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INTRODUCTION

Few models attempt to assess and project household energy consumption and expenditure by taking into account differential household choices correlated with such variables as race, ethnicity, income, and geographic location. The Minority Energy Assessment Model (MEAM), developed by Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), provides a framework to forecast the energy consumption and expenditure of majority, black, Hispanic, poor, and nonpoor households. Among other variables, household energy demand for each of these population groups in MEAM is affected by housing factors (such as home age, home ownership, home type, type of heating fuel, and installed central air conditioning unit), demographic factors (such as household members and urban/rural location), and climate factors (such as heating degree days and cooling degree days). The welfare implications of the revealed consumption patterns by households are also forecast. The paper provides an overview of the model methodology and its application in projecting household energy consumption under alternative energy scenarios developed by Data Resources, Inc., (DRI).
DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.
METHODOLOGY

MEAM is a budgeting model based on a three-stage linear expenditure system (LES). The model is estimated by using the SAS (1984) three-stage nonlinear estimation procedure developed by Amemiya (1985). Structural parameters have been estimated by using a longitudinal sample consisting of approximately 5,000 observations from four Residential Energy Consumption Surveys conducted by DOE (see U.S. Department of Energy, 1982, 1985, 1987, and 1989).

The analysis is done within the context of a well-structured theoretical framework. Standard neoclassical consumer behavior theory is used along with a complete demand system of equations derived from a constrained utility maximization problem. The utility function is derived from the Stone-Geary utility function.¹ It is also assumed that the demand for energy and non-energy goods is separable. This allows for the construction of a multistage budgeting model; a conceptual presentation is shown in Figure 1.

The explanatory variables in the model include the following:

- Household expenditures
- Electricity price
- Nonelectricity energy price
- Consumer price index, excluding energy

¹For a discussion on the general theory underlying the LES model, see Geary (1950-51), Klein and Rubin (1947-48), Samuelson (1947-48), and Stone (1954). Muellbauer (1975) and Pollak and Wales (1981) discuss the incorporation of demographic factors into a complete demand system. The development of a dynamic LES model is covered in the work done by Philips (1972 and 1983).
Figure 1 Multistage Budget

The model consists of four equations, which give estimates of total household energy consumption, electricity consumption, energy expenditures, and the weighted household energy price. The equations are:

\[
q_{et} = \frac{(1 - \beta_e) (\gamma_e + \alpha \theta S_t - 1) \Psi_{et}}{[1 - \Psi_{et} \alpha (1 - \theta)]} + \frac{\beta_e}{p_{et}} (m_t - p_{et} \gamma_e) \tag{1}
\]

\[
q_{el} = (1 - \beta_{el}) \Psi_{el} \gamma_{el} + \beta_{el}[1 - \alpha(1 - \theta)] \left( m_{et} - \frac{p_{nelt} (\gamma_e + \alpha \theta S_t - 1 - \gamma_{el})}{[1 - \alpha (1 - \theta)]} \right) \tag{2}
\]

\[
p_{et} = \frac{(p_{el} q_{el} + p_{nelt} q_{nelt})}{q_{et}} \tag{3}
\]

and

\[
m_{et} = p_{et} q_{et} \tag{4}
\]
where: $q_{et} =$ energy consumption ($10^6$ Btu/year)

$\Psi_{et} =$ energy demand scale factor

$\Upsilon_e =$ nondiscretionary energy demand ($10^6$ Btu/year)

$\alpha =$ dynamic effect parameter

$\theta =$ dynamic adjustment parameter

$S_{t-1} =$ state variable in period $t-1$

$\beta_e =$ marginal energy expenditure share

$\Upsilon_c =$ nondiscretionary non-energy demand

$P_{et} =$ price of energy ($/10^6$ Btu)

$P_{ct} =$ price index of non-energy goods

$m_t =$ household expenditures ($/year$)

$q_{elt} =$ electricity consumption ($10^6$ Btu/year)

$\Psi_{elt} =$ electricity demand scale factor

$q_{nelt} =$ nonelectricity energy consumption ($10^6$ Btu/year)

$\gamma_{el} =$ nondiscretionary electricity demand ($10^6$ Btu/year)

$\beta_{el} =$ marginal electricity expenditure share

$P_{elt} =$ price of electricity ($/10^6$ Btu)

$P_{nelt} =$ price of nonelectricity energy ($/10^6$ Btu)

$m_{et} =$ household energy expenditures ($/year$)

The energy and electricity demand scale factors play an extremely important role in our analysis; they are used to introduce the potential effect of exogenous factors (such as housing turnover) and interregional population migration on energy demand.

