

Top Ten Utility Green Pricing Programs (2020 data)

Utility green pricing programs allow homes and businesses to procure green power through their electric utility. Since 2000, the National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) has compiled data on these utility green pricing programs and released annual “Top 10” lists to recognize outstanding programs. This document contains updated 2020 rankings. This document is updated annually. More information about NREL’s green power market research is available at: <http://www.nrel.gov/analysis/green-power.html>.

Using information provided by utilities, NREL has developed "Top 10" rankings of utility green pricing programs for 2020 in the following categories: total sales, total number of customer participants, and participation rate (the percentage of utility customers that participated in green pricing programs).

Green Power Sales (as of December 2020)

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Sales (MWh) |
|------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 2,593,869 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp | 1,519,326 |
| 3 | Xcel Energy | 950,674 |
| 4 | Austin Energy | 727,711 |
| 5 | Puget Sound Energy | 638,855 |
| 6 | Silicon Valley Power | 426,316 |
| 7 | Dominion Energy Virginia | 389,413 |
| 8 | Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) | 335,524 |
| 9 | AES Indiana | 218,278 |
| 10 | Consumers Energy | 200,430 |

Green Power Customers (as of December 2020)

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Customers |
|------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 232,129 |
| 2 | Xcel Energy | 151,783 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp | 142,879 |
| 4 | Puget Sound Energy | 72,131 |
| 5 | Dominion Energy Virginia | 36,655 |
| 6 | Austin Energy | 24,835 |
| 7 | DTE Energy | 23,647 |
| 8 | Consumers Energy | 18,476 |
| 9 | National Grid | 14,511 |
| 10 | We Energies | 12,455 |

Green Power Sales Rate (as of December 2020)

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Sales Rate |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric (Green Future Choice) | 21.39% |
| 2 | Silicon Valley Power | 11.40% |
| 3 | PacifiCorp (Blue Sky Usage & Habitat) | 7.50% |
| 4 | Portland General Electric (Green Future Enterprise) | 7.49% |
| 5 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 6.55% |
| 6 | Waterloo Utilities | 5.86% |
| 7 | Alameda Municipal Power | 5.43% |
| 8 | Grand Marais Public Utility Commission | 4.85% |
| 9 | Farmers Electric Cooperative | 3.83% |
| 10 | Puget Sound Energy | 3.38% |

Green Power Participation Rate (as of December 2020)

| Rank | Utility | Participation Rate |
|------|----------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 26% |
| 2 | Farmers Electric Cooperative | 19.21% |
| 3 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 11.93% |
| 4 | Alameda Municipal Power | 10.29% |
| 5 | PacifiCorp (Blue Sky Usage & Habitat) | 9.13% |
| 6 | Silicon Valley Power | 6.76% |
| 7 | Puget Sound Energy | 6.12% |
| 8 | Muscoda Utilities | 5.38% |
| 9 | Naperville Public Utilities - Electric | 4.83% |
| 10 | Stoughton Utilities | 4.57% |

Note: Several utilities administer several green pricing programs. Program sales and participation rankings are based on utility-wide sales. Program sales and participation rates are calculated at the program level.

ARCHIVES

2019 Data

Green Power Sales (as of December 2019)

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Sales (MWh) |
|------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 2,315,319 |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 1,189,504 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp | 911,579 |
| 4 | Xcel Energy | 843,686 |
| 5 | Austin Energy | 775,702 |
| 6 | Puget Sound Energy | 570,580 |
| 7 | Silicon Valley Power | 391,901 |
| 8 | Dominion Energy Virginia | 358,447 |
| 9 | Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) | 225,767 |
| 10 | Consumers Energy | 204,609 |

Green Power Customers (as of December 2019)

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Customers |
|------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 225,492 |
| 2 | Xcel Energy | 145,565 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp | 134,485 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 71,867 |
| 5 | Puget Sound Energy | 62,480 |
| 6 | Dominion Energy Virginia | 33,640 |
| 7 | Austin Energy | 23,720 |
| 8 | Consumers Energy | 19,710 |
| 9 | We Energies | 13,052 |
| 10 | Seattle City Light | 10,964 |

Green Power Sales Rate (as of December 2019)

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Sales Rate |
|------|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric (Green Source) | 19.97% |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District (Greenergy) | 8.53% |
| 3 | Oak Ridge Electric Department | 7.39% |
| 4 | PacifiCorp (Blue Sky Usage & Habitat) | 7.06% |
| 5 | Portland General Electric (C&I Clean Wind) | 5.94% |
| 6 | Alameda Municipal Power | 5.61% |
| 7 | Wellesley Municipal Light Plant | 4.65% |
| 8 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 4.16% |
| 9 | Columbus Water & Light | 3.09% |
| 10 | Puget Sound Energy | 2.91% |

**Green Power Participation Rate
(as of December 2019)**

| Rank | Utility | Participation Rate |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric (Green Source) | 25.53% |
| 2 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 13.22% |
| 3 | Alameda Municipal Power | 11.84% |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District (Greenergy) | 11.23% |
| 5 | Wellesley Municipal Light Plant | 10.15% |
| 6 | PacifiCorp (Blue Sky Usage & Habitat) | 9.05% |
| 7 | Silicon Valley Power | 7.54% |
| 8 | Muscoda Utilities | 5.80% |
| 9 | Puget Sound Energy | 5.41% |
| 10 | Stoughton Utilities | 5.02% |

2018 Data

**Top Green Power Sales
(as of December 2018)**

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Sales (MWh) |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 1,996,143 |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 1,040,013 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp | 837,755 |
| 4 | Austin Energy | 757,228 |
| 5 | Xcel Energy | 551,217 |
| 6 | Puget Sound Energy | 524,113 |
| 7 | Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) | 510,932 |
| 8 | Silicon Valley Power | 422,515 |
| 9 | Dominion Energy Virginia | 397,325 |
| 10 | Indianapolis Power & Light | 221,857 |

**Green Power Customers
(as of December 2018)**

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Customers |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 204,889 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp | 128,535 |
| 3 | Xcel Energy | 120,334 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 71,833 |
| 5 | Puget Sound Energy | 49,535 |
| 6 | Dominion Energy Virginia | 30,778 |
| 7 | DTE Energy | 26,934 |
| 8 | Consumers Energy | 20,919 |
| 9 | Austin Energy | 20,625 |
| 10 | National Grid | 16,009 |

**Green Power Sales Rate
(as of December 2018)**

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Sales Rate |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 16.90% |
| 2 | Silicon Valley Power | 11.85% |
| 3 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 10.49% |
| 4 | PacifiCorp (Blue Sky Usage & Habitat) | 6.61% |
| 5 | Austin Energy (GreenChoice) | 5.65% |
| 6 | Portland General Electric | 5.45% |
| 7 | Alameda Municipal Power (Alameda Green) | 4.79% |
| 8 | River Falls Municipal Utility | 3.94% |
| 9 | Stoughton Utilities | 2.57% |
| 10 | Puget Sound Energy | 2.54% |

Note: Several utilities administer several green pricing programs. Program participation and sales rankings are based on utility-wide sales. Program participation rate is calculated at the program level.

**Green Power Participation Rate
(as of December 2018)**

| Rank | Utility | Participation Rate |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 22.91% |
| 2 | Alameda Municipal Power (Alameda Green) | 13.23% |
| 3 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 11.67% |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 10.45% |
| 5 | Pacific Power (Blue Sky) | 9.60% |
| 6 | Silicon Valley Power | 7.84% |
| 7 | Muscoda Utilities | 5.84% |
| 8 | Stoughton Utilities | 4.97% |
| 9 | Naperville Public Utilities (Renewable Energy Program) | 4.96% |
| 10 | Westby Utilities | 4.22% |

2017 Data

Top Green Power Program Participants (as of December 2017)

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Participants |
|------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 173,856 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp | 120,423 |
| 3 | Xcel Energy | 113,772 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 71,873 |
| 5 | Puget Sound Energy | 46,211 |
| 6 | Dominion Energy | 27,779 |
| 7 | DTE Energy | 22,425 |
| 8 | Austin Energy | 17,557 |
| 9 | National Grid | 16,955 |
| 10 | Avangrid NYSEG and RG&E | 15,539 |

Top Green Power Participation Rate (as of December 2017)

| Rank | Utility (Green Pricing Program) | Participation Rate |
|------|------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric (Green Source) | 19.44% |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 11.61% |
| 3 | Farmers Electric Cooperative - Kalona | 10.78% |
| 4 | Wellesley Municipal Light Plant | 10.56% |
| 5 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 10.00% |
| 6 | Silicon Valley Power (Santa Clara) | 9.35% |
| 7 | Alameda Municipal Power | 8.91% |
| 8 | Pacific Power | 8.76% |
| 9 | Muscoda Utilities | 6.00% |
| 10 | Naperville Public Utilities - Electric | 5.43% |

**Top Green Power Sales
(as of December 2017)**

| Rank | Utility | Sales (MWh/year) |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 1,843,565 |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 848,623 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp | 820,644 |
| 4 | Austin Energy | 708,326 |
| 5 | Tennessee Valley Authority | 504,227 |
| 6 | Puget Sound Energy | 500,926 |
| 7 | Xcel Energy | 424,589 |
| 8 | Silicon Valley Power | 423,808 |
| 9 | Dominion Energy | 329,607 |
| 10 | Indianapolis Power & Light Company | 215,175 |

Note: Several utilities administer several green pricing programs. Program participation and sales rankings are based on utility-wide sales. Program participation rate is calculated at the program level.

**Top Green Power Sales Rate
(as of December 2017)**

| Rank | Utility (Green Pricing Program) | Sales Rate |
|-------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric (Green Source) | 14.40% |
| 2 | Silicon Valley Power (Santa Clara) | 12.15% |
| 3 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 7.87% |
| 4 | (TVA) Oak Ridge Electric Department | 7.09% |
| 5 | Pacific Power (Blue Sky Usage & Habitat) | 6.22% |
| 6 | Austin Energy | 5.48% |
| 7 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 3.95% |
| 8 | Wellesley Municipal Light Plant | 3.35% |
| 9 | Alameda Municipal Power | 3.25% |
| 10 | Oklahoma Gas & Electric | 2.81% |

Note: Portland General Electric's Commercial & Industrial Clean Wind program has a sales rate of 4.31%.

2016 Data

Top Green Power Program Participants (as of December 2016)

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Participants |
|------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 150,519 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp | 112,268 |
| 3 | Xcel Energy | 100,359 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 71,970 |
| 5 | Puget Sound Energy | 41,543 |
| 6 | Dominion Virginia Power | 24,104 |
| 7 | National Grid | 17,462 |
| 8 | Avangrid NYSEG and RG&E | 16,386 |
| 9 | We Energies | 14,953 |
| 10 | Austin Energy | 14,721 |

Top Green Power Participation Rate (as of December 2016)

| Rank | Utility | Participation Rate |
|------|------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric (Green Source) | 16.92% |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 11.72% |
| 3 | Farmers Electric Cooperative - Kalona | 11.60% |
| 4 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 9.60% |
| 5 | Pacific Power - CA, OR, & WA | 8.37% |
| 6 | Silicon Valley Power | 8.13% |
| 7 | Madison Gas and Electric Company | 6.36% |
| 8 | Alameda Municipal Power | 6.27% |
| 9 | Naperville Public Utilities - Electric | 5.53% |
| 10 | Stoughton Utilities | 5.00% |

Note: Other PacifiCorp programs have participation rates of: Pacific Power Oregon only – 9.95%, Rocky Mountain Power (ID, UT, WY) – residential only – 5.39%, Rocky Mountain Power (ID, UT, WY) – 4.47%, PacifiCorp (Pacific Power and Rocky Mountain Power) – 6.06%.

Top Green Power Sales (as of December 2016)

| Rank | Utility | Sales (MWh/year) |
|------|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 1,524,616 |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 741,337 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp | 733,363 |
| 4 | Austin Energy | 733,070 |
| 5 | Puget Sound Energy | 471,025 |

| | | |
|----|--------------------------------|---------|
| 6 | Xcel Energy | 352,921 |
| 7 | Dominion Virginia Power | 336,917 |
| 8 | Tennessee Valley Authority | 232,127 |
| 9 | Silicon Valley Power | 206,692 |
| 10 | Indianapolis Power & Light Co. | 200,604 |

Note: Several utilities administer several green pricing programs. Program participation and sales rankings are based on utility-wide sales. Program participation rate is calculated at the program level.

**Top Green Power Sales Rate
(as of December 2016)**

| Rank | Utility | Sales Rate |
|-------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric (Green Source) | 12.30% |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 7.20% |
| 3 | Silicon Valley Power | 6.03% |
| 4 | Austin Energy | 5.69% |
| 5 | PacifiCorp (Blue Sky Usage & Habitat) | 5.50% |
| 6 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 4.30% |
| 7 | Park Electric Cooperative | 3.41% |
| 8 | Madison Gas and Electric Company | 3.07% |
| 9 | Alameda Municipal Power | 2.92% |
| 10 | Stoughton Utilities | 2.70% |

Note: Portland General Electric's Commercial & Industrial Clean Wind program has a sales rate of 5.23%. Other PacifiCorp programs have sales rates of: Pacific Power Usage, Habitat and Block (Oregon-only) – 6.59%, Pacific Power Usage and Habitat (Oregon-only) – 6.16%.

