



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 96th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 125

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1979

No. 127

Senate

By Mr. TSONGAS:

S. 1829. A bill to establish a community energy efficiency program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

COMMUNITY ENERGY EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1979

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Community Energy Efficiency Act of 1979. It provides grants to cities and counties for efforts to make energy use more efficient. Like the Conservation Bank approved unanimously by the Senate Banking Committee last week, this act is a new initiative that recognizes energy conservation as a cost-effective, neglected alternative to imported oil.

About 60 percent of U.S. energy consumption takes place in cities. Municipal services such as transportation, water, and sewers consume energy directly. Local policies also affect energy use indirectly, in areas such as zoning, building codes, parking, and education.

The Community Energy Efficiency Act of 1979 aims to catalyze local energy planning. It helps to insure that local laws, policies, and decisions are consistent with this country's inevitable shift to renewable resources. The act encourages local groups to create answers to our energy crisis.

THE PLAN

This bill provides grants for basic planning, followed by grants for advanced planning and for capital investments. The amount awarded at each stage is based on population and on need for heating and cooling. The grants will total \$5 billion over the next 5 years.

A grant application for basic planning must include targets for energy conservation. There must be a program to amend local land use controls such as building codes and permits and transportation controls to boost conservation and renewable resource development. The local program must promote public understanding of the importance and practicality of energy conservation and renewables. Efforts to help low-income residents are a particular priority.

A recipient of a basic grant can apply for a larger advanced planning grant after making significant progress. A recipient must move into the expanded grant phase by the end of the program's third year.

A community program under an expanded grant continues the activities of the basic program. The expanded program includes adoption of an ordinance to facilitate the use of solar systems in the community, and conservation standards for residential and commercial properties. It must include a transition plan to reduce current petroleum use, and a contingency plan for energy emergencies. The city or county also must develop a budget that uses existing Federal and State programs to implement energy efficiency and renewable resource projects.

In both phases of the community energy action program, recipients must make grants available to neighborhood organizations for special energy projects. These projects could promote community outreach programs or provide grants for energy conservation and renewable resource projects.

Funding for the basic and expanded planning grants would total \$2 billion over 5 years, beginning at \$300 million in the first year and increasingly by \$50 million for each subsequent year.

Cities and counties at the advanced planning stage are eligible for investment grants. These allow investment in conservation and renewable technologies appropriate to individual communities. They may be awarded for city block demonstration projects; low-head hydro development, district heating development, urban waste-based energy production facilities, industrial-residential cogeneration, solar energy systems development, weatherization of low-income housing; building retrofit programs, and neighborhood energy projects. These grants would total \$3 billion over the next 5 years.

This bill also provides \$4 million per year for "documentation and distribution grants." These would be awarded to local governments whose proposed publications offer a unique contribution to knowledge in the field of energy efficiency. A local energy reference center would be established as a clearinghouse for these publications and for other related information and data.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND CITIES

Mr. President, local governments must take the lead in planning and executing the inevitable transition to energy efficiency and renewable resources. Opportunities for conservation and renewables depend on local conditions—one reason why cities and counties should lead these efforts.

Energy efficiencies and renewable resources are diverse and decentralized. That is part of their promise, but it is also a partial cause of their neglect. Potential energy efficiencies are everywhere, and therefore they seem less prominent and promising than a "macho" march into synthetic fuels—no matter what the price in dollars and environmental dangers.

The cause of energy conservation also is plagued by the false argument that energy use must correlate positively with GNP. The Council on Environmental Quality and the Energy Project of the Harvard Business School agree that energy consumption can be cut by 30 to 40 percent by the year 2000. Expert studies by such groups as Resources for the Future, the Ford Foundation, and the National Academy of Sciences conclude that this goal can be met without hurting economic growth.

"Energy Future," the recent report of the Harvard project, states:

Conservation may well be the cheapest, safest, most productive energy alternative readily available in large amounts.

A study last year by the Massachusetts energy office found that economically efficient conservation in New England could create 500,000 jobs, increase economic production by \$2 billion per year, and cut energy costs by \$1.4 billion a year by 1985.

The facts are clear. Conservation and renewables represent our energy future, and they are ready now. Many Massachusetts cities and counties have taken steps in the right direction. The Community Energy Efficiency Act can give more permanence and comprehensiveness to efforts in Massachusetts and across the country.

Examples of local energy leadership in Massachusetts follow:

Springfield, Mass., has several active committees working on different energy-related problems. One group is monitoring energy use in city buildings, and has managed to reduce the city's annual fuel oil use by 4 percent (171,000 gallons) this year. Another committee is dealing with the problems of renters displaced by apartment closings caused by high utility costs.

Arlington, Mass., has cut energy costs by 25 percent in the past 2 years—a savings of 259,000 gallons of fuel oil—without major capital investments. The emphasis has been on accountability and monitoring the results.

Quincy, Mass., is pursuing a program of preliminary energy audits of schools and municipal buildings. The results will be submitted to the State energy office by October 5. If potential savings of at least 20 percent are indicated, the Quincy energy program will seek funds for technical audits—the next step in the retrofit application process.

Boston recently started a municipal energy management plan, which aims to reduce the city's energy use by 30 percent over the next 3 years. It involves

computer monitoring of high energy use in 30 city-owned buildings, and energy audits—particularly for senior citizens' housing.

Over 400 cities nationwide have some type of energy conservation staff, at varying levels of funding. What we need—what they need—is a comprehensive, nationwide program.

The Community Energy Efficiency Act is intended to stimulate discussion and debate. Several important issues still need to be resolved. Among them are the proper role of the Department of Energy and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the appropriate mechanism for State coordination, and the phasing of the three grant programs.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities have worked closely with me in drafting this legislation. I appreciate their continuing efforts on behalf of this important bill.

Mr. President, energy efficiency can and should be a criterion in all aspects of local planning. Local governments can save our energy in many ways. They can give incentives to landlords for making property improvements that save energy.

They can protect access to solar energy. Localities can reduce transportation needs by land use planning, and by decentralizing city services and putting them into the neighborhoods. Transportation policies for cars (and car-pools), mass transit, and bicycles affect energy consumption. Cities and counties can help arrange for cogeneration facilities and other inducements to business. A comprehensive energy efficiency program also should include public education and energy emergency plans. Energy must now be figured into municipal decision-making, but it is no longer a constant. Now it is always a variable.

Some of our Nation's local governments are on the energy efficiency initiative, but all must do more. The Community Energy Efficiency Act complements the Conservation Bank in bringing all segments of American society toward energy solutions. Planners and homeowners, bankers and low-income renters, civic leaders and industrialists must join forces to get our money's worth of energy and security.