To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 
Subject: Retail electricity rate increases in the West

Wellhead prices

Forwarded by Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE on 02/16/2001 03:07 PM
Tracy Terry@HQMAIL on 02/16/2001 02:53:02 PM

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 
Subject: Retail electricity rate increases in the West

Tom -

I left a message for Bill Trapman at EIA about natural gas prices. I'll let you know what I hear back from him.

Tracy

Excerpt from Testimony by Tom Karier, Council Member, Northwest Power Planning Council, Spokane, WA
Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Hearing, January 31, 2001
To receive testimony on California's Electricity Crisis and Implications for the West

Tacoma Public Utilities implemented a 50-percent rate surcharge, which amounts to a 43-percent increase to residential customers and 75 percent to industrial customers. Dry weather is impacting Tacoma's hydropower operations, forcing the utility to make purchases in
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the spot market. Tacoma
continuing high prices spent $60 million for power in December and is facing
has secured diesel with cash reserves of only $130 million. The utility
generators with 50 megawatts of capacity, called for
conservation, imposed the rate surcharge, and is also planning to take on $100
million in debt to get through the rest of the winter.
Oregon is facing market Tillamook Public Utility District in rural western
annual budget is about $11 exposure of $20 million, while the utility's total
million. Tillamook joined with several other rural utilities to buy a portion of its load on the market several years ago, and today the utilities' combined power bill has ballooned to $117 million. While Tillamook recently announced a new agreement with Bonneville, Tillamook has asked its large customers to discuss cutting back electricity consumption. But these customers have orders to fill and are reluctant to jeopardize their production.
Puget Sound Energy of Bellevue, an investor-owned utility with some 900,000 customers, reported it is in a precarious stage of rising finances while Puget is utility may ask the state rate relief. High prices have caused some of Puget's industrial customers who rates to shut down or curtail production.
Clark Public Utilities, which serves about 130,000 customers in the Portland suburb of Vancouver, Washington, recently raised its rates 20 percent to meet the increased price of natural gas and power from its generating plant, which comes from those expire in July and when it goes back on the

Clark anticipates another rate increase in the fall
Bonneville system.
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that a vastly
October, will force the
federal system. As a
rate increase over the
Bonneville acknowledged
60 percent, and some
100 percent higher.
spring runoff, Bonneville
$1.3 billion more than
recently announced
and may require a
proposing a 19-percent rate
increase. Moody's Investor Service recently changed the
credit rating of Seattle
city water levels will impact the
utility's hydropower generation and force more power
purchases on the spot

Last week the Bonneville Power Administration announced
increased demand for its products, beginning in
agency
to make significant market purchases to augment the
result, Bonneville is proposing an average 60-percent
next five-year rate period, beginning October 1, 2001.
that the first year could be significantly higher than
Bonneville customers are anticipating rates as much as
Given the current market situation and the projected
believes it needs revenues that average annually about
its estimates made just last May.

There is other bad news, as well. Idaho Power Company
its power purchases are $121 million above expectations
24-percent rate increase. Utah Power & Light is
rate
increase. Moody's Investor Service recently changed the
city Light to negative because of concerns that low
utility’s hydropower generation and force more power
market.
To: Joel Rubin
cc:

Subject: 
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To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 
Subject: diesel

here you go-- this may be a graph you want also.

- diesel.html
To: Tom Kimbis 02/16/2001 10:29 AM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: Data Request #2

not sure what you mean
JOEL

JOEL RUBIN 02/16/2001 10:20 AM

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: Data Request #2

Tom Kimbis

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: Data Request #2

JOEL

JOEL RUBIN 02/16/2001 07:39 AM

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Data Request #2
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Tom -

This question also came from MBZ...

Could you check on this?

Joel
To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 
Subject: Re: Data Request (from MBZ)

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 
Subject: Data Request (from MBZ)

Tom -

MBZ asked that a sentence like the following be constructed (let's talk?):

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Re: Chart change

Household Gvt Assistance
JOEL

---

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: Chart change

Tom -

Thanks,

joel
To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:

Subject: OIT example for you
To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 

Subject: OTT comments

Joel, note a couple of items in OTT's submission for your chapter 

"One of the Zimmermann's" <czmbz@erols.com> on 02/15/2001 11:10:53 PM

To: EJ Wall/EE/DOE@DOE 
cc: MaryBeth Zimmermann/EE/DOE@DOE 

Subject: OTT comments 

- att1.htm
- comments on OTT NEP expanded section.doc

16014

DOE017-0642

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
Tom Kimbs  
02/15/2001 06:23 PM  

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE  
cc: Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE  

Subject: Re: question 3  

don't know - no data on that....  

