

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: Council of Economic Advisers
Series/Staff Member: Jeffrey Frankel
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 13727
FolderID:

Folder Title:
Talking Points President GCC [Global Climate Change] Plan 10/97

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	20	5	1	2

Talking Points on President's Climate Change Proposal

October 22, 1997



The President has proposed an ambitious climate change plan that is environmentally strong and economically sensible. Based on the President's conviction that global climate change is the premier environmental challenge of the 21st century, the President's plan will proceed pragmatically -- in three stages and with periodic economic and scientific reviews -- to cut greenhouse gas emissions by almost 30% from levels projected for 2010.

In the first stage, the President's plan will provide funding, create incentives, build partnerships and give credit for early emissions reductions. The second phase, beginning around 2004, will review, evaluate and extend the efforts of the first phase while laying the groundwork for phase three. In phase three, an international and domestic emissions trading system would begin.

The President's plan includes the following key elements:

- **A binding, realistic target to reach 1990 emissions levels by 2008-2012.** This target is part of a comprehensive framework for agreement in Kyoto that also includes flexible, market-based mechanisms and the participation of developing countries. The President is also committed to reductions below 1990 levels in the five-year period that follows.
- **A \$5 billion program of tax cuts and R&D for new technologies.** To spur energy efficiency and the development of new technologies, the President proposes a major new package of tax cuts and R&D spending amounting to \$5 billion over five years.
- **Active consultations over the next 9 months on an industry-by-industry basis, with early credit for companies making early reductions.** The President is committed to working with business to get their best ideas on how they can best reduce their own emissions, and to rewarding firms that act early.
- **Developing countries must participate.** Climate change is a global problem, and requires a global solution. That's why the President has committed that the United States will not adopt binding obligations without developing country participation.
- **A domestic and international emissions trading system.** Such a system can harness the power of the market to reduce emissions, as it has with great success in the case of acid rain.
- **Encouraging the use of energy-efficient products.** The President will engage in a broad-based effort to expand the use of existing energy-efficient technologies.
- **Federal procurement and energy use.** The Department of Energy will spearhead a comprehensive effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from Federal sources.
- **Electricity Restructuring.** To deliver a significant down payment on emission reductions, while saving consumers billions, we will pursue a bold plan for electricity restructuring.
- **Setting a concentration goal.** With advice from the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. supports developing a specific, long-term concentration goal for greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.
- **Transition assistance.** The President is committed to working with Congress and labor to ensure a just transition for any workers dislocated by the changes in energy usage inherent in any climate change plan.



PRESIDENT CLINTON'S CLIMATE CHANGE PROPOSAL

October 22, 1997

Global climate change is the premier environmental challenge and opportunity of the 21st century, and the risks it poses justify sensible preventive steps. Addressing this issue is one of the United States' greatest imperatives, for this and future generations. Recognizing the solid foundation of climate science, President Clinton is committed to strong and sensible action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions -- including realistic and binding emissions targets.

Key elements of President Clinton's climate change proposal include:

- **Binding Targets to Reach 1990 Emissions Levels by 2008-2012 and Reductions Below 1990 Levels in the 5-Year Period That Follows.** A critical component of the President's comprehensive framework is a realistic, achievable, and binding target of reducing greenhouse emissions to 1990 levels by 2008-2012 and reductions below 1990 levels in the 5-year period that follows.
- **\$5 Billion Program of Tax Cuts and R&D for New Technologies.** To spur energy efficiency and the development of new technologies, the President proposes a major new package of tax cuts and R&D spending amounting to \$5 billion over five years.
- **Industry-by-Industry Consultations and Early Credit.** The Administration challenges key industries to prepare plans over the next 9 months on how they can best reduce emissions. To provide an incentive for near-term actions to cut emissions, the President is committed to ensuring appropriate rewards for firms that act early.
- **Developing Countries Must Participate.** Climate change is a global problem, and requires a global solution. That's why the United States has spear-headed joint implementation projects, and the President has committed that the United States will not adopt binding obligations without developing country participation.
- **Broad-Based Domestic and International Emissions Trading System Begins After A Decade of Experience Has Accumulated.** The President is committed to a market-based emissions trading system, both domestically and internationally, that will harness the power of the market to reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2008-2012. The trading system would begin after a decade's worth of experience with tax incentives, R&D, early credit, electricity restructuring, Federal efforts, and other measures.

BINDING TARGETS: The U.S. binding target is realistic: It seeks to return U.S. emissions to 1990 levels in the period 2008-2012 and reduce them further thereafter. We reject the European proposal for more stringent early reductions, as well as the "do-nothing" approach of some interests. The target is achievable: By providing incentives for early action to reduce emissions, attacking domestic energy inefficiencies, and putting in place a market-based emissions trading system, we can reach 1990 levels in the proposed time frame with minimal economic costs. And it is meaningful: Achieving 1990 levels in the period 2008-2012 would amount to almost a 30 percent reduction off a business-as-usual path, an important first step on the road toward stabilizing greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere.

SOLID PRINCIPLES: The President's five climate change principles include: that the policies should be guided by science, rely on market-based, common-sense tools, that we should seek win-win solutions, that global participation is essential to addressing the global problem of climate change, and that we must have regular common-sense reviews of the economics and science of climate change.

SOUND AND SENSIBLE THREE-STAGE APPROACH: Reflecting his five key principles, the President's plan includes three stages: Stage 1 includes priming the pump through programs such as R&D, tax incentives, incentives for early action, and Federal leadership, and industry consultations. Stage 2 builds upon the first stage by including a review and evaluation in preparation for the permit trading system. Stage 3 -- which does not occur for a decade -- involves meeting binding targets through a domestic and international emissions trading program. The President is committed to working with labor and Congress to insure that we give proper assistance to any workers dislocated by the changes in energy usage inherent in any climate change plan.

INITIAL ACTION PLAN: The President's immediate action plan includes 9 elements:

1. *\$5 Billion in Tax Cuts and Federal R&D:* To spur energy efficiency and encourage the development and deployment of lower-carbon energy sources, the Administration supports a major new package of tax cuts and R&D spending amounting to \$5 billion over five years.
2. *Credit for Early Action:* To provide an immediate incentive for near-term actions, the President is committed to ensuring that firms acting early are rewarded appropriately.
3. *Industry-by-Industry Consultations:* The Administration challenges key industry sectors to prepare plans over the next 9 months on how they can best reduce emissions.
4. *Encouraging the Use of Energy-Efficient Products:* The President will complement his tax incentives, commitment to early action credit, and industry consultations by engaging in a broad-based effort to expand the use of *existing* energy-efficient technologies.
5. *Federal Procurement and Energy Use:* The Department of Energy will spearhead a comprehensive effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from Federal sources.
6. *Electricity Restructuring:* To deliver a significant downpayment on emission reductions, while saving consumers billions, we will pursue a bold plan for electricity restructuring.
7. *Setting a Concentration Goal:* The United States supports developing a specific, long-term concentration goal with the assistance of the National Academy of Sciences and other bodies.
8. *Bilateral Dialogues:* In addition to pursuing agreement in Kyoto, the Administration will pursue bilateral dialogues with key developing countries to promote clean energy.
9. *Economics and Science Reviews:* The President proposes regular scientific and economic reviews. These reviews will ensure that policy-makers have the best possible information on climate change.