The analysis presented in this paper assumes that through factors affecting the energy and electricity scale factors, the energy demand curve for each of the five population groups shifts
down by 10% while their electricity demand curves shift up by 10%.

In addition to these exogenous shifts in demand, the effects of two energy price scenarios on energy consumption and expenditures are analyzed. The two scenarios are a base case (produced by DRI in Spring 1990) and an Iraq-Kuwait case (produced by DRI in September, 1990, after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in August, 1990).

CASE I

The base-case energy forecasts were based on macroeconomic and energy variable forecasts obtained from Data Resources, Inc. (DRI, 1990a). Figure 2 shows the nominal cost of imported crude oil under this scenario (prepared in spring 1990). As the gap between the world oil demand and supply narrows during the 1990s, crude oil prices are forecasted to rise moderately in the first-half of the 1990s and then rise at a double-digit rate in the second-half of the 1990s. This results in crude oil prices of $18.50/barrel in 1990, $25.40/barrel in 1995, and $41.50/barrel in 2000. Figure 3 shows the average annual rate of increase of selected key economic variables (used in MEAM) over the last two years from 1989 to 1999. On the basis of the data shown in the figure, the nominal household income is forecasted to increase at a higher rate throughout the 1990s than the rate of inflation (as measured by the Consumer Price Index [CPI]), which, in turn, will be higher than the escalation in electricity rates. However, the escalation in the price of nonelectricity fuels will cross the escalation in the price of electricity in 1991, the escalation of the CPI in 1992, and the escalation of income in 1993. Some of the
Case I variable projections are shown in Table 1. The historical values were also obtained from DRI (1989).

The time horizon of the forecast was broken into two periods: 1989-1993 and 1994-1999. Essentially, these periods could be considered intermediate and long-run, respectively. The DRI estimates were used to represent the base case prevailing for the entire period between 1990 and 1999.

CASE II

This special case is based on the Iraq-Kuwait price shock and is referred to as Case II. Case II is based on the DRI macroeconomic scenario "Control 0990" (1990b) released after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in August, 1990. This scenario incorporates DRI's expectation of the new crude-oil-price trajectory over the 1990-93 period (Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1989-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Price Index</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Price</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonelectricity Energy Price</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DRI 1989 and 1990a
FIGURE 2 Average Annual Price of Imported Crude Oil, in Nominal Dollars per Barrel, under Alternative Cases
FIGURE 3  Key Economic Variables under Case I (annual rates of change over the preceding two-year periods)
The world crude oil market has demonstrated dramatic volatility with respect to oil prices as a result of the events in the Persian Gulf. Crude oil prices in the United States prior to the Iraqi invasion on August 2, 1990, were just over $20/bbl (DRI, 1990b). Because of various developments during the armed conflict in the Persian Gulf, the price of crude oil surged above $30/bbl in August. Prices eased by the end of the month as OPEC temporarily suspended production quotas. West Texas Intermediate and OPEC spot prices retreated to $27/bbl. Against this background, the average price of crude oil is projected to be $27.90/bbl in the fourth quarter of 1990. This corresponds to an average price of $21.50/bbl in the year of 1990 (Figure 2). Even though, as per the scenario assumption, the embargo of Iraqi and Kuwaiti crude oil is likely to extend into mid-1991, the increased production by other OPEC members is expected to leave total world oil production in 1991 just 1.5 million barrels below pre-invasion forecasts. This is expected to lead to an average crude oil price of $23.17/bbl in 1991. With the assumed restoration of Iraqi and Kuwaiti production to the levels of 80% by the end of 1992 and 100% by 1993, the crude oil price will gradually fall to $20.80/bbl in 1992 before slowly firming to the base case projections of $23.50 by late 1993. It is then assumed that the forecast of the four variables given in Table 1 will be the same under both scenarios (Case I and Case II) for the 1994-1999 period. The variable forecasts for the entire period (1989-99) are shown in Table 2. It must be stressed that these values of crude oil prices are subject to large variations that can result from uncertain developments in the Middle East situation.
TABLE 2 Case II Annual Rates of Change in Key Macroeconomic and Energy Variables: 1989-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>1989-93</th>
<th>1993-99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Price Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Price</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonelectricity Energy Price</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DRI 1990a and 1990b.

HOUSEHOLD ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVE CASES

Total Energy Consumption

Table 3 shows 1989 household energy consumption estimates for majority, black, Hispanic, poor, and nonpoor groups. Among these groups, total energy consumption was highest for blacks (112 million Btu/household [mBtu/hh]) and lowest for Hispanics (88 mBtu/hh).