2015 Data

Top Green Power Program Participants (as of December 2015)

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Participants |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 128,983 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp | 106,655 |
| 3 | Xcel Energy | 96,635 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 71,875 |
| 5 | Puget Sound Energy | 43,365 |
| 6 | Dominion Virginia Power | 26,974 |
| 7 | Consumers Energy Company | 19,618 |
| 8 | Iberdrola: New York State Electric & Gas and Rochester Gas & Electric | 17,407 |
| 9 | National Grid | 16,276 |
| 10 | We Energies | 15,595 |

Top Green Power Participation Rate (as of December 2015)

| Rank | Utility | Participation Rate |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric (Green Source) | 14.65% |
| 2 | Farmers Electric Cooperative - Kalona | 11.93% |
| 3 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 11.75% |
| 4 | PacifiCorp - Oregon (Blue Sky Usage, Block and Habitat) | 9.46% |
| 5 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 8.58% |
| 6 | Silicon Valley Power | 7.94% |
| 7 | Madison Gas & Electric Company | 7.16% |
| 8 | Alameda Municipal Power | 6.44% |
| 9 | Naperville Public Utilities - Electric | 5.97% |
| 10 | Stoughton Utilities | 5.14% |

Note: Other PacifiCorp programs have rates of 8.98%: Pacific Power (CA, OR, WA) - residential only; 7.91%: Pacific Power - Usage, Habitat, Block (PP system wide - OR; WA; CA); 7.37%: Pacific Power-Blue Sky Usage & Habitat; 5.83%: PacifiCorp PP & RMP.

**Top Green Power Sales
(as of December 2015)**

| Rank | Utility | Sales (MWh/year) |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 1,356,388 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp | 716,849 |
| 3 | Austin Energy | 637,462 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 629,625 |
| 5 | Puget Sound Energy | 482,772 |
| 6 | Dominion Virginia Power | 345,223 |
| 7 | Xcel Energy | 340,973 |
| 8 | Tennessee Valley Authority | 202,195 |
| 9 | Indianapolis Light and Power Company | 182,496 |
| 10 | Silicon Valley Power | 179,621 |

**Top Green Power Sales Rate
(as of December 2015)**

| Rank | Utility | Sales Rate |
|-------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric (Green Source) | 10.47% |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 6.01% |
| 3 | Silicon Valley Power | 5.64% |
| 4 | PacifiCorp (Blue Sky Usage & Habitat) | 5.30% |
| 5 | Edmond Electric/City of Edmond | 5.15% |
| 6 | Austin Energy | 4.56% |
| 7 | Waterloo Utilities | 4.37% |
| 8 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 3.76% |
| 9 | Madison Gas and Electric Company | 3.11% |
| 10 | Stoughton Utilities | 2.69% |

Note: Portland General Electric's Commercial & Industrial Clean Wind program has a rate of 5.92%; PacifiCorp's Usage, Habitat and Block (Oregon) program a rate of 4.09%.

2014 Data

Total Number of Customer Participants (as of December 2014)

| Rank | Utility | Green Power Participants |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 108,709 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp | 100,594 |
| 3 | Xcel Energy | 88,181 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 71,578 |
| 5 | Puget Sound Energy | 44,689 |
| 6 | Eversource/United Illuminating | 27,950 |
| 7 | Dominion Virginia Power | 25,298 |
| 8 | DTE Energy (Detroit Edison) | 23,102 |
| 9 | Iberdrola: New York State Electric & Gas and Rochester Gas & Electric | 18,561 |
| 10 | Consumers Energy | 18,071 |

Customer Participation Rate (as of December 2014)

| Rank | Utility | Participation Rate |
|------|------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric (Green Source) | 12.33% |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 11.76% |
| 3 | Wellesley Municipal Light Plant (MA) | 11.05% |
| 4 | Farmers Electric Cooperative of Kalona | 10.46% |
| 5 | Eversource/United Illuminating | 8.93% |
| 6 | PacifiCorp (Blue Sky Usage and Habitat) | 8.90% |
| 7 | Silicon Valley Power | 8.17% |
| 8 | Madison Gas & Electric Co | 7.97% |
| 9 | City of Naperville (IL) | 6.23% |
| 10 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 5.88% |

Green Power Sales (as of December 2014)

| Rank | Utility | Sales (MWh/year) |
|------|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 1,171,978 |
| 2 | Austin Energy | 683,986 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp | 673,977 |
| 4 | Puget Sound Energy | 450,191 |
| 5 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 446,995 |
| 6 | Xcel Energy | 377,480 |
| 7 | Eversource/United Illuminating | 250,456 |
| 8 | Dominion Virginia Power | 244,853 |
| 9 | Tennessee Valley Authority | 206,522 |
| 10 | CPS Energy | 170,931 |

**Green Power Sales as a Percentage of Total Retail Electricity Sales (in MWh)
(as of December 2014)**

| Rank | Utility | Sales Rate |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Waterloo Utilities | 23.68% |
| 2 | City of Wellesley Municipal Light Plant (MA) | 11.0% |
| 3 | Edmond Electric | 10.45% |
| 4 | Portland General Electric (Green Source) | 8.96% |
| 5 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 8.14% |
| 6 | Silicon Valley Power | 5.31% |
| 7 | Austin Energy | 5.20% |
| 8 | Pacific Power (Blue Sky Usage and Habitat) | 4.98% |
| 9 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 4.31% |
| 10 | City of Palo Alto (CA) | 3.23% |

2013 Data

Green Pricing Program Renewable Energy Sales (as of December 2013)

| Rank | Utility | Sales (MWh/year) |
|------|------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 986,660* |
| 2 | Austin Energy | 863,956 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp | 634,092 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 423,724 |
| 5 | Xcel Energy (CO, MI, MN, NM, WI) ¹ | 388,157 |
| 6 | Puget Sound Energy | 380,155 |
| 7 | Connecticut Power & Light/ United Illuminating | 273,658 |
| 8 | CPS Energy | 205,713 |
| 9 | Tennessee Valley Authority | 199,067 |
| 10 | Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co | 189,462 |

Total Number of Customer Participants (as of December 2013)

| Rank | Utility | Number of Customers |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 99,818 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp | 94,787 |
| 3 | Xcel Energy (CO, MI, MN, NM, WI) ² | 77,054 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 63,104 |
| 5 | Puget Sound Energy | 40,519 |
| 6 | Connecticut Power & Light/United Illuminating | 27,786 |
| 7 | DTE Energy | 22,686 |
| 8 | Dominion Virginia Power | 20,362 |
| 9 | Iberdrola: New York State Electric & Gas and Rochester Gas & Electric | 19,498 |
| 10 | WE Energies | 17,711 |

Customer Participation Rate (as of December 2013)

| Rank | Utility | Customer Participation Rate |
|------|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | City of Palo Alto (CA) | 19.4% |
| 2 | Farmers Electric Cooperative of Kalona | 14.0% |
| 3 | Portland General Electric ³ | 12.6% |
| 4 | Town of Wellesley Municipal Light Plant (MA) | 11.1% |
| 5 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 10.4% |
| 6 | Madison Gas & Electric Co | 8.5% |
| 7 | PacifiCorp - (OR) ⁴ | 8.3% |

| | | |
|----|---------------------------------|------|
| 8 | Silicon Valley Power | 7.7% |
| 9 | City of Naperville - (IL) | 7.0% |
| 10 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 5.7% |

**Green Power Sales as a Percentage of Total Retail Electricity Sales (in MWh)
(as of December 2013)**

| Rank | Utility | % of Load |
|------|----------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Waterloo Utilities | 23.8% |
| 2 | Edmond Electric | 11.5% |
| 3 | Portland General Electric ⁵ | 8.4% |
| 4 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 7.4% |
| 5 | City of Palo Alto - (CA) | 6.0% |
| 6 | Silicon Valley Power | 5.2% |
| 7 | PacifiCorp/ Pacific Power ⁶ | 4.5% |
| 8 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 4.1% |
| 9 | Madison Gas & Electric Co | 3.6% |
| 10 | Town of Wellesley Municipal Light Plant (MA) | 3.3% |

**Net Price Premium Charged for New, Residential Customer-Driven Renewable Power
(as of December 2013)**

| Rank | Utility | Net Premium |
|------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy | -1.04¢/kWh |
| 2 | Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co | 0.04¢/kWh |
| 3 | Indianapolis Power & Light Co | 0.06¢/kWh |
| 4 | City of Palo Alto – (CA) | 0.20¢/kWh |
| 5 | Edmond Electric | 0.27¢/kWh |
| 6 | Xcel – (MN) ⁷ | 0.29¢/kWh |
| 7 | Avista Corp – (WA & ID) | 0.33¢/kWh |
| 8 | Portland General Electric ⁸ | 0.80¢/kWh |
| 9 | Duke Energy (NC, SC, IN, OH, KY) | 0.90¢/kWh |
| 10 | Connecticut Power & Light/United Illuminating | 0.99¢/kWh |

Notes:

¹ Windsource and Renewable Energy Trust

² Windsource and Renewable Energy Trust

³ Green Source

⁴ Note that PacifiCorp's Blue Sky Usage and Habitat achieved 6.4% customer participation rate

⁵ Green Source

⁶ Blue Sky Usage and Habitat; note that PacifiCorp/Pacific Power's Standard Block, Block QS, Usage & Habitat in Oregon achieved 3.5% in green power sales

⁷ Windsource

⁸ Green Source

* Portland General Electric data were updated 10/10/14

2012 Data

Green Pricing Program Renewable Energy Sales (as of December 2012)

| Rank | Utility | Sales (MWh/year) |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 834,125 |
| 2 | Austin Energy | 744,443 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp | 604,007 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 416,477 |
| 5 | Xcel Energy | 390,056 |
| 6 | Puget Sound Energy | 365,796 |
| 7 | Connecticut Light and Power Co. / United Illuminating | 254,838 |
| 8 | Dominion Virginia Power | 250,364 |
| 9 | Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. | 210,187 |
| 10 | CPS Energy | 179,786 |

Total Number of Customer Participants (as of December 2012)

| Rank | Utility | Participants |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric | 87,987 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp - Blue Sky Usage, Block, and Habitat | 87,919 |
| 3 | Xcel Energy | 61,315 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 55,207 |
| 5 | Puget Sound Energy | 34,962 |
| 6 | Connecticut Light and Power Co. / United Illuminating | 27,664 |
| 7 | Iberdrola: NYSEG and RG&E | 21,201 |
| 8 | We Energies | 20,066 |
| 9 | National Grid | 18,302 |
| 10 | Dominion Virginia Power | 15,179 |

Customer Participation Rate (as of December 2012)

| Rank | Utility | Customer Participation Rate |
|------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | City of Palo Alto (California) | 18.2% |
| 2 | Portland General Electric | 12.4% |
| 3 | Madison Gas & Electric Co. | 9.4% |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 9.2% |
| 5 | City of Naperville (Illinois) | 7.6% |
| 6 | Pacific Power (Oregon) | 7.6% |
| 7 | Silicon Valley Power | 6.9% |
| 8 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 6.1% |
| 9 | Stoughton Utilities | 5.1% |

| | | |
|----|-------------------------|------|
| 10 | Cuba City Light & Water | 5.0% |
|----|-------------------------|------|

**Green Power Sales as a Percentage of Total Retail Electricity Sales (in MWh)
(as of December 2012)**

| Rank | Utility | % of Load |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1 | Waterloo Utilities | 23.9% |
| 2 | Edmond Electric | 10.7% |
| 3* | City of Palo Alto | 8.1% |
| 3 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | 7.3% |
| 4 | Austin Energy | 6.0% |
| 5 | Portland General Electric | 4.4% |
| 6 | Madison Gas & Electric Co. | 4.1% |
| 6 | PacifiCorp - Blue Sky Usage and Habitat | 4.1% |
| 8 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 3.9% |
| 9 | Stoughton Utilities | 2.9% |
| 10 | Silicon Valley Power | 2.8% |

* City of Palo Alto provided an updated response after the submission deadline. The updated ranking is provided here but the remaining rankings have been unchanged.

**Net Price Premium Charged for New, Residential Customer-Driven Renewable Power
(as of December 2012)**

| Rank | Utility | Net Premium |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | City of Ponca (Oklahoma) | -0.87¢/kWh |
| 2 | Public Service Co. of New Mexico | 0.04¢/kWh |
| 3 | Edmond Electric | 0.14¢/kWh |
| 4 | Indianapolis Power & Light Co. | 0.15¢/kWh |
| 5 | Avista Corp. (Washington and Idaho) | 0.33¢/kWh |
| 6 | Arizona Public Service | 0.40¢/kWh |
| 7 | Xcel Energy (Minnesota only) | 0.66¢/kWh |
| 8 | Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. | 0.86¢/kWh |
| 9 | Connecticut Light and Power Co. / United Illuminating | 0.99¢/kWh |
| 10 | CPS Energy | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 10 | WPPI Energy | 1.00¢/kWh |

Note: The average net premium for City of Ponca over 2012 was -0.08¢/kWh.

**Utilities Using at Least 2% Solar to Supply their Green Pricing Programs
(as of December 2012)**

| Rank | Utility | % Solar |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 14.5% |
| 2 | Tennessee Valley Authority | 5.9% |
| 3 | Xcel Energy (Colorado only) | 3.0% |
| 4 | City of Palo Alto (California) | 2.5% |

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|------|
| 5 | Alameda Municipal Power | 2.0% |
| 5 | PacifiCorp - Blue Sky Habitat & Usage | 2.0% |

Note: While additional individual utility products may include at least 2% solar, this list represents the overall mix provided by the utility to meet all of its green pricing needs.

* Data were not collected in 2011.