WIN-WIN: There are numerous win-win solutions to reducing carbon emissions. For example, a breakthrough in fuel cell technology announced yesterday will clear the way toward developing cars that are three times as efficient as today's models -- cutting pollution while also cutting driving costs.

INITIAL CLIMATE CHANGE ACTIONS

October 22, 1997

President Clinton has proposed nine immediate actions to begin addressing climate change:

- 1. Tax Cuts and Federal R&D:** To spur energy efficiency and the development of lower-carbon energy sources, the Administration supports a major new package of tax cuts and R&D spending amounting to \$5 billion over five years. Many of the ideas from the recent report of the President's Committee on Science and Technology (PCAST) will be considered in constructing this package.
- 2. Credit for Early Action:** To provide an immediate incentive for near-term actions to cut emissions, the Administration is committed to ensuring that firms which act early are rewarded appropriately. We will work with companies to build a program that appropriately rewards those who take prompt and early actions before the beginning of the mandatory emissions budget period in Stage 3.
- 3. Industry-by-Industry Consultations:** The Administration challenges key industry sectors to prepare plans over the next 9 months on how they can best reduce emissions, including how the Federal government can remove regulatory hurdles that discourage energy efficiency. The Administration will work in partnership with industry to develop sensible efficiency standards in a variety of areas.
- 4. Encouraging the Use of Energy-Efficient Products:** As the Department of Energy's 5-Labs study illustrates, many existing technologies produce win-win solutions to reducing carbon emissions -- but nonetheless are still not widely used. The President is committed to expanding their reach. He will therefore complement his other programs by engaging in a broad-based effort to expand the use of *existing* energy-efficient technologies -- while also spurring the development of *new* technologies.
- 5. Federal Procurement and Energy Use:** To reduce greenhouse gas emissions from Federal sources, DOE will spearhead a comprehensive effort that includes expanded performance contracting to make Federal buildings more energy-efficient, improved Federal procurement of energy-efficient technology, and partnerships to improve the energy efficiency of Federal aircraft, ships and vehicles. Federal agencies will also be called upon to assess emissions in major initiatives.
- 6. Electricity Restructuring:** To spur further efforts to clean our air and deliver a downpayment on greenhouse gas emission reductions, while saving consumers billions, we will pursue a bold plan to restructure the energy sector. It is time to change the rules that are often more than 70 years old -- stifling innovations that can save money and impede newer, cleaner technologies.
- 7. Setting a Concentration Goal for Greenhouse Gases in the Atmosphere:** The goal of the existing climate treaty is to stabilize concentrations of greenhouse gases, but the specific concentration has never been defined. The U.S. supports developing a specific, long-term goal, with the assistance of the National Academy of Science and other appropriate bodies.
- 8. Bilateral Dialogues:** In addition to pursuing agreement in Kyoto, the Administration will pursue bilateral dialogues with key developing countries to promote clean energy.
- 9. Economics and Science Reviews:** The President proposes regular scientific and economic reviews, to ensure that policy-makers have the best possible information on climate change.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

INDEX

Title

1. President Clinton's Climate Change Proposal
2. Initial Climate Change Actions

Background Information

3. President Clinton's Five Climate Change Principles
4. President's Three-Stage Plan on Climate Change
5. Comprehensive Framework for Effective, Sensible Action
6. Fact Sheet on International Emissions Trading
7. Fact Sheet on Joint Implementation
8. Fact Sheet on Electricity Restructuring
9. Fact Sheet on Federal Energy Management
10. Fact Sheet on U.S. Global Change Research Program
11. Fact Sheet on PNGV
12. Fact Sheet on Fuel Cells
13. Fact Sheet on PATH
14. Fact Sheet on Potential Industry Sector Savings
15. Fact Sheet on Potential Building Sector Savings
16. Fact Sheet on Potential Transportation Sector Savings

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S FIVE CLIMATE CHANGE PRINCIPLES

October 22, 1997

Global climate change is the premier environmental challenge and opportunity of the 21st century, and the risks it poses justify sensible preventive steps. Addressing this issue is one of the United States' greatest imperatives, for this and future generations. Recognizing the solid foundation of climate science, President Clinton is committed to strong and sensible action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions -- including realistic and binding emissions targets.

President Clinton's climate change plan is based on **five key principles**:

- **Guided by science.** The vast majority of the world's scientists have concluded that if the countries of world do not work together to cut greenhouse gas emissions, temperatures will rise and disrupt the global climate. Indeed, most scientists say this process has already begun. But there is much we still don't know about how the climate and human health will react to increased greenhouse gas concentrations. That's why the President's plan includes regular science reviews, to ensure that our policies are guided by the best science available.
- **Market-based, common-sense tools.** We have learned that the costs of protecting the environment is substantially lower if we harness the power of markets to do so. That's why the President's plan emphasizes flexible and market-based mechanisms. His plan includes a domestic and international permit trading system for greenhouse gas emissions, similar to the highly successful permit trading system that has dramatically cut acid rain at a fraction of the predicted cost.
- **Seek win-win solutions.** There are a multitude of win-win solutions to reducing carbon emissions, that can improve our energy efficiency and save consumers money. For example, a breakthrough in fuel cell technology announced yesterday will clear the way toward developing cars that are twice as efficient as today's models -- cutting pollution while also cutting driving costs. The President believes that we must seek such win-win solutions to addressing climate change.
- **Global participation.** Climate change is a global problem, and requires a global solution. A ton of carbon emitted in Argentina has just as much effect on the global climate as a ton of carbon emitted in the United States -- and within the next few decades, emissions from developing countries are expected to exceed those from developed countries. And many win-win opportunities exist to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in developing countries. That's why the United States has spear-headed joint implementation projects and the President has committed that the United States will not adopt binding obligations without developing country participation.
- **Common-sense economic reviews.** Our knowledge of the challenges and opportunities we face will grow over time. Therefore, the President is calling for regular 5-year economic reviews and updates, to ensure that policy-makers, both in the Administration and in Congress, have the best possible information on how the economy is responding to the effort to address climate change, how other countries are performing relative to their own commitments, and how the climate is changing in response to human activities.

THE PRESIDENT'S THREE-STAGE PLAN ON CLIMATE CHANGE

October 22, 1997

Reflecting his five key principles, the President's plan will proceed in three stages:

- **Stage 1: Priming the Pump Through R&D, Tax Incentives, Incentives for Early Action, Federal Leadership, and Industry Consultations.** The first stage of the President's package includes a 9-point action plan -- including \$5 billion in tax incentives and spending for R&D and energy efficiency, incentives for early action, a set of Federal government energy initiatives, and industry-by-industry consultations to explore their best ideas on how to reduce emissions in a cost-effective manner (including market-oriented standards for energy efficiency). The first economic review would occur near the end of Stage 1.
- **Stage 2: Review and Evaluation.** The second stage, which would begin around 2004, will build upon the programs adopted in Stage 1, by including a review of our progress and an evaluation of next steps as we move toward a market-based permit trading system for carbon emissions. During this second stage, the details of the permit system would be refined and perhaps tested. Such a permit system is similar in concept to the one that dramatically cut acid rain emissions -- although the scale would be significantly larger than the current acid rain program. The second economic review would occur near the end of Stage 2.
- **Stage 3: Meeting Binding Targets Through Domestic and International Emissions Trading Program.** In the third stage, we would reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2008-2012, and below 1990 levels in the 5-year period after that, through a market-based domestic and international emissions trading system. Before beginning this third stage, the second economic update and review would allow Congress and the President to evaluate how the economy had responded to a decade's worth of experience in the first two stages of the President's plan. The President is committed to working with labor and Congress to insure that we give proper assistance to any workers dislocated by the changes in energy usage inherent in any climate change plan.