JOEL  

---  

JOEL RUBIN  
02/15/2001 06:21 PM  

To: Tom Kimbs/EE/DOE@DOE  
cc:  

Subject: Re: question 3  

Thanks,  

Joel  

Tom Kimbs  

---  

Tom Kimbs  
02/15/2001 06:12 PM  

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE  
cc:  

Subject: Re: question 3  

---  

16021
I hope that helps.

Tom

JOEL

JOEL RUBIN
02/15/2001 04:21 PM

To: Tom Kimble/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 

Subject: question 3

Please don't forget to reference these answers should I send these questions to Darrell?

Joel
To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:  
Subject: Re: question again

Joel

Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 06:22 PM

ps- remember, this is just an educated guesstimate for best numbers!

JOEL

---

JOEL
RUBIN
02/15/2001 06:13 PM

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: question again

Excellent!!!!

Joel
Tom Kimbis

---

Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 05:32 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE

Subject: Re: question again
Tom

JOEL

To: Tom Kimb/MOE/DOE@DOE
cc: 

Subject: question again

Joel
To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 
Subject: Re: question 3

Tom Kimbis
02/15/2001 06:12 PM

To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 
Subject: question 3

JOEL RUBIN
02/15/2001 04:21 PM
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should I send these questions to Darrell?

Joel
To:  Joel Rubi/EE/DOE@DOE  
cc:  MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE, Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE@DOE  

Subject: Re: question 5  

---

JOEL

02/15/2001 04:24 PM

To:  Tom Kimbi/EE/DOE@DOE  
cc:  

Subject: question 5  

---

JOEL RUBIN

02/15/2001 05:56 PM

To:  Tom Kimbi/EE/DOE@DOE  
cc:  

Subject: question 5  

---

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 

Subject: Re: question 7?

JOEL

JOEL RUBIN
02/15/2001 04:29 PM

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 

Subject: question 7?
To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 
Subject: Re: question 7?

JOEL

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: 
Subject: question 7?
To: Joel Rubin/EE/DOE@DOE
cc: MaryBeth Zimmerman/EE/DOE@DOE
Subject: Re: question again

Tom

JOEL

JOEL RUBIN
02/15/2001 04:20 PM

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE@DOE
cc:
Subject: question again

Joel
Subject: poverty

Joel:

As for poverty, the census bureau in its most recent releases (for 1999) state that 32.2 million Americans live in poverty, or 11.8% of the US Population.

Income and Poverty 1999 - Press Briefing

PRESS BRIEFING ON 1999 INCOME AND POVERTY ESTIMATES

Dr. Daniel H. Weinberg
Chief, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division
U.S. Census Bureau

September 26, 2000

Welcome to the press briefing on the 1999 income and poverty estimates. Your press packets contain a press release today, and the two reports we are releasing. You can obtain additional unpublished detailed tables (www.census.gov).

Let me introduce some of the analysts who worked on the reports; they will be available to answer your questions. Division Chief, Mary Nafteh (Chief of the Poverty and Health Statistics Branch), Edward Weisner (Chief of the U.S. Census Bureau), Robert Cleveland, Joe Dalaker, Carmen DeNavas-Walt, and Bernadette Proctor. I'd also like to thank the analysts who work hard to collect these data and the households who answer our survey questions.

Please hold your questions unless it's a technical clarification. The main presentation should take about 20 min.

Let me first summarize the main findings. (Chart 1) Incomes in income and decline in poverty were again widens the half of households in the United States have sustained in their real median income. In addition, the poverty rate fell for the third consecutive year, from 12.7 percent in the number of poor dropped significantly also — from 34.5 million poor in 1998 to 32.3 million.

These statistics come from the March Supplement to the Current Population Survey, a sample survey of approx. each month for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. These data reflect 1999 and not current conditions. As in all surveys, sampling variability and response errors. All statements made in the reports and in this briefing have been tested.
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...statistically significant differences. All historical income data are expressed in 1999 dollars and were adjusted u percent between 1998 and 1999. The poverty thresholds are also updated each year for inflation; in 1999 the for a family of three, $13,290.

(Chart 2) presents the key estimates of median household income. As I noted earlier, median income for all U.S between 1998 and 1999 to $40,800. Overall, real median household income has risen 24.5 percent since 1996 computed. Chart 3 shows that the Midwest and South regions reached all-time highs in median household income.