2010 Data

Green Pricing Program Renewable Energy Sales (as of December 2010)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Sales (kWh/year) | Sales (aMW) ^a |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy ^b | Wind, landfill gas | 754,203,479 | 86.1 |
| 2 | Portland General Electric ^c | Wind, biomass, geothermal | 735,745,202 | 84.0 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp ^{bde} | Wind, biomass, landfill gas, solar | 587,373,391 | 67.1 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^b | Wind, hydro, biomass, solar | 395,537,564 | 45.2 |
| 5 | Xcel Energy ^{bf} | Wind, solar | 388,837,429 | 44.4 |
| 6 | Puget Sound Energy ^{bg} | Wind, landfill gas, biomass, small hydro, solar | 314,892,507 | 35.9 |
| 7 | Connecticut Light and Power/United Illuminating | Wind, hydro | 229,408,999 | 26.2 |
| 8 | CPS Energy ^h | Wind | 186,880,675 | 21.3 |
| 9 | National Grid ⁱ | Biomass, wind, small hydro, solar | 167,149,902 | 19.1 |
| 10 | We Energies ^b | Wind, landfill gas, solar | 164,546,605 | 18.8 |

- a. An "average megawatt" (aMW) is a measure of continuous capacity equivalent (i.e. operating at a 100% capacity factor).
- b. Product is Green-e Energy (www.green-e.org) certified.
- c. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- d. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- e. Includes Pacific Power and Rocky Mountain Power.
- f. Includes Northern States Power, Public Service Company of Colorado and Southwestern Public Service.
- g. Residential product marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- h. Data period: February 2010 thru January 2011.
- i. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.

**Total Number of Customer Participants
(as of December 2010)**

| Rank | Utility | Program(s) | Participants |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric ^a | Clean Wind, Green Source, Renewable Future | 77,907 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp ^{bc} | Blue Sky Block ^d , Blue Sky Usage ^d , Blue Sky Habitat ^d | 76,322 |
| 3 | Xcel Energy ^e | WindSource ^d , Renewable Energy Trust | 66,401 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy ^d | 51,498 |
| 5 | PECO ^f | PECO WIND | 32,629 |
| 6 | Puget Sound Energy ^g | Green Power Program ^d | 29,398 |
| 7 | Connecticut Light and Power/United Illuminating | CTCleanEnergyOptions | 24,283 |
| 8 | Iberdrola USA: NYSEG and RG&E ^f | Catch the Wind | 23,011 |
| 9 | We Energies | Energy for Tomorrow ^d | 22,306 |
| 10 | National Grid ^h | GreenUp | 21,475 |

- a. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- b. Includes Pacific Power and Rocky Mountain Power.
- c. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- d. Product is Green-e Energy certified.
- e. Includes Northern States Power, Public Service Company of Colorado and Southwestern Public Service.
- f. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy Inc.
- g. Residential product marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- h. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.

**Green Power Sales as a Percentage of Total Retail Electricity Sales (in kWh)
(as of December 2010)**

| Rank | Utility | Program(s) | % of Load |
|-------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1 | Waterloo Utilities ^a | Renewable Energy Program ^b | 22.6% |
| 2 | Edmond Electric ^c | Pure and Simple | 9.9% |
| 3 | Portland General Electric ^d | Clean Wind, Green Source, Renewable Future | 8.1% |
| 4 | City of Palo Alto Utilities ^e | Palo Alto Green ^b | 7.4% |
| 5 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | Renewable Energy Program ^a | 7.2% |
| 6 | Austin Energy | Green Choice ^b | 6.3% |
| 7 | Madison Gas and Electric | Green Power Tomorrow | 4.5% |
| 8 | Pacific Power-Oregon Only ^f | Blue Sky Block ^b , Blue Sky Usage ^b , Blue Sky Habitat ^b | 4.3% |
| 9 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy ^b | 3.9% |

| | | | |
|----|----------------------------------------|---------------------|------|
| 10 | Park Electric Cooperative ^g | Green Power Program | 3.4% |
|----|----------------------------------------|---------------------|------|

- a. Power supplied by WPPI Energy.
- b. Product is Green-e Energy certified.
- c. Power supplied by Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority.
- d. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- e. Marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- f. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- g. Power supplied by Basin Electric Power Cooperative.

**Price Premium Charged for New, Residential Customer-Driven Renewable Power
(as of December 2010)**

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Premium (¢/kWh) |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Indianapolis Power & Light Company ^a | Wind | 0.14 |
| 2 | Edmond Electric ^{bc} | Wind | 0.27 |
| 3 | Avista Utilities | Wind, landfill gas, hydro | 0.33 |
| 4 | City of Onawa | Wind | 0.40 |
| 5 | Flathead Electric Cooperative ^d | Wind | 0.50 |
| 5 | Moorhead Public Service | Wind | 0.50 |
| 5 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^a | Wind, hydro, biomass, solar | 0.50 |
| 8 | OG&E Electric Services ^e | Wind | 0.72 |
| 9 | Emerald People's Utility District | Landfill gas, wind, biomass | 0.80 |
| 10 | Xcel Energy (Minnesota only) ^{ac} | Wind | 0.84 |

- a. Product is Green-e Energy certified.
- b. Power supplied by Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority.
- c. Premium is variable; customers in these programs are exempt or otherwise protected from changes in utility fuel charges.
- d. Power is supplied by Basin Electric Power Cooperative.
- e. 0.72¢/kWh represents the average price premium paid. The premium varies from .7¢/kWh to .9¢/kWh, based on purchase quantities.

**Customer Participation Rate
(as of December 2010)**

| Rank | Utility | Program(s) | Customer Participation Rate | Program Start Year |
|------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | City of Palo Alto Utilities ^a | Palo Alto Green ^b | 21.5% | 2003 |
| 2 | Portland General Electric ^c | Clean Wind, Green Source, Renewable Future | 12.6% | 2002 |
| 3 | Farmers Electric Cooperative of Kalona | Green Power Project | 11.2% | 2009 |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------------------|
| 4 | Madison Gas and Electric | Green Power Tomorrow | 9.0% | 1999 |
| 5 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy ^b | 8.7% | 1997 |
| 6 | City of Naperville, IL ^d | Renewable Energy Program | 8.0% | 2005 |
| 7 | Silicon Valley Power ^a | Santa Clara Green Power ^b | 7.8% | 2004 |
| 8 | Pacific Power - Oregon Only ^g | Blue Sky Block ^b , Blue Sky Usage ^b , Blue Sky Habitat ^b | 6.9% | 2000 ^h |
| 9 | River Falls Municipal Utilities ^c | Renewable Energy Program ^b | 6.4% | 2001 |
| 10 | Lake Mills Light & Water ^e | Renewable Energy Program ^b | 5.3% | 2001 |

- a. Marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- b. Product is Green-e Energy certified.
- c. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- d. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy Inc.
- e. Power supplied by WPPI Energy.
- f. Some products marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- g. Blue Sky Habitat & Blue Sky Usage programs began in 2002.

**Community Solar Programs
(as of December 2010)**

| Utility/Provider | Program | Program Size (kW) | Program Start |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Ashland, Oregon | Solar Pioneers II | 63 | 2008 |
| Bainbridge Island, Washington | Solar for Sakai | 5 | 2009 |
| Ellensburg, Washington | Community Solar Project | 27 | 2006 |
| Florida Keys Electric Cooperative | Simple Solar | 117 | 2008 |
| Holy Cross Energy/Clean Energy Collective | Mid Valley Solar Array | 80 | 2010 |
| Sacramento Municipal Utility District | SolarShares | 1,000 | 2008 |
| St. George, Utah | SunSmart | 250 | 2009 |
| United Power | Sol Partners Cooperative Solar Farm | 10 | 2009 |

For More Information -

Online Report: *Utility Green Pricing Programs: What Defines Success?* NREL/TP-620-29831, August 2001. ([PDF 1.1 MB](#))

2009 Data

Green Pricing Program Renewable Energy Sales (as of December 2009)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Sales (kWh/year) | Sales (aMW)^a |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy | Wind, landfill gas | 764,895,830 | 87.3 |
| 2 | Portland General Electric ^b | Wind, biomass, geothermal | 740,880,487 | 84.6 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp ^{cde} | Wind, biomass, landfill gas, solar | 578,744,080 | 66.1 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^c | Wind, hydro, biomass, solar | 377,535,530 | 43.1 |
| 5 | Xcel Energy ^{cf} | Wind, solar | 374,296,375 | 42.7 |
| 6 | Puget Sound Energy ^{cg} | Wind, landfill gas, biomass, small hydro, solar | 303,046,167 | 34.6 |
| 7 | Connecticut Light and Power/United Illuminating | Wind, hydro | 197,458,734 | 22.5 |
| 8 | National Grid ^h | Biomass, wind, small hydro, solar | 174,536,130 | 19.9 |
| 9 | Public Service Company of New Mexico | Wind | 173,863,751 | 19.8 |
| 10 | We Energies ^c | Wind, landfill gas, solar | 173,217,802 | 19.8 |

- a. An "average megawatt" (aMW) is a measure of continuous capacity equivalent (i.e. operating at a 100% capacity factor).
- b. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- c. Product is Green-e Energy (www.green-e.org) certified.
- d. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- e. Includes Pacific Power and Rocky Mountain Power.
- f. Includes Northern States Power, Public Service Company of Colorado and Southwestern Public Service.
- g. Residential product marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- h. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.

Green Power Sales as a Percentage of Total Retail Electricity Sales (in kWh) (as of December 2009)

| Rank | Utility | Program(s) | % of Load |
|-------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1 | Waterloo Utilities ^a | Renewable Energy Program ^b | 21.4% |
| 2 | Edmond Electric ^c | Pure and Simple | 8.1% |
| 3 | Portland General Electric ^d | Clean Wind, Green Source, Renewable Future | 7.9% |
| 4 | City of Palo Alto Utilities ^e | Palo Alto Green ^b | 6.9% |
| 5 | Austin Energy | Green Choice | 6.4% |
| 6 | River Falls Municipal Utilities | Renewable Energy Program ^a | 6.2% |
| 7 | Madison Gas and Electric | Green Power Tomorrow | 4.9% |
| 8 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy ^b | 3.6% |
| 9 | Park Electric Cooperative ^f | Green Power Program | 3.4% |
| 10 | PacifiCorp (Oregon only) ^{be} | Blue Sky Block ^b , Blue Sky Usage ^b , Blue Sky Habitat | 2.8% |

- a. Power supplied by WPPI Energy.
- b. Product is Green-e Energy certified.
- c. Power supplied by Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority.
- d. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- e. Marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- f. Power supplied by Basin Electric Power Cooperative.

Total Number of Customer Participants (as of December 2009)

| Rank | Utility | Program(s) | Participants |
|------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Portland General Electric ^a | Clean Wind, Green Source, Renewable Future | 72,812 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp ^{bc} | Blue Sky Block ^d , Blue Sky Usage ^d , Blue Sky Habitat | 71,165 |
| 3 | Xcel Energy ^c | WindSource ^d , Renewable Energy Trust | 70,393 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy ^d | 50,250 |
| 5 | PECO ^f | PECO WIND | 34,491 |
| 6 | Puget Sound Energy ^{cg} | Green Power Program ^d | 25,789 |
| 7 | National Grid ^h | GreenUp | 22,888 |
| 8 | Connecticut Light and Power/United Illuminating | CTCleanEnergyOptions | 22,336 |
| 9 | We Energies | Energy for Tomorrow ^d | 20,927 |
| 10 | Iberdrola USA: NYSEG and RG&E ^f | Catch the Wind | 20,386 |

- a. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- b. Includes Pacific Power and Rocky Mountain Power.
- c. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- d. Product is Green-e Energy certified.
- e. Includes Northern States Power, Public Service Company of Colorado and Southwestern Public Service.
- f. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy Inc.
- g. Residential product marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- h. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.

Customer Participation Rate (as of December 2009)

| Rank | Utility | Program(s) | Customer Participation Rate | Program Start Year |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | City of Palo Alto Utilities ^a | Palo Alto Green ^b | 20.8% | 2003 |
| 2 | Portland General Electric ^c | Clean Wind, Green Source, Renewable Future | 10.2% | 2002 |
| 3 | Madison Gas and Electric | Green Power Tomorrow | 9.6% | 1999 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy ^b | 8.5% | 1997 |
| 5 | City of Naperville ^d | Renewable Energy Program | 8.4% | 2005 |
| 6 | Silicon Valley Power ^a | Santa Clara Green Power ^b | 8.1% | 2004 |
| 7 | Pacific Power - Oregon Only ^a | Blue Sky Block ^b , Blue Sky Usage ^b , Blue Sky Habitat | 6.5% | 2002 |
| 8 | River Falls Municipal Utilities ^e | Renewable Energy Program ^b | 5.8% | 2001 |
| 9 | Stoughton Utilities ^e | Renewable Energy Program ^b | 5.2% | 2002 |
| 10 | Lake Mills Light & Water ^e | Renewable Energy Program ^b | 5.1% | 2002 |
| 10 | Pacific County PUD | Green Power Tomorrow | 5.1% | 2002 |

- a. Marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group Inc.
- b. Product is Green-e Energy certified.
- c. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- d. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy Inc.
- e. Power supplied by WPPI Energy.