This three-stage program recognizes the long-term nature of the effort to address climate change in three ways:

- By adopting a graduated approach to emissions reductions, it allows us to exploit the tremendous opportunities for win-win reductions first.
- By adopting a system of regular scientific and economic updates and reviews, it allows us to monitor our progress and re-assess our success in reducing emissions, the state of scientific knowledge, and how the economy is responding to our efforts. Only after we have accumulated ten years of experience with the first two stages of the program would we enter the internationally binding period.
- By insisting that the United States will not adopt binding obligations without developing country participation and by emphasizing the importance of an international trading system and joint implementation, we take advantage of low-cost reduction possibilities wherever they occur -- either here or abroad.

COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR EFFECTIVE, SENSIBLE ACTION

October 22, 1997

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION REDUCTION TARGET

Under the current international climate change agreement (signed in Rio de Janeiro in 1992), industrialized countries accepted a non-binding emissions reduction goal. Most nations, including the United States, will fall short of meeting it. This fact, coupled with better scientific evidence on the seriousness of the climate change threat, led the U.S. to propose last year that a new agreement set binding limits on emissions. The proposed U.S. emissions target is designed to provide important environmental gains while maintaining strong economic growth. It is:

- **Realistic.** Seeks to return U.S. emissions to 1990 levels in the period 2008-2012 and reduce them further thereafter. Rejects European proposal for more stringent early reductions, as well as the “do-nothing” approach of some interests.
- **Achievable.** By providing incentives for early action to reduce emissions, attacking domestic energy inefficiencies, securing flexible international implementation mechanisms, and putting in place a market-based domestic emissions trading system, the U.S. can reach 1990 levels in the proposed time frame with minimal economic costs.
- **Meaningful.** Achieving 1990 levels in the period 2008-2012 would amount to almost a 30 percent reduction off a business-as-usual path, an important first step on the road toward stabilizing concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Emissions accounting will include all greenhouse gas sources and sinks (including reforestation).

FLEXIBLE, MARKET-BASED IMPLEMENTATION

Just as the effects of climate change will be felt globally, so too are the causes of climate change global in nature. Greenhouse gas emissions do equal harm to the atmosphere whether they come from a coal plant in China or a bus in Boston. For this reason, any regime to reduce greenhouse gases must be global. It must also allow all nations the ability to seek out the most efficient way of reducing emissions so that the greatest gains are achieved at the least cost. For these reasons, the United States strongly supports the inclusion in a new climate change agreement of two innovative, flexible mechanisms for reducing emissions:

- **International Emissions Trading –Using Markets to Lower Costs.** The principle of emissions trading is to use the efficiency of the market place to achieve environmental objectives at the lowest possible cost. Under an international emissions trading regime, a country (or firm) would be able to meet its emissions reduction target by reducing pollution itself, purchasing reductions from another country (or firm) that was able to achieve excess gains, or some combination of both.
- **Joint Implementation --A Global Solution to Low-Cost Reductions.** Joint Implementation (JI) is an innovative, market-based approach for addressing global climate change that uses international partnerships to achieve low-cost reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Under JI, a company in the United States invests in a project which reduces emissions in another country and uses those reductions as a less expensive means of meeting its own target.

PARTICIPATION OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

In addition to its non-binding emissions reduction aim for developed countries, the Rio climate change agreement required all countries to take policies and measures to reduce emissions. Many developing countries have made real strides, through, for example, reducing energy subsidies. Nevertheless, given that developing country emissions will eclipse those from the developed world within several decades, these countries need to do more. Accordingly, the U.S. calls on developing countries to strengthen their existing commitments and to agree that their obligations must increase over time to include binding emissions limits. Our principles include:

- **Global Participation.** All countries must participate. Every nation would be required to take meaningful actions to limit emissions. The U.S. will not assume binding obligations until developing countries agree to participate meaningfully in the challenge of addressing climate change.
- **Equity.** The obligations of poorer and less developed countries should take into account their state of economic development and their relative contribution to the climate change problem.
- **Assistance.** While insisting that developing countries take meaningful actions to address climate change, the U.S. recognizes that many of these countries face significant development challenges that hamper their ability to reduce emissions. President Clinton is reemphasizing his commitment to working with these nations to help build more sustainable energy futures. This includes a \$1 billion package of assistance from USAID and a renewed commitment to provide financial assistance through the Global Environment Facility, as well as our pathbreaking joint implementation proposals.

FACT SHEET ON INTERNATIONAL EMISSIONS TRADING

October 22, 1997

Description

The principle of emissions trading is to use the efficiency of the market place to achieve environmental objectives at the lowest possible cost. Under an international emissions trading regime, a country (or firm) would be able to meet its emissions reduction target by reducing pollution itself, purchasing reductions from another country (or firm) that was able to achieve excess gains, or some combination of both.

Given an effective international regime, emissions trading provides a powerful incentive for nations to reduce below the amount required and then sell excess reductions to others who in turn avoid more costly actions. The U.S. has proposed that emissions trading be permitted among all countries that agree to a binding emissions target.

How it would work

Consider a simplified example for how international emissions trading might work. Country A and Country B must reduce emissions by 100 tons each. It might cost each country \$1,000 to reduce 100 tons individually for a total cost of \$2,000. However, if Country A could reduce its emissions by 200 tons for a total cost of \$1,500 and sell half of these reductions to Country B, the overall target would be achieved for \$500 less, a savings of 25 percent.

U.S. experience

Emissions trading is being used successfully at the domestic level to reduce sulfur dioxide emissions (which cause acid rain) under the Clean Air Act. Achieving targeted reductions was originally estimated to cost \$5 billion annually if traditional controls had been required and \$4 billion with emissions trading. A GAO estimate after the initial stage of emissions trading now puts the cost at \$2 billion per year, or 60 percent below the original estimate with pollution reductions significantly ahead of schedule. Emissions trading has also been successful in cutting the costs of phasing out leaded gasoline and in curbing the production of chlorofluorocarbons which deplete the ozone layer.

Cost savings

According to the 1997 Economic Report of the President, international emissions trading for carbon dioxide could lower the cost of reductions by 50 percent below the minimum achievable using purely domestic programs.

FACT SHEET ON JOINT IMPLEMENTATION

October 22, 1997

Description

Joint Implementation (JI) is an innovative, market-based approach for addressing global climate change that uses international partnerships to achieve low-cost reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Under JI, a company in the United States invests in a project which reduces emissions in another country and uses those reductions as a less expensive means of meeting its own target. The U.S. has proposed that a formal regime that gives credit for JI projects be part of a new climate change agreement.

How it would work

Consider the example of a project announced today as part of a pilot program on joint implementation instituted by the United States. Two U.S. companies (Solar Electric Power and Light of Washington, D.C. and Trexler and Associates, Inc of Oak Grove, Illinois) will work with Renewable Energy Services Company of Asia, Ltd. to market and install 812,000 solar home systems in Sri Lanka. These systems will replace the use of kerosene lamps for lighting and the use of diesel-electric charging of lead-acid batteries for powering small home appliances. The result will be a 1.5 million metric ton reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and cleaner energy for tens of thousands of people.