As Chart 4 shows, the number of poor in the U.S. in 1999 has fallen to its 1989 level -- 32.3 million people -- of poor also leads to a lower poverty rate in 1999 than in 1998 by 11.8 percent, the lowest since 1979. When 5), in contrast to the income findings, it was the Northeast and West that had significant declines in poverty rate. The poverty rate in the South remains at its all-time low, 13.1 percent.

Chart 6 presents the changes in real median household income by race and Hispanic origin between 1998 and for Asian and Pacific Islander households, all racial and ethnic groups experienced an annual increase in their re household income was the highest ever reported for Whites, non-Hispanic Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics, while Pacific Islanders.

As this next chart (Chart 7) shows, poverty dropped for all racial and ethnic groups as well, the first time since groups. While the national poverty rate is still above its historic low (set in 1973 at 11.1 percent), 1999 poverty rates for those on American Indian reservations or in Alaska Native villages were significantly different geographic areas.

Beginning with this year, the Census Bureau is showing income and poverty data for American Indians and Alas those estimates is much higher than for other race groups because of their relatively small sample size. Accordin only the average of 1997 through 1999 data. These estimates are shown in Chart 8. The three-year-average m Alaska Natives, $30,800, is higher than that for Blacks, statistically equal to the income estimate for Hispanics, non-Hispanic Whites, and Asians and Pacific Islanders. The three-year-average poverty rate of American Indians the same as that of Blacks and Hispanics, and higher than the poverty rate for non-Hispanic Whites and Asians about both the income and poverty estimates for American Indians and Alaska Natives; results from the 1990 the poverty rate for those on American Indian reservations or in Alaska Native villages were significantly differ geographic areas.

Chart 9 illustrates two interesting developments about poverty rates by age. First, the poverty rate for those 6 1999. Second, in 1999, 12.1 million children were poor, down 1.4 million and 2.0 percentage points from 1999 (percent in 1999) is higher than for the other age groups shown here, but it is significantly lower than in 1998 a of 22.7 percent in 1993. Children make up 38 percent of the poor but only 26 percent of the total population.

The real median earnings of men who worked full time, year-round increased by 1.0 percent between 1998 an 10). The earnings for comparable women remained statistically unchanged, however. The combination led to a full-time year-round workers to 72 percent, down from its all-time high of 74 percent first reached in 1996.

Chart 11 shows the fraction of aggregate income going to each fifth of the population in 1999. For the sixth c not change; that is, no statistically significant changes occurred between 1998 and 1999 in the share of agg in the Gini index of inequality. Income inequality measures, of which these are only two, do not typically chang no such changes since our measurement methodology changed in 1994. A more thorough discussion of incom measures of inequality, was presented in a recent Census Bureau report, The Changing Shape of the Nation's I

Based on a comparison of two-year moving averages for states (Chart 12), real median household income incre District of Columbia and fell in none. In the same period, the poverty rate fell in seven states and the District of D.C., New York, and South Dakota had both increases in income and declines in poverty.

The Census Bureau also produces a series of experimental estimates on how noncash benefits and taxes -- wh income and poverty. The income report shows 17 experimental definitions of income. The Census Bureau's res
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broadened definition of income that takes into account the effects of noncash benefits and taxes is roughly 8 points higher than the official definition. Government benefits do more than taxes to reduce income inequality.

Valuing noncash benefits and subtracting taxes also affects the estimated poverty rate. The Census Bureau has measures, based on recommendations made by the National Academy of Sciences, and will issue a new report in 1999 that takes into account the effects of noncash benefits and taxes in income, but they also use a new set of experimental poverty thresholds.

Four of those experimental measures are presented in the final chart (Chart 13). All of these experimental measures are more than do the official measure. Researchers point out that the experimental measures capture the effect while the official measure of poverty does not.

Let me again summarize the main findings. Increases in income and declines in poverty were widespread in 1999 than does the official measure. Researchers point out that the experimental measures capture the effects of noncash benefits and taxes is roughly 8 points higher than the official measure of poverty does not.

I’ll be glad to answer questions from the press at this time. Please identify yourself and your affiliation.

Contact the Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division at 301-457-3242 or mail to hhes-info@census.gov

Go to Income 1999
Go to Income Statistics
Go to Poverty 1999
Go to Poverty Statistics

Created: September 20, 2000
Last Revised: February 02, 2001
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JOEL

JOEL RUBIN
02/15/2001 12:49 PM

To: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE
cc: Tom Kimbis/EE/DOE

Subject: graphics please

NEPA_Chop 2 Outline.doc
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To: Joel Rubin
cc:

Subject: Stories and Graphics relating to Industry

it did come electronically....d.

-------------------------- Forwarded by Darrell Beschen/EE/DOE on 02/15/2001 04:38 PM --------------------------