Price Premium Charged for New, Customer-Driven Renewable Power (as of December 2009)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Premium (¢/kWh) |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Edmond Electric ^{ab} | Wind | -0.17 |
| 2 | OG&E Company ^{ac} | Wind | 0.28 |
| 3 | Avista Utilities | Wind, landfill gas, hydro | 0.33 |
| 4 | Park Electric Cooperative ^d | Wind | 0.39 |
| 5 | Arizona Public Service Company ^e | Wind, geothermal, biomass, landfill gas, solar | 0.40 |
| 6 | Indianapolis Power & Light Company | Wind | 0.42 |
| 7 | Flathead Electric Cooperative ^d | Wind | 0.50 |
| 7 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^e | Wind, hydro, biomass, solar | 0.50 |
| 9 | Xcel Energy (New Mexico) ^{ac} | Wind, solar | 0.75 |
| 10 | Emerald People's Utility District | Landfill gas, wind, biomass | 0.80 |

- a. Premium is variable; customers in these programs are exempt or otherwise protected from changes in utility fuel charges.
- b. Power supplied by Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority.
- c. OG&E Company offers two rate structures for its Wind Power program; the lowest premium is for the rate which exempts customers from the fuel charge.
- d. Power is supplied by Basin Electric Power Cooperative.
- e. Product is Green-e Energy certified.

For More Information -

Online Report: *Utility Green Pricing Programs: What Defines Success?*. NREL/TP-620-29831, August 2001. ([PDF 1.1 MB](#))

2008 Data

Green Pricing Program Renewable Energy Sales (as of December 2008)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Sales (kWh/year) | Sales (Avg. MW) ^a |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy | Wind, landfill gas | 723,824,901 | 82.6 |
| 2 | Portland General Electric ^b | Wind, biomass | 681,943,576 | 77.9 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp ^{cde} | Wind, biomass, landfill gas, solar | 492,892,222 | 56.3 |
| 4 | Xcel Energy ^{ef} | Wind | 362,040,082 | 41.3 |
| 5 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^e | Wind, solar, biomass, landfill gas, hydro | 325,275,628 | 37.1 |
| 6 | Puget Sound Energy ^e | Wind, solar, biomass, landfill gas, hydro | 291,166,600 | 33.2 |
| 7 | Public Service Company of New Mexico | Wind | 176,497,697 | 20.1 |
| 8 | We Energies ^e | Wind, landfill gas, solar | 176,242,630 | 20.1 |
| 9 | National Grid ^{gh} | Biomass, wind, small hydro, solar | 174,612,444 | 19.9 |
| 10 | PECO ⁱ | Wind | 172,782,490 | 19.7 |

- a. An "average megawatt" (aMW) is a measure of continuous capacity equivalent (i.e., operating at a 100% capacity factor).
- b. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- c. Includes Pacific Power and Rocky Mountain Power.
- d. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group, Inc.
- e. Product is [Green-e certified](#). For Xcel Energy, the Colorado and Minnesota Windsorce products are *Green-e* certified.
- f. Includes Northern States Power, Public Service Company of Colorado, and Southwestern PublicService.
- g. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.
- h. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, Inc., EnviroGen, Green Mountain Energy Company, Mass Energy, People's Power & Light, and Sterling Planet.
- i. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, Inc.

Total Number of Customer Participants (as of December 2008)

| Rank | Utility | Program(s) | Participants |
|------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Xcel Energy ^a | <i>Windsource^b Renewable Energy Trust</i> | 71,571 |
| 2 | Portland General Electric ^c | <i>Clean Wind Green Source</i> | 69,258 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp ^{de} | <i>Blue Sky Block^b Blue Sky Usage^b Blue Sky Habitat</i> | 67,252 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | <i>Greenery^b</i> | 45,992 |
| 5 | PECO ^f | <i>PECO WIND</i> | 36,300 |
| 6 | National Grid ^{gh} | <i>GreenUp</i> | 23,668 |
| 7 | Energy East (NYSEG/RGE) ^f | <i>Catch the Wind</i> | 22,210 |
| 8 | Puget Sound Energy | <i>Green Power Program^b</i> | 21,509 |
| 9 | Los Angeles Department of Water & Power | <i>Green Power for a Green LA</i> | 21,113 |
| 10 | We Energies | <i>Energy for Tomorrow^b</i> | 19,615 |

- a. Includes Northern States Power, Public Service Company of Colorado, and Southwestern Public Service.
- b. Product is Green-e certified. For Xcel Energy, the Colorado and Minnesota *Windsource* products are *Green-e* certified.
- c. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- d. Includes Pacific Power and Rocky Mountain Power.
- e. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group, Inc.
- f. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, Inc.
- g. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.
- h. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, EnviroGen, Green Mountain Energy Company, Mass Energy, People's Power & Light, and Sterling Planet.

Customer Participation Rate (as of December 2008)

| Rank | Utility | Customer Participation Rate | Program(s) | Program Start Year |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | City of Palo Alto Utilities ^{ab} | 21.0% | <i>Palo Alto Green</i> | 2003 |
| 2 | Lenox Municipal Utilities ^c | 10.5% | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 2003 |
| 3 | Portland General Electric ^d | 9.7% | <i>Clean Wind Green Source Renewable Future</i> | 2002 |
| 4 | Madison Gas and Electric Company | 9.6% | <i>Green Power Tomorrow</i> | 1999 |
| 5 | Silicon Valley Power ^{ab} | 8.4% | <i>Santa Clara Green Power</i> | 2004 |
| 6 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 7.8% | <i>Greenergy</i> | 1997 |
| 6 | City of Naperville Public Utilities ^e | 7.8% | <i>Renewable Energy Program</i> | 2005 |
| 8 | Pacific Power (Oregon only) ^{ab} | 6.2% | <i>Blue Sky Block^b Blue Sky Usage^b Blue Sky Habitat</i> | 2002 |
| 9 | River Falls Municipal Utilities ^{bf} | 5.3% | <i>Renewable Energy Program</i> | 2001 |
| 10 | Lake Mills Light & Water ^{bf} | 5.0% | <i>Renewable Energy Program</i> | 2001 |

- a. Marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group, Inc.
- b. Product is [Green-e certified](#).
- c. Program offered in association with the Iowa Association of Municipal Utilities.
- d. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- e. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, Inc.
- f. Power supplied by WPPI Energy.

Green Power Sales as a Percentage of Total Retail Electricity Sales (in kWh) (as of December 2008)

| Rank | Utility | Program Name | % of Load |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1 | Edmond Electric ^a | <i>Pure & Simple</i> | 6.4% |
| 2 | Austin Energy | <i>GreenChoice</i> | 6.0% |
| 3 | River Falls Municipal Utilities ^{bc} | <i>Renewable Energy Program</i> | 5.8% |
| 4 | City of Palo Alto Utilities ^{ce} | <i>PaloAltoGreen</i> | 5.7% |
| 5 | Portland General Electric ^d | <i>Clean Wind Green Source Renewable Future</i> | 3.9% |
| 6 | Madison Gas and Electric Company | <i>Green Power Tomorrow</i> | 3.8% |
| 7 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^e | <i>Greenenergy</i> | 3.0% |
| 8 | Fort Collins Utilities ^f | <i>Green Energy Program</i> | 2.6% |
| 9 | Pacific Power (Oregon only) ^e | <i>Blue Sky Block^e Blue Sky Usage^e Blue Sky Habitat</i> | 2.3% |
| 10 | Emerald People's Utility District | <i>EPUD Renewables</i> | 2.2% |

- a. Power supplied by Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority.
- b. Power supplied by WPPI Energy.
- c. Marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group, Inc.
- d. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- e. Product is [Green-e certified](#).
- f. Power supplied by Platte River Power Authority.

Price Premium Charged for New, Customer-Driven Renewable Power^a (as of December 2008)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Premium (¢/kWh) |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | OG&E Electric Services ^b | Wind | -1.01 |
| 2 | Edmond Electric ^{bc} | Wind | -0.94 |
| 3 | Avista Utilities | Wind, landfill gas, biomass | 0.33 |
| 4 | Park Electric Cooperative | Wind | 0.44 |
| 5 | Indianapolis Power and Light | Wind, landfill gas | 0.65 |
| 6 | PacifiCorp ^{dg} | Wind, biomass, landfill gas, solar | 0.78 |
| 7 | Emerald People's Utility District | Wind | 0.80 |
| 7 | Basin Electric Power Cooperative ^h | Wind | 0.80 |
| 7 | Clallam County Public Utility District ^b | Landfill gas | 0.80 |
| 10 | Xcel Energy (Minnesota) ^{bdf} | Wind | 0.91 |

- a. Includes only programs that have installed or announced firm plans to install or purchase power from 100% new renewable resources.
- b. Premium is variable; customers in these programs are exempt or otherwise protected from changes in utility fuel charges.
- c. Power supplied by Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority.
- d. Product is [Green-e certified](#).
- e. The price for new customers enrolling in the program (fifth batch of renewable energy capacity).
- f. Net premium of the Minnesota *Windsorce* program.
- g. Pacific Power *Blue Sky Usage* and *Blue Sky Habitat* products; only available in Oregon. Product marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group, Inc.
- h. A number of Basin Electric Power Cooperatives offer green power at a premium of 0.8¢/kWh

For More Information -

Online Report: *Utility Green Pricing Programs: What Defines Success?*. NREL/TP-620-29831, August 2001. ([PDF 1.1 MB](#))

2007 Data

Green Pricing Program Renewable Energy Sales (as of December 2007)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Sales (kWh/year) | Sales (Avg. MW) ^a |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy | Wind, landfill gas | 577,636,840 | 65.9 |
| 2 | Portland General Electric ^b | Geothermal, biomass, wind | 553,677,903 | 63.2 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp ^{cde} | Wind, biomass, landfill gas, solar | 383,618,885 | 43.8 |
| 4 | Florida Power & Light ^b | Biomass, wind, landfill gas, solar | 373,596,000 | 42.6 |
| 5 | Xcel Energy ^{ef} | Wind | 326,553,866 | 37.3 |
| 6 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^e | Wind, landfill gas, small hydro, solar | 275,481,584 | 31.4 |
| 7 | Puget Sound Energy ^e | Wind, solar, biomass, landfill gas | 246,406,200 | 28.1 |
| 8 | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | Wind | 226,474,000 | 25.9 |
| 9 | National Grid ^{gh} | Biomass, wind, small hydro, solar | 180,209,571 | 20.6 |
| 10 | PECO ⁱ | Wind | 160,000,000 | 18.3 |

- a. An "average megawatt" (aMW) is a measure of continuous capacity equivalent (i.e., operating at a 100% capacity factor).
- b. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company. For Portland General Electric, some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- c. Includes Pacific Power and Rocky Mountain Power.
- d. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group, Inc.
- e. Product is Green-e certified. For Xcel Energy, the Colorado and Minnesota Windsorce products are *Green-e* certified.
- f. Includes Northern States Power, Public Service Company of Colorado, and Southwestern Public Service.
- g. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.
- h. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, Inc., EnviroGen, Green Mountain Energy Company, Mass Energy, People's Power & Light, and Sterling Planet.
- i. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, Inc.

Total Number of Customer Participants (as of December 2007)

| Rank | Utility | Program(s) | Participants |
|------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Xcel Energy ^a | <i>Windsorce^b Renewable Energy Trust</i> | 75,534 |
| 2 | Portland General Electric ^{cg} | <i>Clean Wind Green Source</i> | 61,543 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp ^{de} | <i>Blue Sky Block^b Blue Sky Usage^b Blue Sky Habitat</i> | 60,539 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | <i>Greenergy^b</i> | 43,543 |
| 5 | PECO ^f | <i>PECO WIND</i> | 38,548 |
| 6 | Florida Power & Light ^g | <i>Sunshine Energy</i> | 37,184 |
| 7 | National Grid ^{hi} | <i>GreenUp</i> | 24,429 |
| 8 | Los Angeles Department of Water & Power | <i>Green Power for a Green LA</i> | 22,788 |
| 9 | Puget Sound Energy | <i>Green Power Program^b</i> | 20,457 |
| 10 | Energy East (NYSEG/RGE) ^f | <i>Catch the Wind</i> | 19,520 |

- a. Includes Northern States Power, Public Service Company of Colorado, and Southwestern Public Service.
- b. Product is Green-e certified. For Xcel Energy, the Colorado and Minnesota *Windsorce* products are *Green-e* certified.
- c. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- d. Includes Pacific Power and Rocky Mountain Power.
- e. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group, Inc.
- f. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, Inc.
- g. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- h. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.
- i. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, EnviroGen, Green Mountain Energy Company, Mass Energy, People's Power & Light, and Sterling Planet.

Customer Participation Rate (as of December 2007)

| Rank | Utility | Customer Participation Rate | Program(s) | Program Start Year |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | City of Palo Alto Utilities ^{ab} | 20.4% | <i>Palo Alto Green</i> | 2003 |
| 2 | Lenox Municipal Utilities ^c | 14.3% | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 2003 |
| 3 | Silicon Valley Power ^{ab} | 8.7% | <i>Santa Clara Green Power</i> | 2004 |
| 4 | Portland General Electric ^d | 8.5% | <i>Clean Wind Green Source Renewable Future</i> | 2002 |
| 5 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^b | 7.4% | <i>Greenergy</i> | 1997 |
| 6 | City of Naperville Public Utilities ^c | 6.7% | <i>Renewable Energy Program</i> | 2005 |
| 7 | Montezuma Municipal Light & Power ^c | 6.2% | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 2003 |
| 8 | Pacific Power (Oregon only) ^{ab} | 5.7% | <i>Blue Sky Usage, Habitat, Block</i> | 2002 |
| 9 | River Falls Municipal Utilities ^f | 5.3% | <i>Renewable Energy Program</i> | 2001 |
| 10 | Holy Cross Energy | 5.2% | <i>Wind Power Pioneers Local Renewable Energy Pool</i> | 1998 2002 |

- a. Marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group, Inc.
- b. Product is [Green-e certified](#).
- c. Program offered in association with the Iowa Association of Municipal Utilities.
- d. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- e. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, Inc.
- f. Power supplied by Wisconsin Public Power Inc.