U.S. experience

Under the U.S. pilot program on JI (formed under the existing climate change convention), 28 projects have been approved in 12 countries, including Costa Rica, Bolivia, the Czech Republic, and Russia. These projects span a range of technologies, including solar, geothermal, and wind power; fuel switching for district heating; biomass energy; and reforestation. U.S. companies and organizations already participating include Commonwealth Edison, Wisconsin Electric Power, Kenetech Windpower, Sealweld Corp., American Electric Power, PacificCorp, Detroit Edison, Clean Air Coalition, and many others.

Benefits

Lower costs: JI provides a strong incentive for companies and countries to search the globe for the lowest cost ways of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Expanded exports of U.S. technology: The enormous potential for JI projects around the world creates major opportunities for the increased sale of U.S. energy efficiency and alternative energy technologies.

Technology transfer: Increased reliance on more energy efficient technologies and less carbon-intensive energy alternatives will help developing countries meet their growing energy needs with more environmentally sustainable solutions.

FACT SHEET ON POTENTIAL BUILDINGS SECTOR SAVINGS

October 22, 1997

The buildings sector also produces approximately one-third of total U.S. emissions. There is substantial opportunity to improve the energy efficiency of our buildings and the appliances in them. Many of these technologies improve the quality of service delivered (i.e. higher quality lighting), and have also been documented in a number of cases to improve productivity. According to a recently released report from five of the nation's energy laboratories, programs such as the ones below can reduce emissions in the buildings sector in 2010 by 25 million metric tons even with no increase in energy prices.

Standards: Substantial carbon emissions reductions in 2010 can be achieved through existing authority of the Department of Energy to establish market-oriented efficiency standards for appliances, such as refrigerators and air conditioners. The Department of Energy uses a consensus-based approach in which manufacturers, environmentalists, consumer advocates, and the states work together to develop applicable standards.

Voluntary Programs: Significant carbon reductions in 2010 could also be achieved by expanding voluntary programs such as the joint EPA-DOE Energy Star program. Energy Star labeling has already transformed a number of markets. For example, it has cut the energy used by computers, monitors, and printers by 50 percent at virtually no incremental cost. It is now being extended to dozens of other products.

Adopting Best Electricity Engineering Practices: Electronic equipment consumes electricity in stand-by mode (even when not being used) generating 12 MMTs of carbon emission each year. Preliminary analysis suggests that 80 percent of that could be saved through adopting best engineering practices without reducing service.

Research and Development: Designing buildings with advanced technology can reduce energy consumption by 25 to 50 percent without increasing the building's initial cost. The extra cost of some of the energy-efficient equipment is offset by the smaller required heating and cooling system.

Combined Heat and Power: As in industry, we can reduce the carbon intensity of the buildings sector by accelerating the use of combined heat and power (CHP). Two CHP technologies—small turbines and proton-exchange membrane (PEM) fuel cells—can convert natural gas to useful energy with 80 to 90 percent efficiency, significantly cutting carbon emissions from a building.

FACT SHEET ON POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION SECTOR SAVINGS

October 22, 1997

The transportation sector produces approximately one-third of total U.S. emissions. According to a recently released report from five of the nation's energy laboratories, programs such as the ones below can reduce emissions in the transportation sector in 2010 by 73 million metric tons even with no increase in energy prices.

High Efficiency Cars And Light Trucks: The goal of the President's Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles is to produce cars that are three times more efficient than current vehicles with no compromise in size, safety, comfort or cost. The objective is a production prototype vehicle with a fuel efficiency of 80 mpg in 2004 and commercial availability soon after. A variety of efficient technologies such as hybrid vehicle design, advanced engines, regenerative braking and lightweight materials are under development. These technologies are also applicable to light trucks and sport utility vehicles, so that a PNGV for these heavier passenger vehicles is quite possible with an expanded research effort.

High efficiency heavy trucks: Ongoing federal R&D on advanced diesel engines and lightweight materials have the potential to substantially reduce carbon emissions from heavy trucks. These technologies are projected to be available by about 2003 and be quickly adopted by trucking manufacturers since energy is a major cost component of freight transportation (a truck typically gets 7 to 8 miles per gallon while traveling over 50,000 miles a year).

Advanced Efficient Aircraft and Rail: Ongoing federal R&D on advanced aircraft engines, improved airframes, and air traffic control have the potential to improve aircraft energy efficiency by 35 percent, with an additional increment of carbon emissions reductions achieved by increasing the efficiency of trains.

Low-Carbon Fuel: Government-industry R&D partnerships have brought the cost of ethanol from cellulosic waste (such as crop waste) and dedicated crops (such as switchgrass) from \$3.60 per gallon in 1980 to \$1.20 per gallon today. Such fuels are carbon neutral because the crops capture carbon dioxide when they grow and release it during combustion.

FACT SHEET ON FEDERAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT

October 22, 1997

Aggressive energy management can substantially reduce carbon emissions from the activities of the Federal government, which has the nation's largest energy bill at almost \$8 billion per year. Significant strides have already been made --energy consumption per square foot in Federal buildings is down 15 percent and energy use in civilian and military vehicles is down about 27 percent from 1985 levels. However, we can do much more.

The initiatives below will reduce Federal emissions of greenhouse gases through enhanced focus on energy efficiency and renewable energy. They address areas which can deliver the greatest energy savings, best leverage private sector funding and improve the Federal procurement system.

1. Expand Energy Savings Performance Contracting

- Expand use of Energy Savings Performance Contracts. ESPC uses private investment capital and expertise to accomplish energy and cost saving projects in Federal facilities. When a private sector firm which has invested in federal energy efficiency improvements is fully repaid from its share of the delivered savings, all additional savings accrue to the government. Streamlined ESPC contracts put in place by DOD and DOE are beginning to speed large investments in energy projects at Federal facilities. However, use of ESPC's is still limited in the Federal government. The Office of Management and Budget will lead an effort to increase their use. It will include new policy and budget guidance for agencies. ESPC authority can also be extended to other areas including:
 - *Leased Federal buildings.* These include buildings where the Government either pays for the energy use directly or in other building where ESPC can provide a better lease for the Government.
 - *Federal mobility.* There may be great potential for energy savings from more efficient energy use in aircraft, ships and vehicles.
 - *Water conservation.* Water conservation projects save energy because each gallon contains energy from pumping, heating, chilling or treatment.
 - *Non-federal facilities* where the Government makes indirect payment of energy expenses. These include, for example, National Guard facilities which the state owns but where the Federal Government covers utility expenses and public housing facilities which are Federally supported but owned by public housing authorities.
 - *State and local government facilities.* Federal energy experts can help transfer ESPC techniques to state and local governments so they can access this important approach to energy efficiency.

2. Improve Federal Procurement of Energy Efficient Technology

- *Accelerate the development of Product Energy Efficiency Recommendations.* These cover products that are in the top 25 percent of their class for energy efficiency or have Energy Star ratings, for example electric motors and air conditioning chillers. They provide a guide to Federal purchasers

of the energy efficiency level to request in a specification or procurement.

