimed at mitigating fossil fuel-generated carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) and other human-generated emissions. (For more details, see the CRS electronic briefing book on Global Climate Change at [http://www.congress.gov/brbk/html/ebgcc1.html].) The Clinton Administration has identified renewable energy as a significant part of the strategy for curbing carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions. This is reflected in its CCTI proposals for increased renewable energy R&D spending, tax credits, and other policy mechanisms at DOE and other agencies.

The federal government funds programs for renewable energy as a mitigation measure at DOE, EPA, the Agency for International Development (AID), and the World Bank. The latter two agencies have received funding for renewable energy-related climate actions through Foreign Operations appropriations bills.

Because CO$_2$ contributes the largest share of greenhouse gas emission impact, it has been the focus of studies of the potential for reducing emissions through renewable energy and other means. DOE’s 1997 report by five national laboratories entitled *Scenarios of U.S. Carbon Reductions: Potential Impacts of Energy Technologies by 2010 and Beyond* estimated the possible emissions impact from renewables. Also known as the *Five-Lab Study*, it estimated that the development and use of cellulosic biofuels could curb from 12 million to 17 million tons of carbon (MtC). Further, it estimated that, with a $50/metric ton carbon tax, renewable energy electric power technologies (mainly wind energy and biomass cofired with coal) could reduce CO$_2$ emissions by 25 to 50 MtC. However, for the longer-term beyond 2010, the *Five-Lab Study* concluded that renewables could make a much larger contribution to CO$_2$ reduction.

On March 25, 1999, the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources held a hearing on *Economic Impacts of the Kyoto Protocol*. It focused on contending views of potential costs to implement the 7% reduction in U.S. greenhouse emissions called for in the Protocol. Also, EPA, DOE, and DOE’s Energy Information Administration (EIA) testified at an April 14, 1999, House Science Committee hearing, *Fiscal Year 2000 Climate Change Budget Authorization Request*. EIA contended that the CCTI provisions would provide minimal reduction in greenhouse emissions. In contrast, EPA and DOE stressed the urgency of action, noting that CCTI provisions would provide immediate savings in energy, costs, and emissions.
S. 882, introduced April 27, 1999, proposes R&D funding increases for renewable energy and other energy technologies as a partial alternative to the CCTI. It would provide $200 million per year over 10 years to accelerate development of energy efficiency, fossil energy, nuclear energy, and renewable energy R&D. Through this means, the bill focuses on a long-term strategy for curbing greenhouse gas emissions.

Except for biofuels and biopower, wherever renewable energy equipment displaces fossil fuel use, it will also reduce carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) emissions, as well as pollutants that contribute to water pollution, acid rain, and urban smog. In general, the combustion of biomass for fuel and power production releases CO$_2$ at an intensity that may rival or exceed that for natural gas. However, the growth of biomass material offsets this release. Hence, net emissions occur only when combustion is based on deforestation. In a “closed loop” system, biomass combustion is based on rotating energy crops, there is no net release, and its displacement of any fossil fuel, including natural gas, reduces CO$_2$ emissions.

On August 12, 1999, the President issued Executive Order 12124 on biobased products and bioenergy. The main stated purpose is to increase the market competitiveness of these products, while reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally, a council would be created, charged with creating a strategic plan with national goals for bioenergy development and use.

**Electric Industry Restructuring**

Several electricity industry restructuring bills propose to eliminate the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA), which has been key to the growth of renewable power facilities. Bills intended to ensure a continuing role for renewable energy sources have been introduced in the 106th Congress that include some combination of a renewable energy portfolio standard (RPS), a public benefits fund (PBF), and/or an information disclosure requirement that supports “green” pricing and marketing of renewable power. Some states and electric utility companies have already instituted such measures.

Debate is focused on whether there should be a federal role in restructuring generally and in creating incentives for renewables specifically. The Administration’s bill, “Comprehensive Electricity Competition Plan,” introduced by request as S. 1047 and H.R. 1828, includes elements of all three policies described above. Also, H.R. 2050 sets provisions for renewables, which are defined to include solar, wind, geothermal, and biomass power, but it excludes all forms of hydropower. *Inside Energy* of July 26, 1999, reports (p. 5-6) that on July 23, Chairman Barton of the House Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power released a proposed bill outline that excludes a renewable energy portfolio standard, but includes in its place an incentive for owners or operators of “qualified renewable energy facilities.”