Green Power Sales as a Percentage of Total Retail Electricity Sales (in kWh) (as of December 2007)

| Rank | Utility | Program Name | % of Load |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Edmond Electric ^a | <i>Pure & Simple</i> | 5.7% |
| 2 | Austin Energy | <i>GreenChoice</i> | 5.0% |
| 3 | City of Palo Alto Utilities ^{bd} | <i>PaloAltoGreen</i> | 4.6% |
| 4 | Portland General Electric ^c | <i>Clean Wind, Green Source, Renewable Future</i> | 2.9% |
| 5 | Silicon Valley Power ^{bd} | <i>Santa Clara Green Power</i> | 2.8% |
| 6 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^d | <i>Greenergy</i> | 2.6% |
| 7 | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | <i>PrairieWinds</i> | 1.9% |
| 7 | Pacific Power (Oregon only) ^{bde} | <i>Blue Sky Usage, Habitat, Block</i> | 1.9% |
| 9 | Emerald People's Utility District | <i>EPUD Renewables</i> | 1.8% |
| 10 | Public Service Company of New Mexico | <i>PNM Sky Blue</i> | 1.5% |
| 10 | Roseville Electric ^{bd} | <i>Green Roseville</i> | 1.5% |

- a. Power supplied by Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority.
- b. Marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group, Inc.
- c. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- d. Product is [Green-e certified](#)
- e. Renewable portfolio options offered to Oregon customers.

Premium Charged for New, Customer-Driven Renewable Power^a (as of December 2007)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Premium (¢/kWh) |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Edmond Electric ^{bc} | Wind | 0.09 |
| 2 | OG&E Electric Services ^b | Wind | 0.10 |
| 3 | Austin Energy ^{bc} | Wind, landfill gas | 0.16 |
| 4 | Indianapolis Power and Light | Wind, landfill gas | 0.20 |
| 5 | Park Electric Cooperative | Wind | 0.22 |
| 6 | Avista Utilities | Wind, landfill gas, biomass | 0.33 |
| 7 | Xcel Energy (Minnesota) ^{bdf} | Wind | 0.58 |
| 8 | Clallam County Public Utility District ^b | Landfill gas | 0.70 |
| 9 | PacifiCorp ^{dg} | Wind, biomass, landfill gas, solar | 0.78 |
| 10 | Portland General Electric ^h | Biomass, Geothermal, Wind | 0.80 |
| 10 | Emerald People's Utility District | Wind | 0.80 |

- a. Includes only programs that have installed or announced firm plans to install or purchase power from 100% new renewable resources.
- b. Premium is variable; customers in these programs are exempt or otherwise protected from changes in utility fuel charges.
- c. Power supplied by Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority.
- d. Product is [Green-e certified](#).
- e. The price for new customers enrolling in the program (fourth batch of renewable energy capacity).
- f. Net premium of the Minnesota *Windsorce* program.
- g. Pacific Power *Blue Sky Usage* product; only available in Oregon. Product marketed in partnership with 3Degrees Group, Inc.
- h. Portland General Electric *Green Source* Product. Product marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.

For More Information -

Online Report: *Utility Green Pricing Programs: What Defines Success?*. NREL/TP-620-29831, August 2001. ([PDF 1.1 MB](#))

2006 Data

Green Power Program Renewable Energy Sales (as of December 2006)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Sales (kWh/year) | Sales (Avg. MW ^a) |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy | Wind, landfill gas | 580,580,401 | 66.3 |
| 2 | Portland General Electric ^b | Existing geothermal and hydro, wind | 432,826,408 | 49.4 |
| 3 | Florida Power & Light | Landfill gas, biomass, wind, solar | 302,792,000 | 34.6 |
| 4 | PacifiCorp ^{cd} | Wind, biomass, solar | 299,862,690 | 34.2 |
| 5 | Xcel Energy ^{ef} | Wind | 236,505,718 | 27.0 |
| 6 | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | Wind | 217,427,000 | 24.8 |
| 7 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^e | Wind, landfill gas, small hydro | 216,476,278 | 24.7 |
| 8 | National Grid ^{ghi} | Biomass, wind, small hydro, solar | 156,447,869 | 17.9 |
| 9 | OG&E Electric Services | Wind | 134,553,920 | 15.4 |
| 10 | Puget Sound Energy | Wind, solar, biogas | 131,742,000 | 15.0 |

- a. An "average megawatt" (aMW) is a measure of continuous capacity equivalent (i.e., operating at a 100% capacity factor).
- b. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- c. Includes Pacific Power and Rocky Mountain Power.
- d. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services.
- e. Product is Green-e certified. For Xcel Energy, the Colorado and Minnesota Windsource products are Green-e certified.
- f. Includes Northern States Power, Public Service Company of Colorado, and Southwestern Public Service.
- g. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.
- h. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, EnviroGen, Green Mountain Energy Company, Mass Energy, People's Power & Light, and Sterling Planet.
- i. Some products are certified by Green-e or Environmental Resources Trust.

Total Number of Customer Participants (as of December 2006)

| Rank | Utility | Program Name(s) | Participants |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Xcel Energy ^a | <i>Windsource^b Renewable Energy Trust</i> | 63,028 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp ^{cd} | <i>Blue Sky Block Blue Sky Usage Blue Sky Habitat</i> | 51,297 |
| 3 | Portland General Electric ^e | <i>Clean Wind Green Source</i> | 50,284 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | <i>Greenergy^b</i> | 35,707 |
| 5 | PECO ^f | <i>PECO WIND</i> | 34,303 |
| 6 | Florida Power & Light ^g | <i>Sunshine Energy</i> | 28,742 |
| 7 | Los Angeles Department of Water & Power | <i>Green Power for a Green LA</i> | 24,320 |
| 8 | National Grid ^{hi} | <i>GreenUp^j</i> | 23,751 |
| 9 | Puget Sound Energy | <i>Green Power Program</i> | 17,426 |
| 10 | We Energies | <i>Energy for Tomorrow^b</i> | 15,823 |

- a. Includes Northern States Power, Public Service Company of Colorado, and Southwestern Public Service.
- b. Product is Green-e certified. For Xcel Energy, the Colorado and Minnesota Windsorce products are Green-e certified.
- c. Includes Pacific Power and Rocky Mountain Power.
- d. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services.
- e. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- f. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, Inc.
- g. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- h. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.
- i. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, EnviroGen, Green Mountain Energy Company, Mass Energy, People's Power & Light, and Sterling Planet.
- j. Some products are certified by Green-e or Environmental Resources Trust.

Customer Participation Rate (as of December 2006)

| Rank | Utility | Customer Participation Rate | Program(s) | Program Start Year |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | City of Palo Alto Utilities ^a | 16.9% | <i>Palo Alto Green^b</i> | 2003 |
| 2 | Lenox Municipal Utilities ^c | 16.6% | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 2003 |
| 3 | Montezuma Municipal Light & Power ^c | 6.5% | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 2003 |
| 3 | Portland General Electric ^d | 6.5% | <i>Clean Wind Green Source</i> | 2002 |
| 5 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 6.2% | <i>Greenergy^b</i> | 1997 |
| 6 | Silicon Valley Power ^a | 6.1% | <i>Santa Clara Green Power</i> | 2004 |
| 7 | Holy Cross Energy | 5.6% | <i>Wind Power Pioneers Local Renewable Energy Pool</i> | 1998 2002 |
| 8 | Central Electric Cooperative ^e | 5.5% | <i>Green Power</i> | 1999 |
| 9 | River Falls Municipal Utilities ^f | 5.4% | <i>Renewable Energy Program</i> | 2001 |
| 10 | Orcas Power and Light Cooperative | 5.1% | <i>Go Green</i> | 1997 |

- a. Marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services
- b. Product is *Green-e* certified.
- c. Program offered in association with the Iowa Association of Municipal Utilities.
- d. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- e. Power supplied by PNGC Power.
- f. Power supplied by Wisconsin Public Power Inc.

Premium Charged for New, Customer-Driven Renewable Power^a (as of December 2006)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Premium (¢/kWh) |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy ^b | Wind, landfill gas | -0.13 |
| 2 | OG&E Electric Services ^b | Wind | 0.026 |
| 3 | Edmond Electric ^{bc} | Wind | 0.144 |
| 4 | Avista Utilities | Wind, landfill gas, biomass | 0.33 |
| 5 | Indianapolis Power and Light | Wind | 0.35 |
| 6 | Eugene Water and Electric Board ^{bd} | Wind | 0.65 |
| 7 | Clallam County Public Utility District ^b | Landfill gas | 0.70 |
| 8 | PacifiCorp ^c | Wind, biomass, solar | 0.78 |
| 9 | Idaho Power | Wind, solar | 0.882 |
| 10 | Mason County PUD 3 | Wind | 1.0 |
| 10 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^d | Wind, landfill gas, hydro | 1.0 |
| 10 | Wisconsin Public Service Corporation | Wind, landfill gas, biomass | 1.0 |

- a. Includes only programs that have installed or announced firm plans to install or purchase power from 100% new renewable resources.
- b. Premium is variable; customers in these programs are exempt or otherwise protected from changes in utility fuel charges.
- c. Power supplied by Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority.
- d. Product is [Green-e](#) certified.
- e. Pacific Power *Blue Sky Usage* product; only available in Oregon. Product marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services.

For More Information -

Online Report: *Utility Green Pricing Programs: What Defines Success?* ([PDF Report: 1.1 MB](#))
NREL/TP-620-29831, August 2001.

2005 Data

Green Power Program Renewable Energy Sales (as of December 2005)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Sales (kWh/year) | Sales (Avg. MW ^a) |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy | Wind, landfill gas | 435,140,739 | 49.7 |
| 2 | Portland General Electric ^b | Existing geothermal and hydro, wind | 339,577,170 | 38.8 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp ^{cd} | Wind, biomass, solar | 234,163,591 | 26.7 |
| 4 | Florida Power & Light | Biomass, wind, solar | 224,574,530 | 25.6 |
| 5 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^e | Wind, landfill gas, small hydro, solar | 195,081,504 | 22.3 |
| 6 | Xcel Energy ^{ef} | Wind | 147,674,000 | 16.9 |
| 7 | National Grid ^{ghi} | Biomass, wind, small hydro, solar | 127,872,457 | 14.6 |
| 8 | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | Wind | 113,957,000 | 13.0 |
| 9 | Puget Sound Energy | Wind, solar, biogas | 71,341,000 | 8.1 |
| 10 | OG&E Electric Services | Wind | 63,591,526 | 7.3 |

- a. An "average megawatt" (aMW) is a measure of continuous capacity equivalent (i.e., operating at a 100% capacity factor).
- b. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- c. Includes Pacific Power and Utah Power.
- d. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services.
- e. Product is *Green-e* certified (www.green-e.org). For Xcel Energy, only the Public Service Company of Colorado product is *Green-e* certified.
- f. Includes Northern States Power, Public Service Company of Colorado, and Southwestern PublicService.
- g. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.
- h. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, EnviroGen, Green Mountain Energy Company, Mass Energy, People's Power & Light, and Sterling Planet.
- i. Some products are certified by *Green-e* (www.green-e.org) or Environmental Resources Trust (<http://www.ert.net>).

Total Number of Customer Participants (as of December 2005)

| Rank | Utility | Program Name(s) | Participants |
|------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Xcel Energy ^a | <i>WindSource^b</i> <i>Renewable Energy Trust</i> | 49,354 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp ^{cd} | <i>Blue Sky Block</i> <i>Blue Sky Usage</i> <i>Blue Sky Habitat</i> | 42,269 |
| 3 | Portland General Electric ^c | <i>Clean Wind</i> <i>Green Source</i> <i>Healthy Habitat</i> | 40,570 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | <i>Greenenergy^b</i> | 31,229 |
| 5 | Los Angeles Department of Water & Power | <i>Green Power for a Green L.A.</i> | 24,380 |
| 6 | Florida Power and Light ^f | <i>Sunshine Energy</i> | 23,066 |
| 7 | PECO ^g | <i>PECO WIND</i> | 22,164 |
| 8 | National Grid ^{hi} | <i>GreenUp^j</i> | 20,986 |
| 9 | Puget Sound Energy | <i>Green Power Program</i> | 15,500 |
| 10 | We Energies | <i>Energy for Tomorrow^b</i> | 12,458 |
| 10 | Alliant Energy ^k | <i>Second Nature^b</i> | 12,426 |

- a. Includes Northern States Power, Public Service Company of Colorado, and Southwestern Public Service.
- b. Product is *Green-e* certified (www.green-e.org). For Xcel Energy, only the Public Service Company of Colorado product is *Green-e* certified. For Alliant Energy, Iowa and Minnesota products are *Green-e* certified.
- c. Includes Pacific Power and Utah Power.
- d. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services.
- e. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- f. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- g. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, Inc.
- h. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.
- i. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, EnviroGen, Green Mountain Energy Company, Mass Energy, People's Power & Light, and Sterling Planet.
- j. Some products are certified by Green-e (www.green-e.org) or Environmental Resources Trust (www.ert.net).
- k. Includes Interstate Power and Light and Wisconsin Power and Light.