- *Establish as standard practice, the purchase of energy efficient products for Government use.* Traditionally, federal purchases have been based on lowest price, ignoring the substantial savings many energy efficient products can achieve over their life. The Executive Office of the President will lead an interagency team to streamline and update Executive Orders and procurement practices to encourage the acquisition of these products. Use of alternative contracting vehicles to acquire energy-efficient products will be encouraged, and purchase of products in the top 25 percent of class for energy efficiency or conforming to Energy Star standards will become standard practice, subject to necessary exceptions. The initiative will be augmented by publication of a “best practices” buying guide and expanded training of purchasing decision-makers.
- *Use consolidated purchasing to stimulate markets and lower prices.* Consolidated Federal purchasing can stimulate commercial markets for new and emerging products which offer greater energy efficiency, lower operating costs, and sales opportunities for small businesses that produce these products.
- *Increase Federal procurement of renewable energy.* In states that have implemented retail competition in their electricity industry, Federal facilities will work with their suppliers to ensure that the facilities purchase competitively supplied non-hydro renewable energy at levels equivalent to the percentage specified in that state’s retail competition legislation.
- *Report Federal Agencies’ Contributions to Reduction of Carbon Emissions.* This initiative will develop an appropriate measurement methodology to convert currently available data on Federal energy use to carbon emissions to aid national carbon reduction efforts.

3. Building for the 21st Century

- *Establish a new level of excellence for Federal building construction and renovation that incorporates energy efficiency, quality, affordability, and sustainability.* By using the latest construction techniques and tapping the knowledge of the building community and local partners, agencies will work to ensure that new Federal buildings achieve energy efficiency increases of 30-50 percent by 2000 as compared to existing facilities. This will be accomplished through a “whole building” approach that treats buildings as integrated systems rather than a series of independent component selections.
- *Deploy solar technologies in Federal buildings.* Show Federal leadership by installing solar photovoltaic and solar thermal systems on 20,000 Federal roofs by 2010 in support of the President’s ‘Million Solar Roof Initiative’. Utilize alternative financing methods to provide the rapid infusion of investment necessary to support the cost-effective installation of these systems.
- *Expand the use of combined heat and power generation at Federal facilities.* Combined heat and power makes greater use of the waste heat produced in the generation of electricity.
- *Use biomass fuels in Federal boilers.* Biomass would come from agricultural and wood waste and methane from landfill and treatment plant operations.
- *Expand public awareness of energy efficient technologies.* By showcasing energy efficient and

renewable energy technologies at National Parks, Federal offices, embassies, military bases, and other facilities the public will be more aware of their potential to reduce pollution and lower costs.

- *Seek increased resources for civilian agency staffing to expand energy management activities and complete energy efficiency projects.* In recent years, budgets for energy management in several key agencies have been cut by more than 80 percent. These Federal appropriations often provide the most cost-effective funding for Federal energy efficiency projects.

4. Improve Aircraft, Ship, and Heavy Vehicle Fuel Efficiency

- *Public-Private partnerships to improve the energy efficiency of Federal aircraft, ships and vehicles.* Energy use in Federal aircraft, ships and vehicles, predominantly in the military services, is responsible for 43 percent of the \$8 billion Federal energy bill. This initiative would improve the energy efficiency of main propulsion systems, with particular emphasis on medium and heavy diesel engines and high performance turbine technology. The initiative -- designed along the lines of the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles -- would involve a partnership between Federal agencies and the private sector. Advances under this initiative will have significant application in commercial markets. In addition, the initiative will focus on near-term energy efficiency opportunities such as lighting retrofits on ships.
- *Increase the use of alternative fueled vehicles (AFVs) in the Federal fleet.* Federal agencies are increasing the use of alternative fuel vehicles which, among other things, helps reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. This initiative would enhance the focus of the current program on AFVs such as electrics, hybrid-electrics, natural gas and renewable-fueled vehicles.

5. Greenhouse Gas Assessments

- Federal agencies will be required to assess their greenhouse gas emissions in major actions they undertake.

FACT SHEET ON U.S. GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH PROGRAM

October 22, 1997

Background: The U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP) is a National Research Program conducted under the auspices of the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) Committee on Environment and Natural Resources. The NSTC is a cabinet-level council established by President Clinton in November 1993 to coordinate Federal science and technology efforts. The program's fundamental purpose is to increase understanding of the Earth system, and of human and naturally induced changes in the Earth's environment, and thus provide a sound scientific basis for decision making on global change issues. The USGCRP began as a Presidential Initiative, and was codified by the Global Change Research Act of 1990. The overall FY 1997 USGCRP budget was \$1.81 billion.

The core program of the USGCRP is focused on four key scientific areas:

- *Seasonal to Interannual Climate Variability:* The development and refinement of forecasts of seasonal and interannual climate variability, including study and prediction of the El Niño phenomena.
- *Climate Change Over Decades to Centuries:* Analysis and projection of the effects of long-term climate change on natural resources, public health, and socio-economic sectors.
- *Changes in Ozone, UV Radiation, and Atmospheric Chemistry:* Research on the causes, rate, magnitude, and human health and ecological consequences of changes in stratospheric ozone, UV radiation, and atmospheric chemistry.
- *Changes in Land Cover and Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecosystems:* Research on the causes and consequences of land-cover changes, and on basic processes governing the functions and structure of terrestrial, aquatic, and marine ecosystems.

New Research Directions: Global change research is providing the information about the changing Earth system, and in particular, about climate change, that is needed to achieve a sustainable future. New research efforts include:

- *A National Assessment of Climate Change Impacts* to aggregate information across regions and sectors, analyze national-scale consequences, and support development of mitigation and adaptation strategies.
- *Improved Regional-scale Analyses*, including regional estimates of the rate and magnitude of climate change, analyses of the environmental and socio-economic consequences of climate change in the context of other stresses, and integrated assessments of the implications for society and the environment of climate change.
- *Regional Workshops* to examine the vulnerabilities of various regions of the United States to climate change.

FACT SHEET ON PNGV

October 22, 1997

Announced at the White House on September 29, 1993 by President Clinton, Vice President Gore, and the CEOs of the domestic auto makers, the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles (PNGV) is a partnership between the U.S. Federal government (7 agencies and 20 federal laboratories) and Chrysler, Ford, and General Motors that aims to strengthen America's competitiveness by developing technologies for a new generation of vehicles. Its programs include research support for over 350 automotive suppliers, universities, and small businesses.

PNGV's long-term goal is to develop production prototypes of an attractive, affordable car that can meet all applicable environmental and safety times and achieve up to three times the fuel efficiency of a comparable automobile sold today. This would mean that a typical midsize car would be able to achieve 80 mpg. The partnership also aims to (i) improve automotive manufacturing, and (ii) introduce efficiency technologies into production vehicles as soon as they are economically justified.

There are numerous reasons for pursuing PNGV, including:

- **Environmental:** Automobiles are a major contributor to atmospheric carbon dioxide, a major greenhouse gas. Already, concentrations of carbon dioxide are 25 percent higher than pre-industrial levels and are expected to double within the next century. Since the number of registered vehicles in the United States is expected to climb from 194 million in 1993, to as many as 270 million in 2010, PNGV's success is critical to any program of controlling US and world greenhouse gas emissions. It will also result in low cost methods for controlling the emissions that contribute to urban air pollution.
- **Reducing U.S. Dependence on Foreign Oil:** The United States currently imports 50 percent of the oil we consume -- this share is expected to grow to more than 60 percent by 2010. Petroleum imports make up ten percent of our country's import inventory and account for a large chunk of the nation's trade deficit. This dependence on foreign oil makes the United States vulnerable.

PNGV Status Report: The industrial partners are now in the process of selecting technologies that will be included in concept vehicles that will be completed by the turn of the century. The federal agencies are working to revise their research priorities to support both technologies that can be incorporated in production prototypes for 2004 and that can be integrated into even more advanced vehicles that would be designed in later years.