On May 13, 1999, FERC issued a proposed rule to create voluntary regional transmission organizations (RTOs). Comments from several "green" groups argued that the proposal should address access and pricing barriers for renewables and that RTOs be required to provide data needed to verify green marketing claims, track information disclosure requirements, and monitor compliance with state RPS provisions. In contrast, the Edison...
Electric Institute expressed concern about RTOs becoming too powerful, especially in assessing RPS's.

More details about the debate over renewable energy provisions in federal legislation to restructure the electric power industry are described in CRS Report RS20270 on *Renewable Energy and Electricity Restructuring*. (For a discussion of broader electricity restructuring issues, see CRS Electronic Briefing Book on *Electricity Restructuring* at [http://www.congress.gov/brbk/html/ebele1.html] and CRS Issue Brief IB10006, *Electricity: The Road to Restructuring*.)

**LEGISLATION**

**P.L. 106-60, H.R. 2605**

**P.L. 106-170, H.R. 1180**
Work Incentives Act. Section 507 extends the production tax credit for wind and closed loop biomass, and it adds a new credit for poultry waste. This section was derived as an amendment of S. 1792 that was incorporated in conference. Conference reported (H. Rept. 106-478) November 17. Passed Senate November 19. Signed into law December 17, 1999.

**H.R. 1465 (Salmon)/S. 1634 (Allard)**
Residential Solar Energy Tax Credit Act. Creates 15% credit for photovoltaics and solar water heating equipment. House bill introduced April 15, 1999; referred to Committee on Ways and Means. Senate bill introduced September 24, 1999; referred to Committee on Finance.

**H.R. 2050 (Largent)**
Electric Consumers’ Power to Choose Act. Provides for a more competitive electric power industry. Would create production tax credit for renewable energy and establish a Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) that may begin on January 1, 2005, and would sunset in 2015. Introduced June 8, 1999; referred to Committee on Commerce, and to the Committees on Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Resources.

**H.R. 2380 (Matsui)**

**H.R. 2819 (M. Udall)**
H.R. 4035 (Gekas)

H.R. 4733 (Packard)

S. 882 (Murkowski)

S. 935 (Lugar)/H.R. 1827 (Ewing)

S. 1003 (Rockefeller)
Alternative Fuels Promotion Act. Provides increased tax incentives for the purchase of alternative fuels and electric vehicles and for other purposes. Introduced May 11, 1999; referred to Committee on Finance.

S. 1047 (Murkowski)/H.R. 1828 (Bliley)

S. 1369 (Jeffords)
Clean Energy Act. Creates incentive for renewable energy and other measures under electricity restructuring. Introduced July 14, 1999; referred to Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S. 1776 (Craig)
S. 2557 (Lott)

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS, REPORTS, AND DOCUMENTS


CRS Reports

CRS Report RS20270. Renewable energy and electricity restructuring, by Fred Sissine.


CRS Report 98-615. Electricity restructuring: The Implications for Air Quality, by Larry Parker.


**FOR ADDITIONAL READING**

*Tables showing DOE Renewable Energy R&D Funding (current and constant) trends back to FY1974 are available from the author of this issue brief.*


**Web Sites**


National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. [http://www.naruc.org/]

National Association of State Energy Offices. [http://www.naseo.org/]


U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Solar Site. [http://www.epa.gov/solar/]
Table 3. DOE Renewable Energy Budget for FY1999-FY2001
($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solar Buildings</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photovoltaics</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrating Solar Power</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass - Total</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass/Utility Power</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass/Biofuels Transp.</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Incentive</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Program Support</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Renewables</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREL (incl. construction)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Hydro</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renew. Amer. Indian Res.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric/Storage</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Direction</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Energy Management</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENEWABLES, Subtotal</td>
<td>332.3</td>
<td>315.1</td>
<td>407.8</td>
<td>343.4</td>
<td>397.0</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductions/Prior Year/Increase</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENEWABLES, Adjusted</td>
<td>331.3</td>
<td>315.1</td>
<td>407.8</td>
<td>343.4</td>
<td>397.0</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/Photovoltaics Rsch.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/Biomass-Biofuels</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/Wind</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/Solar Photoconversion</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/Hydrogen</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/Subtotal</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENEWABLES, with OS</td>
<td>380.2</td>
<td>362.2</td>
<td>454.9</td>
<td>390.5</td>
<td>444.1</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENEWABLES with OS, Adjusted</td>
<td>379.2</td>
<td>362.2</td>
<td>454.9</td>
<td>390.5</td>
<td>444.1</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>