Customer Participation Rate (as of December 2005)

| Rank | Utility | Participation Rate | Program Name(s) | Start Date |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | City of Palo Alto Utilities ^a | 13.6% | <i>Palo Alto Green^b</i> | 2003 |
| 2 | Lenox Municipal Utilities ^c | 12.6% | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 2003 |
| 3 | Montezuma Municipal Light and Power ^c | 6.3% | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 2003 |
| 4 | Holy Cross Energy | 6.0% | <i>Wind Power Pioneer Local Renewable Energy Pool</i> | 1998 2002 |
| 5 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 5.5% | <i>Greenergy^b</i> | 1997 |
| 6 | Portland General Electric ^d | 5.3% | <i>Clean Wind Green Source Healthy Habitat</i> | 2002 |
| 7 | City of Fairbank ^c | 4.9% | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 2003 |
| 8 | Silicon Valley Power ^a | 4.8% | <i>Santa Clara Green Power</i> | 2004 |
| 9 | Moorhead Public Service | 4.7% | <i>Capture the Wind</i> | 1998 |
| 10 | Central Electric Cooperative ^e | 4.6% | <i>Green Power</i> | 1999 |

- a. Marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services
- b. Product is *Green-e* certified (www.green-e.org).
- c. Program offered in association with the Iowa Association of Municipal Utilities.
- d. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- e. Power supplied by PNGC Power.

Premium Charged for New, Customer-Driven Renewable Power^a (as of December 2005)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Premium (¢/kWh) |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Xcel Energy ^{bc} | Wind | -0.67 |
| 2 | Edmond Electric ^{bd} | Wind | -0.45 |
| 3 | OG&E Electric Services ^b | Wind | -0.25 |
| 4 | Avista Utilities | Wind | 0.33 |
| 5 | Western Farmers Electric Cooperative | Wind | 0.50 |
| 6 | Austin Energy ^b | Wind, landfill gas | 0.70 |
| 6 | Clallam County Public Utility District ^b | Landfill gas | 0.70 |
| 8 | PacifiCorp ^e | Wind, biomass, solar | 0.78 |
| 9 | Wabash Valley Power Association ^f | Landfill gas | 0.90 |
| 10 | Eugene Water and Electric Board ^b | Wind | 0.91 |

- a. Includes only programs that have installed or announced firm plans to install or purchase power from 100% new renewable resources.
- b. Premium is variable; customers in these programs are exempt or otherwise protected from changes in utility fuel charges.
- c. Public Service Company of Colorado only. Product is *Green-e* certified (www.green-e.org).
- d. Power supplied by Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority.
- e. Pacific Power *Blue Sky Usage* product; only available in Oregon. Product marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services.
- f. The premium charged by participating member distribution utilities varies from 0.9¢/kWh to 1.0¢/kWh.

For More Information -

Online Report: *Utility Green Pricing Programs: What Defines Success?* ([PDF Report: 1.1 MB](#))
NREL/TP-620-29831, August 2001.

2004 Data

Green Power Program Renewable Energy Sales (as of December 2004)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Sales (kWh/year) | Sales (Avg. MW^a) |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy | Wind, landfill gas, small hydro | 334,446,101 | 38.2 |
| 2 | Portland General Electric ^b | Existing geothermal, wind, small hydro | 262,142,564 | 29.9 |
| 3 | PacifiCorp ^{cd} | Wind, biomass, solar | 191,838,079 | 21.9 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^e | Landfill gas, wind, small hydro, solar | 176,774,804 | 20.2 |
| 5 | Xcel Energy | Wind | 137,946,000 | 15.7 |
| 6 | National Grid ^{fgh} | Biomass, wind, small hydro, solar | 88,204,988 | 10.1 |
| 7 | Los Angeles Department of Power & Water | Wind and landfill gas | 75,528,746 | 8.6 |
| 8 | OG&E Electric Services | Wind | 56,672,568 | 6.5 |
| 9 | Puget Sound Energy | Wind, solar, biogas | 46,110,000 | 5.3 |
| 10 | We Energies ^e | Landfill gas, wind, small hydro | 40,906,410 | 4.7 |

- a. An "average megawatt" (aMW) is a measure of capacity equivalent that assumes the capacity operates continuously.
- b. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- c. Includes Pacific Power and Utah Power.
- d. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services.
- e. Product is *Green-e* accredited (www.green-e.org).
- f. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.
- g. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, CET & Conservation Services Group, EnviroGen, Green Mountain Energy Company, Mass Energy, People's Power & Light, and Sterling Planet.
- h. Some products are *Green-e* certified (www.green-e.org).

Total Number of Customer Participants (as of December 2004)

| Rank | Utility | Program Name(s) | Participants |
|------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Xcel Energy | <i>WindSource Renewable Energy Trust</i> | 40,990 |
| 2 | PacifiCorp ^{ab} | <i>Blue Sky Block Blue Sky Usage Blue Sky Habitat</i> | 36,125 |
| 3 | Portland General Electric ^c | <i>Clean Wind Green Source Healthy Habitat</i> | 33,491 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | <i>Greenenergy^d PV Pioneers I</i> | 28,527 |
| 5 | Los Angeles Department of Water & Power | <i>Green Power for a Green L.A.</i> | 27,293 |
| 6 | National Grid ^e | <i>GreenUp^{fg}</i> | 14,978 |
| 7 | Puget Sound Energy | <i>Green Power Program</i> | 14,074 |
| 8 | Alliant Energy | <i>Second Nature^d</i> | 11,544 |
| 9 | We Energies | <i>Energy for Tomorrow^d</i> | 11,120 |
| 10 | Florida Power and Light ^h | <i>Sunshine Energy</i> | 10,674 |

- a. Includes Pacific Power and Utah Power.
- b. Some Oregon products marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services.
- c. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- d. Product is *Green-e* accredited (www.green-e.org).
- e. Includes Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Narragansett Electric, and Nantucket Electric.
- f. Marketed in partnership with Community Energy, CET & Conservation Services Group, EnviroGen, Green Mountain Energy Company, Mass Energy, People's Power & Light, and Sterling Planet.
- g. Some products are *Green-e* certified (www.green-e.org).
- h. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.

Customer Participation Rate (as of December 2004)

| Rank | Utility | Participation Rate | Program Name(s) | Start Date |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Lenox Municipal Utilities ^a | 14.5% | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 2003 |
| 2 | City of Palo Alto Utilities ^b | 10.9% | <i>Palo Alto Green^c</i> | 2003 |
| 3 | Montezuma Municipal Light and Power ^a | 6.4% | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 2003 |
| 4 | Holy Cross Energy | 5.2% | <i>Wind Power Pioneer Local Renewable Energy Pool</i> | 1998 2002 |
| 4 | Moorhead Public Service | 5.2% | <i>Capture the Wind</i> | 1998 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | 5.2% | <i>Greenergy^c PV Pioneers I</i> | 1997 1993 |
| 7 | Orcas Power & Light | 4.7% | <i>Go Green</i> | 1999 |
| 7 | Portland General Electric ^d | 4.3% | <i>Clean Wind Green Source Healthy Habitat</i> | 2002 |
| 9 | Central Electric Cooperative ^e | 4.0% | <i>Green Power</i> | 1999 |
| 10 | Madison Gas & Electric | 3.8% | <i>Wind Energy Program</i> | 1999 |
| 10 | River Falls Municipal Utilities ^f | 3.8% | <i>Renewable Energy Program</i> | 2001 |

- a. Program offered in association with the Iowa Association of Municipal Utilities.
- b. Marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services
- c. Product is *Green-e* accredited (www.green-e.org).
- d. Some products marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- e. Power supplied by PNGC Power.
- f. Program offered in association with Wisconsin Public Power Inc.

Premium Charged for New, Customer-Driven Renewable Power^a (as of December 2004)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Premium |
|------|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Avista Utilities | Wind | 0.33¢/kWh |
| 2 | Austin Energy ^b | Wind, small hydro, landfill gas | 0.50¢/kWh |
| 3 | Edmond Electric ^b | Wind | 0.68¢/kWh |
| 4 | Clallam County Public Utility District | Landfill gas | 0.70¢/kWh |
| 5 | Eugene Water and Electric Board ^b | Wind | 0.71¢/kWh |
| 6 | PacifiCorp ^c | Wind, biomass, solar | 0.78¢/kWh |
| 7 | OG&E Electric Services ^b | Wind | 0.88¢/kWh |
| 8 | Wabash Valley Power Association ^d | Landfill gas | 0.90¢/kWh |
| 9 | Roseville Electric | Geothermal, small hydro, solar | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 9 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^e | Landfill gas, wind, small hydro | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 9 | Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency | Wind | 1.00¢/kWh |

- a. Includes only programs that have installed or announced firm plans to install or purchase power from 100% new renewable resources.
- b. Premium is variable; customers in these programs are exempt or otherwise protected from changes in utility fuel charges.
- c. Pacific Power product marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services.
- d. The premium charged by participating member distribution utilities varies from 0.9¢/kWh to 1.0¢/kWh.
- e. Product is *Green-e* accredited (www.green-e.org).

For More Information -

Online Report: *Utility Green Pricing Programs: What Defines Success?* ([PDF Report: 1.1 MB](#))
NREL/TP-620-29831, August 2001.

2003 Data

Green Pricing Program Renewable Energy Sales (as of December 2003)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Sales (kWh/year) | Sales (Avg. MW)^a |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy | Wind and landfill gas | 289,038,019 | 33.0 |
| 2 | Portland General Electric ^b | Wind and geothermal | 188,646,290 | 21.5 |
| 3 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^d | Landfill gas, wind, hydro | 143,160,698 | 16.3 |
| 4 | PacifiCorp ^b | Wind and geothermal | 132,168,603 | 15.1 |
| 5 | Xcel Energy | Wind | 123,700,000 | 14.1 |
| 6 | Los Angeles Department of Power & Water | Small hydro, landfill gas, solar | 87,845,342 ^c | 10.0 |
| 7 | Tennessee Valley Authority ^d | Biogas, wind, solar | 40,491,000 | 4.6 |
| 8 | We Energies ^d | Landfill gas, wind, hydro | 34,648,566 | 4.0 |
| 9 | Alliant Energy | Wind and landfill gas | 27,958,473 | 3.2 |
| 10 | Puget Sound Energy | Wind and solar | 27,312,900 | 3.1 |

- a. An "average megawatt" (aMW) is a measure of capacity equivalent that assumes the capacity operates continuously.
- b. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- c. Data is for 2002.
- d. Product is Green-e certified (www.green-e.org).

Total Number of Customer Participants (as of December 2003)

| Rank | Utility | Program Name(s) | Participants |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Xcel Energy | <i>WindSource Renewable Energy Trust</i> | 43,039 |
| 2 | Los Angeles Department of Water & Power | <i>Green Power for a Green L.A.</i> | 29,677 |
| 3 | Portland General Electric Company ^a | <i>Clean Wind Renewable Usage Healthy Habitat</i> | 26,893 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | <i>Greenenergy^b PV Pioneers I</i> | 24,542 |
| 5 | PacifiCorp ^a | <i>Blue Sky Renewable Usage Habitat Option</i> | 23,351 |
| 6 | We Energies | <i>Energy for Tomorrow^b</i> | 10,760 |
| 7 | Alliant Energy | <i>Second Nature</i> | 9,519 |
| 8 | Austin Energy | <i>GreenChoice</i> | 7,462 |
| 9 | Tennessee Valley Authority | <i>Green Power Switch^b</i> | 7,364 |
| 10 | Wisconsin Public Service | <i>SolarWise for Schools NatureWise^b</i> | 6,157 |

- a. Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.
- b. Product is Green-e certified (www.green-e.org).

Customer Participation Rate (as of December 2003)

| Rank | Utility | Program Name(s) | Participation Rate | Start Date |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Lenox Municipal Utilities ^a | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 11.1% | 2003 |
| 2 | City of Palo Alto Utilities ^b | <i>Palo Alto Green^d</i> | 6.6% | 2003 |
| 3 | Moorhead Public Service | <i>Capture the Wind</i> | 5.5% | 1998 |
| 4 | Holy Cross Energy | <i>Wind Power Pioneer Local Renewable Energy Pool</i> | 5.1% | 1998 2002 |
| 5 | Montezuma Municipal Light and Power ^a | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 4.9% | 2003 |
| 5 | Orcas Power & Light | <i>Go Green</i> | 4.9% | 1999 |
| 7 | City of Fairbank ^a | <i>Green City Energy</i> | 4.7% | 2003 |
| 8 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | <i>Greenergy^d PV Pioneers I</i> | 4.6% | 1997 1993 |
| 9 | Central Electric Cooperative ^c | <i>Green Power</i> | 4.1% | 1999 |
| 10 | Madison Gas & Electric | <i>Wind Energy Program</i> | 3.9% | 1999 |

- a. Program offered in association with the Iowa Association of Municipal Utilities.
- b. Product marketed in partnership with 3 Phases Energy Services.
- c. Power supplied by PNGC Power.
- d. Product is Green-e certified (www.green-e.org).

Premium Charged for New, Customer-Driven Renewable Power^a (as of December 2003)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Premium |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Austin Energy ^b | Wind and landfill gas | 0.59¢/kWh |
| 2 | OG&E Electric Services ^b | Wind | 0.63¢/kWh |
| 3 | Clallam County Public Utility District ^b | Landfill gas | 0.70¢/kWh |
| 4 | Wabash Valley Power Association ^c | Landfill gas | 0.90¢/kWh |
| 5 | Roseville Electric | Geothermal and solar | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 5 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District ^d | Landfill gas, wind, hydro | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 5 | Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency | Wind | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 8 | Emerald People's Utility District ^e | Wind | 1.20¢/kWh |
| 9 | American Municipal Power - Ohio ^e | Hydro, wind | 1.30¢/kWh |
| 9 | Eugene Water and Electric Board ^b | Wind | 1.30¢/kWh |

- a. Includes only programs that have installed or announced firm plans to install or purchase power from 100% new renewable resources.
- b. Premium is variable; customers in these programs are exempt or otherwise protected from changes in utility fuel charges.
- c. The premium charged by participating member distribution utilities varies from 0.9¢/kWh to 1.0¢/kWh.
- d. Product is Green-e certified (www.green-e.org).
- e. Product is marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.