The goal of the program, while extremely ambitious, still seems possible given the advances in key technology that have been achieved during the life of the program. These include advances in production of low-cost, light-weight materials for the vehicle body and frame; electrical control systems, batteries; and compact, inexpensive fuel cells -- including the new technology for using gasoline to power fuel cells announced yesterday; and, advanced internal combustion engines for use in hybrid vehicles.

FACT SHEET ON FUEL CELLS

October 22, 1997

THE BREAKTHROUGH: A gasoline-powered technology that would allow you to double the fuel efficiency of a car and emit half the greenhouse gases and virtually no other air pollution. For the first time, gasoline was used to produce electricity from a pollution-free fuel cell, allowing the use of the existing gasoline infrastructure. Previously, fuel cells have been powered by hydrogen or methanol, which are less convenient for use in cars.

The Department of Energy, together with Los Alamos National Laboratory, and A.D. Little, have developed a breakthrough fuel processor, which can extract hydrogen from gasoline and other fuels such as ethanol and natural gas. Last week, this fuel processor was combined with a fuel cell from Plug Power to demonstrate for the first time that a fuel cell electric car could be fueled by gasoline or ethanol. This eliminates the limited driving range and lengthy recharging times associated with electric cars that run on batteries.

WHAT IS A FUEL CELL: The fuel cell converts the chemical energy of a fuel directly into usable electricity and heat without combustion. Fuel cells are similar to batteries in that both produce a direct current by means of an electrochemical process, but fuel cells can operate indefinitely as long as fuel is supplied to them. Fuel cells can provide power for cars and other applications, such as electricity and hot water for buildings.

The Department of Energy working with its partners has brought down the cost of proton exchange membrane (PEM) fuel cells by a factor of twenty in the last ten years. Continued R&D, coupled with the economies of scale from mass production of fuel cells as they enter the marketplace, should allow us to maintain this pace of cost reduction for another decade.

PARTNERSHIP FOR A NEW GENERATION OF VEHICLES (PNGV): The fuel cell breakthrough was accomplished as part of President Clinton's PNGV initiative, an innovative partnership between the government, the national laboratories, the big three automakers, and their suppliers. PNGV's goal is to develop a family-sized vehicle with triple the fuel efficiency of today's cars, without compromising cost or convenience.

POTENTIAL GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTIONS: One-third of the nation's carbon dioxide emissions comes from the transportation sector, primarily cars. Fuel cell technology alone can directly double fuel efficiency and cut carbon dioxide emissions in half. In combination with other PNGV advances, such as lightweight materials and regenerative braking, fuel cells will allow a tripling of fuel efficiency and a further reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Powering the fuel cell with renewable fuels, such as ethanol, could eliminate automotive greenhouse gas emissions entirely in the long run. The buildings sector also generates one-third of the nation's emissions of carbon dioxide. A building that uses the electricity and hot water from a fuel cell fueled by natural gas would have about half of the greenhouse gas emissions of the average building today. Plug Power expects to introduce fuel cells for homes and other buildings in 2000 that will provide electricity for less than the current residential rate. By 2010, fuel cells in buildings could be providing emissions savings of five million metric tons of carbon.

FACT SHEET ON PATH

October 22, 1997

What is PATH? We are working to develop a partnership for 21st century housing bringing together government and industry to develop, demonstrate and deploy housing technologies, designs and practices that can significantly improve the quality of housing without raising the cost of construction. The **Partnership for Advancing Technologies in Housing** includes government (DOE, HUD, EPA, Labor, Commerce, FEMA, and DOD) and industry working together develop, demonstrate and deploy housing technologies and practices so that homes can be built cheaper, more environmentally sustainable, more disaster resistant, and provide a safer working environment.

PATH has a five-part approach:

- Industry-driven research on new technologies and practices
- Working with industry on pilot programs building thousands of marketable houses
- Streamlining of federal, state and local codes and regulations
- Judicious use of existing authority on standards
- Information campaign to influence consumer demand

R&D: Support more funds for accelerated research and demonstration of inexpensive, highly efficient, highly attractive housing. Link with million solar roofs program.

Standards: The success of PATH will in some part be based on utilizing existing authorities on standards for a select few products that have the potential for great savings. There are five appliance/products currently under review by DoE; Clothes Washers, Ranges/Ovens, Ballasts, Residential water heaters, transformers. Of these, the Clothes Washers and Water Heaters seem to have greatest potential.

Creating Markets: The key to making the Partnership successful will be the ability to create markets and consumer demands for homes that meet the PATH goals. The Partnership will work with states and communities to help them understand the benefits of building these homes, and the opportunities it affords the communities for economic growth. The Partnership will attempt to gain agreements between communities that PATH homes can go through an expedited permitting process.

Education and Outreach: Marketing the benefits of these homes to consumers and to encourage consumers to begin to ask for homes that are built to the quality level of >PATH= homes. This will need to be an intensive campaign of getting the message out to communities, builders and developers. This will provide incentives for more and more builders to want to build these homes.

Pilots: The pilots will play an important role in the success of PATH. The pilot sites will begin of developing the markets and demonstrate the feasibility of the homes. The pilot sites can also act as training sites for builders and community leaders to learn about the benefits of the technologies and as a classroom for training on how to use the technologies. Sites under consideration are Stapleton Airport, Denver (Redevelopment of old airport site near downtown) and Florida (Working with the State to link energy and environment to disaster resistance and affordability).

Regulatory Streamlining: Working with states and communities on making the code approval process more efficient and less time consuming.

FACT SHEET ON POTENTIAL INDUSTRY SECTOR SAVINGS

October 22, 1997

The industrial sector produces approximately one-third of total U.S. emissions. We can cut emissions substantially in this sector through the right mix of tax incentives, accelerated research and development, electricity restructuring, and environmental regulatory reinvention. According to a recently released report from five of the nation's energy laboratories, programs such as the ones below can reduce emissions in the industrial sector in 2010 by 28 million metric tons even with no increase in energy prices.

Increasing Energy Efficiency: Energy audits encourage systematic approaches to energy efficiency that typically have high yields. Southwire Corporation, a large manufacturer of wire, rod, and cable, cut their use of natural gas by 60 percent and cut electricity use by 40 percent per pound of product produced. Motors consume 70 percent of industrial electricity used, and there is room for improving their efficiency. The Greenville Tube Company, for example, increased productivity by 15 percent, increased energy efficiency by 30 percent, reduced scrap by 15 percent, and achieved \$77,000 per year savings -- a 6 month payback -- by improving the efficiency of their motors.

Cogeneration (Combined Heat and Power): New technologies available in the industrial sector will allow us to capture the waste heat the U.S. now throws away. With the right policies, industrial cogeneration of natural gas or biomass could cut annual carbon emission significantly by 2010. Advanced turbines developed by DOE with industry will be available in three years (orders are already being taken). They have an overall efficiency of 80 percent to 90 percent, produce steam together with low-cost electricity and significantly reduce NOx emissions. These turbines can run on natural gas or biomass. Some industries have their own low-cost biomass feedstocks (for example, black liquor gasification in the pulp and paper industry), which makes possible cogeneration with nearly zero carbon emissions.