Figures 4 to 8 show forecasts of household electricity and nonelectricity consumption for the above groups under Case I. As shown in Table 1, the prices of nonelectricity fuel (primarily natural gas and fuel oil) escalate faster than the prices of electricity for all households. As a result, the decrease in nonelectricity energy consumption is greater than the increase in electricity consumption, which, therefore, leaves each group’s total energy consumption slightly lower (Figures 9 and 10). The conservation in total annual energy consumption from 1989 to 1989 is minimum for poor households (5%) and is maximum for nonpoor households (8%).
### TABLE 3 Total Energy Consumption (10^6 Btu/household)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Case I 1989</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>Case II 1993</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>103.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpoor</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under Case II, the gap between the nonelectricity energy and electricity prices is forecasted to be higher than the gap under Case I (Tables 1 and 2). As such, on a comparative basis for each of the household groups, nonelectricity energy consumption is lower under Case II than under Case I, while electricity use is slightly higher (less than offsetting) under Case II than under Case I (Figures 4 to 8). As such, this leaves each group’s total energy consumption slightly lower under Case II than under Case I (Figures 9 and 10). Table 3 provides energy consumption estimates for each of the groups for selected years.

### Total Energy Expenditures

Table 4 shows estimated household energy expenditures for majority, black, Hispanic, poor, and nonpoor groups. Among these groups, total energy expenditure was highest for nonpoor ($1188/year) and almost as high for blacks ($1184/year). The expenditures were lowest for poor ($988/year).
FIGURE 4  Majority Household Energy Consumption under Alternative Cases
FIGURE 5  Black Household Energy Consumption under Alternative Cases
FIGURE 6 Hispanic Household Energy Consumption under Alternative Cases
FIGURE 7 Poor Household Energy Consumption under Alternative Cases
Poor Household Energy Consumption under Alternative Cases

- Poor - Electricity, Case I
- Poor - Electricity, Case II
- Poor - Nonelectricity, Case I
- Poor - Nonelectricity, Case II

Energy Consumption (10^6 Btu/household)

FIGURE 8 Nonpoor Household Energy Consumption under Alternative Cases
FIGURE 9 Energy Consumption of Majority, Black, and Hispanic Households under Alternative Cases
FIGURE 10  Energy Consumption of Poor and Nonpoor Households under Alternative Cases
As might be expected, given the relative insensitivity of consumption with respect to rising energy prices, energy expenditures increase rather dramatically for each population group. Figures 11 to 15 show the projections of household electricity and total energy expenditures for majority, black, Hispanic, poor, and nonpoor groups under the two cases.

The expenditures rise the most for poor households between 1989 and 1999 (64% under Case I and 73% under Case II). This contrasts with an increase in the consumer price index of 60% under Case I and 61% under Case II.

Table 4 provides energy expenditure estimates for each of the groups for selected years.

**Energy Expenditure as Share of Income**

As shown in Figure 3 under Case I, household income is forecasted to increase at a higher rate than the rate of escalation
FIGURE 11 Majority Household Energy Expenditures under Alternative Cases
Majority Household Energy Expenditures under Alternative Cases

Energy Expenditure ($10^3$/household)

Year


Majority - Total, Case II
Majority - Total, Case I
Majority - Electricity, Case II
Majority - Electricity, Case I
FIGURE 12  Black Household Energy Expenditures under Alternative Cases
FIGURE 13 Hispanic Household Energy Expenditures under Alternative Cases
Hispanic Household Energy Expenditures under Alternative Cases

Energy Expenditure ($10^3$/household)

Year


Hispanic - Total, Case II
Hispanic - Total, Case I
Hispanic - Electricity, Case II
Hispanic - Electricity, Case I
FIGURE 14 Poor Household Energy Expenditures under Alternative Cases
FIGURE 15  Nonpoor Household Energy Expenditures under Alternative Cases
of (1) electricity prices between 1989 and 1999 and (2) nonelectricity energy prices between 1989 and 1993. As such, the percent of income spent on energy declines continuously from 1989 to 1995 for all groups (Figures 16 and 17). A milder turnaround then begins. By 1999, energy expenditure as share of income for majority households is forecasted to be only 0.33% short of their levels in 1989, 0.38% short for black households, 0.19% short for Hispanic households, 0.61% short for poor households, and 0.28% short for nonpoor households. Under Case II, the above energy expenditure as shares of income for each of the household groups rises in 1991 before it falls in 1993 and 1995 (Figures 16 and 17). It then resumes an upward path for all groups. For the Hispanic and poor groups, the shares cross their 1989 levels in 1997 and continue to rise thereafter. By 1999 the shares are higher than their 1989 levels by 0.05% for Hispanic households and by 0.27% for poor households. For black households, the share in 1999 will reach its 1989 level. However, shares for majority and nonpoor groups will only narrow the difference between their 1989 and 1999 levels. Specifically, the majority households are forecasted to be only 0.14% short of their 1989 levels while nonpoor households are forecasted to be only 0.10% short.

Table 5 provides energy expenditure as share of income for each of the groups for selected years.
FIGURE 16  Energy Expenditure as Share of Income for Majority, Black, and Hispanic Households under Alternative Cases
FIGURE 17  Energy Expenditure as Share of Income for Poor and Nonpoor Households under Alternative Cases
Energy Expenditure as Share of Income under Alternative Cases

- Poor, Case II
- Poor, Case I
- Nonpoor, Case II
- Nonpoor, Case I

Year:
- 1985
- 1990
- 1995
- 2000

Energy Expenditure as Share of Income (%)
- 14
- 12
- 10
- 8
- 6
- 4
- 2
- 0
TABLE 5  Energy Expenditure as Share of Income (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpoor</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSIONS

With regard to the application of the Minority Energy Assessment Model (MEAM) under two cases, several conclusions may be drawn. Among all household groups in 1989, (1) total energy consumption was highest for black households (112 mBtu/household) and lowest for Hispanic households (88 mBtu/hh); (2) total energy expenditure was highest for nonpoor households ($1188/hh), a close second for black households ($1184/hh), and lowest for poor households ($988/hh); and energy expenditure as share of income was highest for poor households (12.0%) and lowest for nonpoor households (3.0%). Under both cases, the total energy consumption peaks in 1989 for all households. This occurs mostly because the analysis presented in this paper assumes that over the 1989-99 period, the energy demand curve for each of the five population groups falls by 10% while the electricity demand curves rise by 10% to reflect an increase in proportions of households located in the
South and West and a higher incidence of electricity use in new homes. Additionally, because of the resulting higher energy prices, the Persian Gulf Crisis (Case II) slightly reduced household energy consumption for all population groups throughout the period 1989-99. Under both cases, the decline in consumption during the 1989-99 period is lowest for poor households. Under both cases, household energy expenditures over the period 1989-99 increased for all population groups - but disproportionately higher for poor, Hispanics and blacks. This is mostly attributed to the differences in price elasticities with poor and minority energy expenditures more sensitive to the rising nonelectric energy prices. Also, the change in household energy expenditures is a result of the long-term affect of the fuel price shock under Case II. Although crude oil prices declined after the end of the Gulf Crisis, energy prices still remain at slightly higher levels than under the Case I. In addition, many consumer energy conservation measures taken during the crisis are irreversible and remain in effect over the long run. The energy expenditures rise the most for poor households between 1989 and 1999 (64% under Case I and 73% under Case II). This contrasts with a 60% increase in the consumer price index under Case I and a 61% increase under Case II. Under Case I, by 1999 the energy expenditures as shares of income for majority households is forecasted to be only 0.33% short of their levels in 1989, 0.38% short for black households, 0.19% short for Hispanic households, 0.61% short for poor households, and 0.28% short for nonpoor households. Under Case II, the impact on share is more severe than under Case I. Specifically, by 1999, energy
expenditures as shares of income are forecast to be 0.14% short of their 1989 levels for majority households, 0.10% short for nonpoor households, at par for black households, 0.05% higher for Hispanic households, and 0.27% higher for poor households.

Like any model and its application, certain limitations apply. First, the scope of the racial/ethnic minorities in the model is limited to blacks and Hispanics. Because of the limited observations in DOE's Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) data, the model could not be extended to include other minority groups, such as American Indians and Asian-Americans. Second, the parameters of the MEAM equations are estimated from the RECS data base, which is now available only every three years. Because the model captures movements over a two-year period, it is more suitable for medium and long-run analyses than for short-run analyses. Third, the energy demand projections are based on the assumption that household income for each group grows at the same rate -- variations in the actual rates will affect both expenditure share and, to a lesser extent, energy consumption estimates. These analytical limitations indicate areas that warrant further research.
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INTRODUCTION

Few models attempt to assess and project household energy consumption and expenditure by taking into account differential household choices correlated with such variables as race, ethnicity, income, and geographic location. The Minority Energy Assessment Model (MEAM), developed by Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), provides a framework to forecast the energy consumption and expenditure of majority, black, Hispanic, poor, and nonpoor households. Among other variables, household energy demand for each of these population groups in MEAM is affected by housing factors (such as home age, home ownership, home type, type of heating fuel, and installed central air conditioning unit), demographic factors (such as household members and urban/rural location), and climate factors (such as heating degree days and cooling degree days). The welfare implications of the revealed consumption patterns by households are also forecast. The paper provides an overview of the model methodology and its application in projecting household energy consumption under alternative energy scenarios developed by Data Resources, Inc. (DRI).
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