For More Information -

Online Report: *Utility Green Pricing Programs: What Defines Success?* ([PDF Report: 1.1 MB](#))
NREL/TP-620-29831, August 2001.

2002 Data

Green Pricing Program Renewable Energy Sales (as of December 2002)

| Rank | Utility | Resources | Sales (kWh/year) | Sales (Avg. MW) ₁ |
|------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy | Wind, landfill gas, solar | 251,520,000 | 28.7 |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Landfill gas, wind, solar | 104,344,000 ² | 11.9 |
| 3 | Xcel Energy | Wind and solar | 103,739,000 ³ | 11.8 |
| 4 | Los Angeles Department of Power and Water | Wind and landfill gas | 66,666,000 ⁴ | 7.6 |
| 5 | Portland General Electric ⁵ | Wind and geothermal | 57,989,000 | 6.6 |
| 6 | PacifiCorp ⁵ | Wind and geothermal | 55,615,000 | 6.3 |
| 7 | Tennessee Valley Authority | Wind, biomass, landfill gas, solar | 35,955,000 | 4.1 |
| 8 | We Energies | Landfill gas, wind, hydro | 35,161,000 | 4.0 |
| 9 | Puget Sound Energy | Wind and solar | 20,334,000 | 2.3 |
| 10 | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind | 15,593,000 | 1.8 |

Notes:

¹ An "average megawatt" is a consistent measure of capacity equivalent that assumes the capacity operates continuously.

² Includes an estimated 3 million kWh of generation from the 1.9 MW of PV installed through the PV Pioneers program.

³ Includes an estimated 175,000 kWh of generation from the 100 kW of PV installed through the Renewable Energy Trust program.

⁴ Data for 2001 from program audit conducted by the Los Angeles City Controller, August 2002.

⁵ Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.

Total Number of Customer Participants (as of December 2002)

| Rank | Utility | Program Name(s) | Participants |
|------|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Green Power for a Green L.A. | 72,732 ¹ |
| 2 | Xcel Energy | WindSource Renewable Energy Trust | 32,600 ² |
| 3 | PacifiCorp ³ | Blue Sky Renewable Usage Salmon-Friendly | 20,028 |
| 4 | Portland General Electric Company ³ | Clean Wind Power Renewable Usage Salmon-Friendly | 19,623 |
| 5 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy PV Pioneers | 19,172 ⁴ |
| 6 | We Energies | Energy for Tomorrow | 11,014 |
| 7 | Alliant Energy | Second Nature | 7,280 |
| 8 | Austin Energy | GreenChoice | 6,725 |
| 9 | Tennessee Valley Authority | Green Power Switch | 6,487 |
| 10 | Wisconsin Public Service | SolarWise for Schools NatureWise | 5,644 ⁵ |

Notes:

¹ Includes 41,833 lifeline/low-income customers that have signed up for green power but do not pay a premium.

² There were 9,420 participants in the Renewable Energy Trust program as of December 2002. About 20% of these customers also participate in the Windsource program.

³ Marketed in partnership with Green Mountain Energy Company.

⁴ About 800 customers participate in the PV Pioneers program.

⁵ A total of 1,048 customers participate in the NatureWise program. There are 204 customers that participate in both of the utility's green power programs.

Customer Participation Rate (as of December 2002)

| Rank | Utility | Program Name(s) | Participation Rate | Start Date |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Moorhead Public Service | Capture the Wind | 5.8% | 1998 |
| 2 | Orcas Power & Light | Green Power | 5.5% | 1999 |
| 3 | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Green Power for a Green L.A. | 5.2% ¹ | 1999 |
| 4 | Holy Cross Energy | Wind Power Pioneers Local Renewable Energy Pool | 4.9% | 1998 |
| 5 | Central Electric Cooperative ² | Green Power | 3.7% | 1999 |
| 6 | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind Power Program | 3.6% | 1999 |
| 6 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy PV Pioneers | 3.6% | 1997 |
| 8 | Preston Public Utilities ³ | Wind Power | 3.4% | 2000 |
| 9 | Cass County Electric Cooperative ⁴ | Infinity Wind Energy | 3.1% | 1999 |
| 10 | Cedar Falls Utilities | Wind Energy Electric Project | 3.0% | 1999 |
| 10 | Eugene Water and Electric Board | EWEB Wind Power | 3.0% | 1999 |

Notes:

¹ Includes lifeline/low-income customers that have signed up for green power but do not pay a premium.

² Supplied by the Pacific Northwest Generating Cooperative.

³ Supplied by Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency.

⁴ Supplied by Minnkota Power Cooperative.

Premium Charged for New, Customer-Driven Renewable Power¹ (as of December 2002)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Used | Premium |
|------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Clallam County Public Utility District | Landfill gas | 0.70¢/kWh |
| 2 | Roseville Electric | Reinjected geothermal, solar | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Landfill gas, hydro, wind | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 4 | Pacific County Public Utility District | Wind, hydro | 1.05¢/kWh |
| 5 | Austin Energy ² | Wind, solar, landfill gas | 1.08¢/kWh |
| 6 | Eugene Water and Electric Board | Wind | 1.30¢/kWh |
| 7 | City of Bowling Green (Ohio) | Small hydro, solar | 1.35¢/kWh |
| 7 | Dakota Electric Association | Wind | 1.35¢/kWh |
| 9 | Clark Public Utilities | Wind, solar | 1.50¢/kWh |
| 9 | Great River Energy ³ | Wind | 1.50¢/kWh |
| 9 | Moorhead Public Service ⁴ | Wind | 1.50¢/kWh |
| 9 | Oregon Trail Electric Cooperative | Wind | 1.50¢/kWh |

Notes:

¹ Includes only programs that have installed or announced firm plans to install or purchase power from new renewable resources.

² Price premium for customers who signed up for phase two of program. Customers are exempt from fuel charges.

³ Suggested retail price for member distribution cooperatives.

⁴ Adjusted to reflect the cost of 100% new wind power.

For More Information -

Online Report: *Utility Green Pricing Programs: What Defines Success?* ([PDF Report: 1.1 MB](#))
NREL/TP-620-29831, August 2001.

2001 Data

December 2001

Customer Participants (as of December 2001)

| Rank | Utility | Program | # of Participants |
|------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Green Power for a Green L.A. | 87,000 ¹ |
| 2 | Xcel Energy (Colorado) | WindSource | 18,600 |
| 3 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy - All Renewables | 14,200 |
| 4 | Xcel Energy (Colorado) | Renewable Energy Trust | 10,900 |
| 5 | Wisconsin Electric Power Company | Energy for Tomorrow | 10,700 |
| 6 | PacifiCorp | Blue Sky | 7,300 |
| 7 | Austin Energy | GreenChoice | 6,600 |
| 8 | Portland General Electric Company | Salmon Friendly Clean Wind Power | 5,700 |
| 9 | Wisconsin Public Service | SolarWise for Schools | 5,200 |
| 10 | Tennessee Valley Authority | Green Power Switch | 4,900 ² |

Notes:

¹ About half of the total are low-income customers that receive existing renewables at no extra cost.

² TVA supplies the power for programs offered by 12 distribution utilities.

Customer Participation Rates (as of December 2001)

| Rank | Utility | Program | Participation Rate |
|------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Moorhead Public Service | Capture the Wind | 7.0% |
| 2 | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Green Power for a Green L.A. | 6.7% ¹ |
| 3 | Orcas Power & Light Cooperative | Green Power | 5.1% |
| 3 | Holy Cross Energy | Wind Power Pioneers | 5.1% |
| 5 | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind Power Program | 4.1% |
| 6 | Cedar Falls Utilities | Wind Energy Electric Project | 4.0% |
| 7 | Central Electric Cooperative | Green Power | 3.7% |
| 8 | Eugene Water and Electric Board | EWEB Wind Power | 3.3% |
| 9 | Consumers Power | Green Power | 3.1% |
| 10 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy - All Renewables | 3.0% |

Notes:

¹ About half of the total are low-income customers that receive existing renewables at no extra cost.

**Renewable Resources Supported through Green Pricing
(as of December 2001)**

| Rank | Utility | Resources Installed | New Capacity |
|------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy | Wind/PV | 76.9 MW |
| 2 | Xcel Energy (Colorado) | Wind | 46.7 MW ¹ |
| 3 | Los Angeles Department of Power and Water | Wind/landfill methane | 27.0 MW ² |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Landfill methane/PV | 10.2 MW ³ |
| 5 | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind | 8.2 MW ⁴ |
| 6 | Wisconsin Electric | Wind/hydro/landfill methane | 7.2 MW ⁵ |
| 7 | Eugene Water and Electric Board | Wind | 6.5 MW |
| 8 | Tennessee Valley Authority | Wind/landfill methane/PV | 6.2 MW ⁶ |
| 9 | Wisconsin Public Power Inc. | Hydro | 6.0 MW |
| 10 | Platte River Power Authority | Wind | 5.3 MW ⁷ |

Notes:

¹ Xcel Energy sells approximately 6.3 MW from its wind projects as wholesale power to other Colorado utilities.

² LADWP purchases the wind energy equivalent of about 25 MW from PacifiCorp and APX.

³ Includes capacity installed for the Greenergy and PV Pioneers I programs.

⁴ MGE uses 3 MW of its 11.2-MW wind project to satisfy a state renewable energy mandate. The remaining capacity is supported through green pricing.

⁵ Wisconsin Electric purchases another 2.6 MW of existing landfill gas resources for its green pricing program.

⁶ TVA supplies the power for programs offered by 12 distribution utilities.

⁷ Platte River supplies the power for programs offered by Fort Collins, Estes Park, Longmont, and Loveland (Colorado). It also supplies 660 kW of wind power to Tri-State G&T.

Premium Charged for New, Customer-Driven Renewable Power¹ (as of December 2001)

| Rank | Utility | Resources | Premium |
|------|----------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Roseville Electric | Geothermal/PV | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 1 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Landfill methane | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 1 | Texas New Mexico Power Company | Wind | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 4 | Austin Energy ² | Wind/PV | 1.08¢/kWh |
| 5 | Dakota Electric Association | Wind | 1.28¢/kWh |
| 6 | Eugene Water and Electric Board ³ | Wind | 1.32¢/kWh |
| 7 | City of Bowling Green (Ohio) | Landfill methane/PV | 1.38¢/kWh |
| 8 | Clark Public Utilities | Wind/PV | 1.50¢/kWh |
| 8 | Great River Energy ⁴ | Wind | 1.50¢/kWh |
| 8 | Moorhead Public Service ⁵ | Wind | 1.50¢/kWh |

Notes: The premium charged in a green pricing program can be a function of any number of variables, including but not limited to the renewable energy technology utilized, the quality of the renewable energy resource, the size of the project(s), the project and company financials, the availability of subsidies or incentives, inclusion of administrative and marketing costs, the utility's avoided cost of energy, the amount of renewables already in the utility mix, and whether participating customers shoulder the full cost of the program.

¹ Includes only programs that have installed or announced firm plans to install new renewable resources.

² Price for customers in second phase of program. Price is adjusted when fuel prices change.

³ Price is adjusted when fuel prices change.

⁴ Suggested retail price for member distribution cooperatives.

⁵ Adjusted to reflect the cost of 100% new wind power.

June 2001

**Customer Participants
(as of June 2001)**

| Rank | Utility | Program | # of Participants |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Green Power for a Green L.A. | 80,000* |
| 2 | Public Service Company of Colorado | WindSource | 14,110 |
| 3 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy - All Renewables | 11,850 |
| 4 | Public Service Company of Colorado | Renewable Energy Trust | 10,900 |
| 5 | Wisconsin Electric Power Company | Energy for Tomorrow | 10,500 |
| 6 | Austin Energy | GreenChoice | 8,680 |
| 7 | PacifiCorp | Blue Sky | 6,000 |
| 8 | Wisconsin Public Service | SolarWise for Schools | 5,400 |
| 9 | Portland General Electric Company | Salmon Friendly and Clean Wind Power | 4,540 |
| 10 | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind Power Program | 4,480 |

Notes:

* About half of the total are low-income customers that receive existing renewables at no extra cost.

Customer Participation Rates (as of August 2001)

| Rank | Utility | Program | Participation Rate |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | Moorhead Public Service | Capture the Wind | 7.4% |
| 2 | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Green Power for a Green L.A. | 6.2%* |
| 3 | Holy Cross Energy | Wind Power Pioneers | 4.1% |
| 3 | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind Power Program | 4.1% |
| 5 | Cedar Falls Utilities | Wind Energy Electric Project | 4.0% |
| 6 | Orcas Power & Light Cooperative | Green Power | 3.8% |
| 7 | Eugene Water and Electric Board | EWEB Wind Power | 3.7% |
| 8 | Central Electric Cooperative | Green Power | 3.5% |
| 9 | City of Bowling Green | Green Power | 3.4% |
| 10 | Consumers Power | Green Power Pilot Program | 3.1% |

Notes:

* About half of the total are low-income customers that receive existing renewables at no extra cost.

New Renewable Resources Supported through Green Pricing (as of June 2001)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Installed | New Capacity |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Los Angeles Department of Power and Water | Wind/various | 25.0 MW ¹ |
| 2 | Austin Energy | Wind/PV | 23.2 MW |
| 3 | Public Service Company of Colorado | Wind | 15.8 MW ² |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Landfill gas/PV | 10.2 MW ³ |
| 5 | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind | 8.2 MW ⁴ |
| 6 | Wisconsin Electric | Wind/hydro/landfill gas | 7.2 MW ⁵ |
| 7 | Eugene Water and Electric Board | Wind | 6.5 MW |
| 8 | Wisconsin Public Power Inc. | Hydro | 6.0 MW |
| 9 | Platte River Power Authority | Wind | 5.3 MW ⁶ |
| 10 | Alliant Energy | Wind/landfill gas | 4.6 MW |

Notes: Austin Energy plans to install another 53 MW of wind and landfill methane by the end of 2001; PSCo plans to add 36 MW by the end of 2001.

¹ LADWP purchases wind power equivalent to approximately 25 MW from Enron and PacifiCorp.

² PSCo sells 4.3 MW from its 20-MW wind project at wholesale to other Colorado utilities. Includes capacity installed for the WindSource and Renewable Energy Trust programs.

³ Includes capacity installed for the Greenergy and PV Pioneers I programs.

⁴ Madison Gas & Electric uses 3 MW of its 11.2-MW wind project to satisfy a state renewable energy mandate. The remainder of the project is supported through green pricing.

⁵ Wisconsin Electric purchases another 2.6 MW of existing landfill gas resources for its green pricing program.

⁶ Platte River supplies the power for programs offered by Fort Collins, Estes Park, Longmont, and Loveland. It also provides the output of one 660-kW wind turbine to Tri-State.

Premium Charged for New, Customer-Driven Renewable Power¹ (as of June 2001)

| Rank | Utility | Resources | Premium |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy ² | Wind/landfill gas/solar | 0.17¢/kWh |
| 2 | Roseville Electric | Geothermal/PV | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Landfill gas | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 2 | Texas New Mexico Power Company | Wind | 1.00¢/kWh |
| 5 | Dakota Electric Association | Wind | 1.28¢/kWh |
| 6 | City of Bowling Green (Ohio) | Landfill gas/PV | 1.38¢/kWh |
| 7 | Great River Energy ³ | Wind | 1.50¢/kWh |
| 7 | Moorhead Public Service ⁴ | Wind | 1.50¢/kWh |
| 9 | Traverse City Light & Power | Wind | 1.58¢/kWh |
| 10 | El Paso Electric Company ⁵ | Wind | 1.92¢/kWh |

Note: The premium charged in a green pricing program can be a function of any number of variables, including but not limited to the renewable energy technology utilized, the quality of the renewable energy resource, the size of the project(s), the project and company financials, the availability of subsidies or incentives, inclusion of administrative and marketing costs, the utility's avoided cost of energy, the amount of renewables already in the utility mix, and whether participating customers shoulder the full cost of the program.

¹ Includes only programs that have installed or announced firm plans to install new renewable resources.

² Price for customers who sign up for phase two of program. Customers subscribed for first phase of program are obtaining green power at a price 0.98¢/kWh below regular retail rates. Customers are exempt from fuel charges.

³ Suggested retail price for member distribution cooperatives.

⁴ Adjusted to reflect the cost of 100% new wind power.

⁵ Price premium is for residential customers; commercial customers pay a premium of 3.04¢/kWh.

2000 Data

Customer Participants (as of November 2000)

| Rank | Utility | Program | # of Participants |
|------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Green Power for a Green L.A. | 65,000* |
| 2 | Public Service Company of Colorado | Windsource/Renewable Energy Trust | 21,000 |
| 3 | Wisconsin Electric | Energy for Tomorrow | 12,000 |
| 4 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy/PV Pioneers | 8,000 |
| 5 | Wisconsin Public Service | SolarWise for Schools | 5,400 |
| 6 | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind Power | 4,900 |
| 7 | Portland General Electric | Salmon-Friendly Power/Clean Wind Power | 3,900 |
| 8 | Austin Energy | Green Choice | 2,800 |
| 8 | Tennessee Valley Authority | Green Power Switch | 2,800 |
| 10 | PacifiCorp | Blue Sky | 2,700 |

Notes:

* About half of the total are low-income customers that receive existing renewables at no additional cost.

Customer Participation Rates (as of November 2000)

| Rank | Utility | Program | Participation Rate |
|------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Moorhead Public Service | Capture the Wind | 7.3% |
| 2 | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Green Power for a Green L.A. | 4.6%* |
| 3 | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind Power | 4.5% |
| 4 | Orcas Power & Light Cooperative | Green Power | 4.3% |
| 5 | Holy Cross Energy | Wind Power | 4.1% |
| 6 | Cedar Falls Utilities | Wind Energy | 3.6% |
| 7 | Eugene Water and Electric Board | EWEB Windpower | 3.4% |
| 8 | Central Electric Cooperative | Green Power | 2.9% |
| 9 | City of Bowling Green | Green Power | 2.8% |
| 10 | City of Ashland | Solar Pioneers | 2.6% |

Notes:

* About half of the total are low-income customers that receive existing renewables at no additional cost.

New Renewable Resources Supported through Green Pricing (as of November 2000)

| Rank | Utility | Resources Installed | New Capacity |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Los Angeles Department of Power and Water | Wind | 25.0 MW ¹ |
| 2 | Public Service Company of Colorado | Wind | 15.7 MW ² |
| 3 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Landfill methane/PV | 10.2 MW ³ |
| 4 | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind | 8.2 MW ⁴ |
| 5 | Wisconsin Electric | Wind/hydro/landfill methane | 7.2 MW ⁵ |
| 6 | TXU | Wind | 6.6 MW |
| 7 | Eugene Water and Electric Board | Wind | 6.5 MW |
| 8 | Platte River Power Authority | Wind | 5.9 MW ⁶ |
| 9 | Holy Cross Energy | Wind | 3.0 MW ⁷ |
| 10 | Tennessee Valley Authority | Wind/PV | 2.0 MW |

Notes: Austin Energy has announced 97 MW of wind, landfill methane, and solar that will be available in 2001; PSCo plans to add 36 MW of new wind by the end of 2001.

¹ LADWP purchases wind power equivalent to approximately 25 MW from Enron and PacifiCorp.

² PSCo sells 4.3 MW from its 20-MW wind project at wholesale to other Colorado utilities.

³ Includes capacity installed for the Greenergy and PV Pioneers I programs.

⁴ Madison Gas & Electric uses 3 MW of its 11.2-MW wind project to satisfy a state renewable energy mandate. The remainder of the project is supported through green pricing.

⁵ Wisconsin Electric purchases another 2.6 MW of existing landfill methane resources for its green pricing program.

⁶ Platte River supplies the power for programs offered by Fort Collins, Estes Park, Longmont, and Loveland.

⁷ Holy Cross Energy purchases its wind power from PSCo.

Premium Charged for New, Customer-Driven Renewable Power¹ (as of November 2000)

| Rank | Utility | Resources | Premium |
|------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Austin Energy | Wind/landfill methane/solar | -0.5¢/kWh |
| 2 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Landfill methane | 1.0¢/kWh |
| 3 | Dakota Electric Association | Wind | 1.2¢/kWh |
| 4 | Great River Energy | Wind | 1.5¢/kWh ² |
| 4 | Moorhead Public Service | Wind | 1.5¢/kWh ³ |
| 6 | Traverse City Light & Power | Wind | 1.6¢/kWh |
| 7 | Alliant Energy | Landfill methane/wind | 2.0¢/kWh |
| 7 | Minnesota Power | Wind | 2.0¢/kWh |
| 7 | Wisconsin Electric ⁴ | Wind/landfill methane/hydro | 2.0¢/kWh |
| 10 | Holy Cross Energy | Wind | 2.5¢/kWh |
| 10 | Platte River Power Authority ⁵ | Wind | 2.5¢/kWh |
| 10 | Public Service Company of Colorado | Wind | 2.5¢/kWh |
| 10 | Tri-State G&T | Wind/landfill methane | 2.5¢/kWh |

Note: The premium charged in a green pricing program can be a function of any number of variables, including but not limited to the renewable energy technology utilized, the quality of the renewable energy resource, the size of the project(s), the project and company financials, the availability of subsidies or incentives, inclusion of administrative and marketing costs, the utility's avoided cost of energy, the amount of renewables already in the utility mix, and whether participating customers shoulder the full cost of the program.

¹ Includes only programs that have installed or announced firm plans to install new renewable resources.

² Suggested retail price for member distribution cooperatives.

³ Adjusted to reflect the cost of 100% new wind power.

⁴ Three-fourths of the power comes from new renewable resources.

⁵ Serves Colorado municipal utilities of Estes Park, Fort Collins, Longmont and Loveland.

April 2000

**Customer Participants
(as of April 2000)**

| Rank | State | Utility | Program | # of Participants |
|-------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | CA | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Green Power for a Green L.A. | 31,000 |
| 2 | CO | Public Service Company of Colorado | Windsource | 14,500 |
| 3 | WI | Wisconsin Electric | Energy for Tomorrow | 12,000 |
| 3 | CO | Public Service Company of Colorado | Renewable Energy Trust | 12,000 |
| 5 | CA | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Greenergy | 6,100 |
| 6 | WI | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind Power | 5,200 |
| 7 | WI | Wisconsin Public Service | Solar Wise for Schools | 4,000 |
| 8 | OR | Eugene Water and Electric Board | EWEB Windpower | 2,700 |
| 9 | HI | Hawaiian Electric | Sun Power for School | 2,600 |
| 10 | OR | Portland General Electric | Salmon-Friendly Power | 2,500 |

**Customer Participation Rates
(as of April 2000)**

| Rank | State | Utility | Program | Participation Rate |
|-------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | WI | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind Power | 4.7% |
| 2 | CO | Holy Cross Energy | Wind Power | 4.1% |
| 3 | WA | Orcas Power & Light | Green Power | 3.8% |
| 3 | IA | Cedar Falls Utilities | Wind Energy | 3.8% |
| 5 | OR | Eugene Water and Electric Board | EWEB Windpower | 3.7% |
| 6 | MN | Moorhead Public Service | Capture the Wind | 3.4% |
| 7 | OR | Central Electric Cooperative | Green Power | 2.9% |
| 8 | OH | City of Bowling Green | Green Power | 2.5% |
| 9 | CA | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Green Power for a Green L.A. | 2.2% |
| 10 | CO | Fort Collins Utilities | Wind Power Program | 2.1% |

**New Renewable Resources Developed through Green Pricing
(as of April 2000)**

| Rank | State | Utility | Resources Installed | New Capacity |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | CO | Public Service Company of Colorado | Wind | 15.7 MW ¹ |
| 2 | CA | Sacramento Municipal Utility District - Greenergy | Landfill gas | 8.3 MW |
| 3 | WI | Madison Gas and Electric | Wind | 8.2 MW ² |
| 4 | WI | Wisconsin Electric | Wind/hydro/landfill gas | 7.2 MW ³ |
| 5 | TX | TXU | Wind | 6.6 MW |
| 6 | OR | Eugene Water and Electric Board | Wind | 6.5 MW |
| 7 | CO | Holy Cross Energy | Wind | 3.0 MW ⁴ |
| 8 | CO | Fort Collins Utilities | Wind | 2.9 MW ⁵ |
| 9 | CA | Sacramento Municipal Utility District - PV Pioneers | PV | 1.5 MW |
| 9 | KS | Western Resources | Wind | 1.5 MW |

Notes:

¹ PSCO sells 4 MW from its 20-MW wind project to Holy Cross Energy and Colorado Springs Utilities.

² Madison Gas & Electric uses 3 MW of its 11.2-MW wind project to satisfy a state renewable energy mandate. The remainder of the project is supported through green pricing.

³ Wisconsin Electric purchases another 2.6 MW of existing landfill gas resources for its green pricing program.

⁴ Holy Cross Energy purchases its wind power from PSCO.

⁵ Fort Collins obtains its wind power from Platte River Power Authority's 4.6 MW Wyoming wind project.

Premium Charged for New, Customer-Driven Renewable Power¹ (as of April 2000)

| Rank | State | Utility | Resources | Premium |
|------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | TX | Austin Energy | Landfill gas/wind | 0.4¢/kWh |
| 2 | CA | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | Landfill gas | 1.0¢/kWh |
| 3 | MN | Dakota Electric Association | Wind | 1.22¢/kWh |
| 4 | MN | Great River Energy ² | Wind | 1.5¢/kWh |
| 4 | MN | Moorhead Public Service ³ | Wind | 1.5¢/kWh |
| 5 | MI | Traverse City Light & Power | Wind | 1.6¢/kWh |
| 6 | WI | Wisconsin Electric ⁴ | Landfill gas/small hydro/wind | 2.0¢/kWh |
| 7 | CO | Public Service Company of Colorado | Wind | 2.5¢/kWh |
| 7 | CO | Holy Cross Energy | Wind | 2.5¢/kWh |
| 7 | CO | Tri-State G&T | Wind | 2.5¢/kWh |
| 7 | CO | Platte River Power Authority (Estes, Loveland, Fort Collins, Longmont) | Wind | 2.5¢/kWh |

Notes: The premium charged in a green pricing program can be a function of any number of variables, including but not limited to the renewable energy technology utilized, the quality of the renewable energy resource, the size of the project(s), the project and company financials, the availability of subsidies or incentives, inclusion of administrative and marketing costs, the utility's avoided cost of energy, the amount of renewables already in the utility mix, and whether participating customers shoulder the full cost of the program.

¹ Includes only programs that have installed or announced firm plans to install new renewable resources.

² Suggested retail price for member distribution cooperatives.

³ Adjusted to reflect the cost of 100% new wind power.

⁴ Three-fourths of the power comes from new renewable resources.