Expanding Industries of the Future: The seven most energy-intensive industries—steel, aluminum, petroleum refining, chemicals, pulp and paper products, glass, and metal casting—account for about 80 percent of the carbon emissions in U.S. manufacturing and more than 90 percent of the hazardous waste. Industry, partnering with the Department of Energy, has developed long-term visions of energy-efficient, low-polluting, highly competitive "Industries of the Future" as well as technology roadmaps to identify an R&D and deployment pathway to achieving the vision. Visions typically foresee annual energy efficiency improvements of 1.0 percent to 1.5 percent for two decades.

FACT SHEET ON POTENTIAL BUILDINGS SECTOR SAVINGS

October 22, 1997

The buildings sector also produces approximately one-third of total U.S. emissions. There is substantial opportunity to improve the energy efficiency of our buildings and the appliances in them. Many of these technologies improve the quality of service delivered (i.e. higher quality lighting), and have also been documented in a number of cases to improve productivity. According to a recently released report from five of the nation's energy laboratories, programs such as the ones below can reduce emissions in the buildings sector in 2010 by 25 million metric tons even with no increase in energy prices.

Standards: Substantial carbon emissions reductions in 2010 can be achieved through existing authority of the Department of Energy to establish market-oriented efficiency standards for appliances, such as refrigerators and air conditioners. The Department of Energy uses a consensus-based approach in which manufacturers, environmentalists, consumer advocates, and the states work together to develop applicable standards.

Voluntary Programs: Significant carbon reductions in 2010 could also be achieved by expanding voluntary programs such as the joint EPA-DOE Energy Star program. Energy Star labeling has already transformed a number of markets. For example, it has cut the energy used by computers, monitors, and printers by 50 percent at virtually no incremental cost. It is now being extended to dozens of other products.

Adopting Best Electricity Engineering Practices: Electronic equipment consumes electricity in stand-by mode (even when not being used) generating 12 MMTs of carbon emission each year. Preliminary analysis suggests that 80 percent of that could be saved through adopting best engineering practices without reducing service.

Research and Development: Designing buildings with advanced technology can reduce energy consumption by 25 to 50 percent without increasing the building's initial cost. The extra cost of some of the energy-efficient equipment is offset by the smaller required heating and cooling system.

Combined Heat and Power: As in industry, we can reduce the carbon intensity of the buildings sector by accelerating the use of combined heat and power (CHP). Two CHP technologies—small turbines and proton-exchange membrane (PEM) fuel cells—can convert natural gas to useful energy with 80 to 90 percent efficiency, significantly cutting carbon emissions from a building.

FACT SHEET ON POTENTIAL TRANSPORTATION SECTOR SAVINGS

October 22, 1997


The transportation sector produces approximately one-third of total U.S. emissions. According to a recently released report from five of the nation's energy laboratories, programs such as the ones below can reduce emissions in the transportation sector in 2010 by 73 million metric tons even with no increase in energy prices.

High Efficiency Cars And Light Trucks: The goal of the President's Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles is to produce cars that are three times more efficient than current vehicles with no compromise in size, safety, comfort or cost. The objective is a production prototype vehicle with a fuel efficiency of 80 mpg in 2004 and commercial availability soon after. A variety of efficient technologies such as hybrid vehicle design, advanced engines, regenerative braking and lightweight materials are under development. These technologies are also applicable to light trucks and sport utility vehicles, so that a PNGV for these heavier passenger vehicles is quite possible with an expanded research effort.

High efficiency heavy trucks: Ongoing federal R&D on advanced diesel engines and lightweight materials have the potential to substantially reduce carbon emissions from heavy trucks. These technologies are projected to be available by about 2003 and be quickly adopted by trucking manufacturers since energy is a major cost component of freight transportation (a truck typically gets 7 to 8 miles per gallon while traveling over 50,000 miles a year).

Advanced Efficient Aircraft and Rail: Ongoing federal R&D on advanced aircraft engines, improved airframes, and air traffic control have the potential to improve aircraft energy efficiency by 35 percent, with an additional increment of carbon emissions reductions achieved by increasing the efficiency of trains.

Low-Carbon Fuel: Government-industry R&D partnerships have brought the cost of ethanol from cellulosic waste (such as crop waste) and dedicated crops (such as switchgrass) from \$3.60 per gallon in 1980 to \$1.20 per gallon today. Such fuels are carbon neutral because the crops capture carbon dioxide when they grow and release it during combustion.



Questions and Answers on President's Climate Change Proposal
DRAFT -- 11:30 a.m. October 22, 1997

Q: Don't economic models suggest that this effort will cost more than 1.5 million jobs and tank the economy?

A: Some models may suggest that, but only by ignoring several key elements of the President's plan:

1. They ignore the President's \$5 billion package of tax cuts and Federal R&D: To spur energy efficiency and the development of lower-carbon energy sources, the Administration supports a major new package of tax cuts and R&D spending amounting to \$5 billion over five years.

2. They ignore the potential for increased use of existing energy-efficient products: As the Department of Energy's 5-Labs study illustrates, many existing technologies produce win-win solutions to reducing carbon emissions -- but nonetheless are still not widely used. The President is committed to expanding their reach. The models referenced assume little change in the penetration rate of existing energy-efficient equipment.

3. They ignore the President's Federal energy initiative: To reduce greenhouse gas emissions from Federal sources, the Department of Energy will spearhead a comprehensive effort that includes expanded performance contracting to make Federal buildings more energy-efficient, improved Federal procurement practices, establishment of a new level of excellence for Federal building construction and renovation, and partnerships to improve the energy efficiency of Federal aircraft, ships and vehicles.

4. They ignore electricity restructuring: To spur further efforts to clean our air and deliver a down payment on greenhouse gas emission reductions, while saving consumers billions, we will pursue a bold plan to restructure the energy sector. It is time to change the rules that are often more than 70 years old -- stifling innovations that can save money and impede newer, cleaner technologies.

5. They ignore international emissions trading. Two key components of the President's plan are his support for an international system of emissions permit trading, and his commitment that developing countries must participate in the international effort. International trading can substantially reduce the costs of emissions reductions.

6. They ignore the economic costs associated with climate change itself. Climate change will lead to increased flooding, sea-level rise, and other dislocation. So looking just at the impact of reducing emissions on GDP is misleading.

Finally, we all must admit there is much uncertainty over cost projections that are a decade or more in the future -- after all, a decade ago, we could never have predicted that we would now have an unemployment rate below 5 percent, core inflation below 2.5 percent, and a budget deficit substantially under \$50 billion. That's why the President has proposed a graduated, three-stage approach with regular reviews -- starting with a period of voluntary action, tax incentives, R&D, and Federal efficiency improvements, and followed by an evaluation period before the internationally binding period. Only after we have accumulated ten years of experience with the first two stages of the program would we enter the internationally binding period.

Q: Didn't the 5-labs study conclude that carbon prices would have to rise by \$50 to reach 1990 levels by 2010, and isn't that on the optimistic side?

A: The 5-Labs study examined a scenario in which there was no international trading and no electricity restructuring legislation, and concluded that the permit price would have to be \$50 to reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2010 without such elements. But the President's plan emphasizes international trading and developing country participation, and includes a commitment to properly crafted electricity restructuring. [A DOE analysis that combines international permit trading and electricity restructuring with the results of the 5-Labs study suggests that a permit price of \$25 or lower in 2010 would allow the country to meet its target and timetable.]

Q: Doesn't the President's plan amount to the largest energy tax increase in history -- \$200 billion a year or more?

A: Not at all. The President's plan includes tax *cuts*, not tax increases. It does not involve tax increases at all.

Follow: but isn't a permit system just like a tax?

A: No. There are several critical differences between a permit system and a tax. [For example, a permit system provides insurance that a given quantitative target will be met, whereas a tax does not.] In any case, the permit system does not begin until we have accumulated ten years of experience with tax incentives, R&D, Federal energy efforts, early credit, and the other components of the President's initial action plan.

Q: How can you possibly reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2008-2012 without imposing excessive costs on the economy?

A: • The President believes that climate change is a critical challenge facing the country, and that if we make this a top priority, we can accomplish significant emissions reductions at low cost. In this effort, it would be irresponsible not to explore all possible avenues for low-cost emissions reductions. That's why the President has

proposed a graduated, three-stage approach -- starting with a period of early credit, tax incentives, R&D, and Federal efficiency improvements, and followed by an evaluation period around 2004. He has proposed regular economic reviews, to ensure that the economic costs are not excessive. Only after we have accumulated ten years of experience with the first two stages of the program would we enter the internationally binding period.

Q: Won't this plan lead to massive shifts of U.S. industry and jobs abroad?

- A:
- No. The President has made very clear that we will not assume binding obligations without the participation of developing countries.
 - I would also note that non-tradeable sectors account for a substantial share of carbon emissions. Transportation and buildings, for example, account for roughly two-thirds of U.S. emissions. For these sectors, the "competitiveness" argument seems largely irrelevant.
 - In most manufacturing sectors, furthermore, energy costs are a small percentage of total costs. According to the 1995 Annual Census of Manufactures, energy costs for manufacturing industries averaged just 2.2 percent of total costs.

Q: How is the president's initial action plan different from the Climate Change Action Plan that the Administration has already adopted?

- A: The first stage of the President's climate change proposal differs from the Climate Change Action Plan in four critical ways:
- It includes substantially more funding. The President's proposal includes funding for carbon-reducing activities of \$5 billion over 5 years -- substantially more than current funding for the climate change action plan. Activities under the Climate Change Action Plan are estimated to reduce CO2 emissions by 95 million metric tons in 2010 -- and doubling the funding should lead to more reductions. [Total reductions needed in 2010 are 390 million metric tons.]

[Funding for the Climate Change Action Plan in FY 1995 was \$184 million, in FY 1996 \$158 million, and in FY 1997 \$163 million. Total funding for climate-related activities is somewhat higher -- but still less than \$500 million per year -- because items such as PNGV are not included in the Climate Change Action Plan definition.]
 - Crucially, the President's proposal now includes binding targets. In expectation of these binding targets, firms and households will begin to adjust their behavior today -- a factor that was not present in the climate change action plan.

- To provide further incentives for firms to take action now, the President has indicated his strong support for developing an early credit program of appropriate rewards for those who take prompt early action.
- Finally, the President has indicated his support for environmentally-friendly electricity restructuring, which has the potential to reduce emissions.

Q: Hasn't the climate change action plan failed to reduce emissions?

A: Total emissions are higher than anticipated when the Climate Change Action Plan was adopted several years ago, because of stronger economic growth, lower energy prices, and reduced funding for Congress. But the *partial* effect of the activities under the current Climate Change Action Plan is still estimated to be a reduction in CO2 emissions of 32 million metric tons in 2000 and 95 million metric tons in 2010 (and *all* greenhouse gas emissions of 76 million metric tons in 2000 and 169 million metric tons in 2010). The President's three-stage plan includes substantially more funding than the Climate Change Action Plan -- and thus could produce substantially more reductions in carbon emissions. [390 million metric tons of CO2 reductions are needed in 2010 to move from business-as-usual to 1990 emissions levels.]

Q: Will you submit any agreement reached at Kyoto to the Senate for its advice and consent?

A: • We honor and respect the U.S. Senate's important role in providing advice and consent to the ratification of treaties. We would anticipate the need for Senate advice and consent to any international agreement adopted in Kyoto that would impose binding commitments on the U.S. to control emissions.

Q: Will the President or Vice-President go to Kyoto?

A: • We have not made final decisions about the membership of our delegation in Kyoto.

Q: What is the President proposing that developing countries do as part of his proposal?

A: • Today, the President emphasized that the United States will not assume binding obligations under the climate treaty without developing country participation.

• The President believes we can engage developing countries on this issue in ways that are good for them and good for us. He believes that developing countries have an opportunity to chart a different energy future -- one based on clean and cheap technologies.

- The President spoke about this issue in each country he visited in Latin America last week. Throughout his trip, he shared his conviction that we can and must work together on this problem, in ways that benefit us all. He plans to raise this issue with Jiang Zemin next week.

Q: Why did the U.S. propose such a modest target and timetable, which is weaker than any of the proposals to date, including from the European Union and Japan?

- A:
- The President has put forward a strong target that is realistic, achievable and pragmatic, not just rhetorical. We have backed up those proposals with a three-stage domestic implementation plan. And we have called for a comprehensive international framework that will ensure that all countries participate in a global effort to reduce emissions at the least cost.
 - Keep in mind that some of these other targets aren't all they seem to be. The EU derives enormous benefits from a 1990 baseline -- Germany, for example, gets to claim credit for all the cheap reductions that were a fortuitous consequence of reunification.
 - With regard to Japan, a careful examination of their proposal shows that we are not so far apart.

Q: Isn't it true that this proposal doesn't actually reduce emissions at all but instead just stabilizes them at a certain level?

- A:
- No. Our proposal involves real and meaningful reductions. Consider that under a business-as-usual scenario, U.S. emissions are predicted to be 28% above 1990 levels by 2010.
 - We also stipulate that further reductions, below the 1990 baseline, would be achieved in a second emissions budget period.

Q: Given how far apart countries seem to be in their stated positions, is it realistic to expect any kind of agreement in Kyoto?

- A:
- We are hopeful that all countries will come to Kyoto with an open mind, prepared to negotiate an agreement that provides real and achievable gains.
 - No agreement is better than a bad agreement. The U.S. will continue to insist that any international framework include realistic, achievable targets; flexible implementation mechanisms like emissions trading and joint implementation; and

the meaningful participation of developing countries.

Q: What happens if there is no deal in Kyoto?

- A:
- We are hopeful that all countries will come to Kyoto with an open mind, prepared to negotiate an agreement that provides real and achievable gains.
 - Even if we cannot reach agreement in Kyoto, climate change will remain a top priority issue for this President. The U.S. will continue to work on building support for a comprehensive international framework that involves all countries in a common effort to meet this important challenge.
 - And we will get busy on the elements of the President's plan that we can start right away.

Q: Does the climate change science justify near-term action? Aren't the uncertainties still too great?

- A:
- No. The fundamental science of climate change is clear. Greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere are rising as a result of human actions. These increased concentrations are warming the planet, and unless we reduce our emissions, the effects on our climate are likely to become increasingly severe.
 - Uncertainties do remain. We are not sure exactly how fast the planet will warm or which regions of the world will suffer the worst impacts. Yet what we do know is more than enough to justify taking the kinds of sensible actions the President has proposed.
 - As for the skeptics who would have us do nothing, they represent a tiny fraction of the scientific community. On the other hand, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, including 2,000 of the world's premier climate experts, has underscored the seriousness of the climate change problem and the need for action.
 - As part of his proposal, the President has called for additional scientific studies focused on key areas, including a call to the National Academy of Sciences to examine the issue of establishing a long-term goal for stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases.