

present—and all the support staff who have helped them succeed—I extend my warm congratulations on this 50th anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO LOUISVILLE SLUGGER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a fine Louisville product that is recognizable around the world and to the wonderful company behind it that is still knocking it out of the park after 125 years. Hillerich & Bradsby Co., makers of the famous Louisville Slugger, has made over 100 million bats since 1884.

Legend has it that the company's first bat was made by 17-year-old John A. "Bud" Hillerich in his father, J.F. Hillerich's, woodworking shop, after local baseball star Pete Browning broke his bat. Bud invited him to the shop and handcrafted a new one on a steam-powered lathe.

The next day, after Browning got three hits in three at bats, baseball players from all over the region began to visit the Hillerich shop. From this, the Louisville Slugger was born.

The company has remained family owned for five generations, and in that time has become the most iconic brand in the game of baseball. Players from T-ball to the Major Leagues all have used Louisville Sluggers, including such greats as Lou Gehrig, Joe DiMaggio, Jackie Robinson, and Babe Ruth. Ruth personally gave bat makers at the company specifications for the Louisville Slugger bats he would use to hit his record 60 home runs.

In 1996, after operating elsewhere, Louisville Slugger baseball bats came home to Louisville, as Hillerich & Bradsby Co. placed their executive offices, wood bat plant, and a museum in downtown Louisville, just 10 blocks away from where Bud Hillerich made the first Louisville Slugger in 1884. The Louisville Slugger Museum & Factory is now one of the major tourist attractions of Louisville, with more than 2 million visitors since its opening.

If any of my colleagues happen to be in Louisville, my hometown, and want to visit the Louisville Slugger Museum & Factory, it is very easy to find. Just look for the 120-foot-long giant Louisville Slugger bat that marks the building's entrance. Every kid in town knows where to find the world's biggest bat and knows it marks the spot where you can tour the factory and actually see a Louisville Slugger being made. Today, Hillerich & Bradsby Co. manufactures more than 1 million wood bats a year, as well as aluminum bats, for professional and amateur use.

For millions of fans, the word "Louisville" will always evoke the satisfying crack of a bat and the celebration of a home run. This is thanks to the Louisville Slugger. The 2009 baseball season marks the Louisville Slugger's 125th anniversary, and I know all my colleagues join me in congratulating Hillerich & Bradsby Co. for 125 years of

success in baseball, our national pastime.

CREDIT FOR INVESTMENT IN ADVANCED ENERGY FACILITIES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise for a colloquy with the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, to discuss section 1302 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, ARRA, which the President signed into law on February 19, 2009 (Public Law 111-5). That section establishes a new tax credit, known as the section 48C credit, for investment in advanced energy facilities.

I am very pleased that ARRA establishes this new credit. Because until now, all of our investment tax credits for renewable energy technologies have been concentrated downstream that is, at the commercial or individual consumer level. While those incentives have created some U.S. jobs, such as in installation, most advanced energy technologies that are installed in the United States continue to be manufactured overseas. One major driver for this overseas manufacturing is the significant tax incentives that other countries offer. For instance, Malaysia and the Philippines offer solar photovoltaic manufacturers income tax holidays, for 15 years in the case of Malaysia, while Germany offers them up to 50 percent of investment costs. As a result, the U.S. is far behind, and is falling further behind, in "clean tech" manufacturing. According to one recent study, Japan represents 45 percent of global solar cell production while the United States accounts for just 9 percent. And European manufacturers now account for more than 85 percent of the global wind component market.

But just as the U.S. is losing ground in advanced energy manufacturing, we can anticipate rapid near- to mid-term growth in domestic demand for renewable energy technologies. This demand will be driven by numerous factors, including last year's extension of the commercial and residential investment tax credits through 2016; extension by ARRA of the production tax credit through 2013–2012 for wind; and declining product costs; anticipated enactment of national requirements for renewable electricity deployment; and anticipated enactment of a market-based system or tax to limit carbon emissions. But under the status quo, the corresponding growth in domestic demand would largely have been satisfied by imports.

For that reason, I worked with my friend from Montana, Senator BAUCUS, to establish in ARRA the first tax credit for investment in advanced energy facilities those that manufacture property that enables Americans to harness renewable resources to generate energy, to make energy efficient improvements, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. I thank Senator BAUCUS for sharing my commitment to putting our country on the path to being a

leader in advanced energy manufacturing.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank my colleague from New Mexico, the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, for his dedication to this issue. I am pleased to have worked with Senator BINGAMAN, the chairman of the Finance Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure, on this new incentive. And I wholeheartedly agree with Senator BINGAMAN that we cannot allow the United States to miss the opportunity to add thousands of green manufacturing jobs. This new tax credit for investment in advanced energy facilities will level the playing field so that the U.S. can compete for these jobs, and I was pleased to include it in my chairman's mark when the Finance Committee considered this legislation.

Under section 1302 of ARRA, the Treasury Secretary is authorized to award total credits of up to \$2.3 billion for qualifying projects. Within 180 days of enactment, the Treasury Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, is required to establish a program to consider and award certifications for projects that qualify for the credit. The bill enumerates selection criteria that the Treasury Secretary shall take into consideration. The Finance Committee developed these criteria with the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and through the Chair, I would like to ask Senator BINGAMAN to explain the criteria and clarify how Congress intends the administration to implement this credit.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Senator. At the outset, I note that this credit is a product of the Senate; it was not included in the preconference legislation that was passed by the House.

Overall, we intend the credit to promote the manufacture of property that, until recently, has not been widely deployed in the United States. In particular, the credit is intended to benefit manufacturers of property (including component parts of property) that (a) harnesses renewable resources to produce energy; (b) enhances the efficient use of energy derived from conventional or renewable resources; or (c) reduces greenhouse gas emissions from energy produced by conventional resources.

Treasury's creation of transparent scoring criteria will be critical for efficient delivery of the allocated credit amount, which, in turn, will drive efficient deployment of private capital.

The new section 48C requires the Treasury Secretary to make awards only to projects for which there is a reasonable expectation of commercial viability. Commercial viability primarily considers readiness for deployment. It also considers capital requirements to reach end-consumers in a cost-effective manner. Projects that have immediate and fungible markets and are positioned to compete in those

markets have greater commercial viability than those that will require significant additional market development. Additionally, in determining viability the Secretary should consider the potential scale of market applications, and therefore the project's broader impact.

In allocating credits, section 48C directs the Secretary to consider five additional factors.

First, the Secretary shall consider projects that will provide the greatest domestic job creation, both direct and indirect, during the credit period. Because of their potential to catalyze additional growth, ARRA's stimulus objective will be maximized if the program supports emerging sectors and technologies. Accordingly, the Secretary should consider job creation estimates that include some evaluation of the potential breadth and scale of the property's applications, including job creation potential of the property's supply chain, distribution, installation, and maintenance.

Second, the Secretary shall consider projects that will provide the greatest net impact in avoiding or reducing air pollutants or anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases. Emissions from both the manufacturing project's operations and the installed energy property should be considered. Applicant projects should be compared to the existing most-likely alternatives, and also to alternative new competing property. We expect that the Treasury Secretary will consult with the Department of Energy in estimating direct greenhouse gas emissions on a lifecycle basis for applicant projects. Additionally, the Treasury Secretary shall ensure that any potential project has received all Federal and State environmental authorizations or reviews necessary to commence construction of the project.

Third, the Secretary shall look to projects that have the greatest potential for technological innovation and commercial deployment. This criterion will ensure that tax credits are directed to those projects that have the greatest opportunity to catalyze new technologies, and thus multiply the tax credit's impact. The Secretary might implement this standard by preferring projects that are first- or second-of-a-kind, or that employ significantly improved technologies—i.e., those that will achieve significant improvements in cost or technology performance relative to existing solutions.

Fourth, the Secretary shall prioritize projects that have the lowest levelized cost either of generated or stored energy, or of measured reduction in energy consumption or greenhouse gas emissions. Because it takes into account the installed system price and associated costs, such as financing and operation, levelized cost of energy is an accepted and common metric for comparing the cost of generating energy or saving energy across properties. In the case of property that generates or

stores energy, the appropriate measure is levelized cost of generated or stored energy, which factors the cost per kilowatt hours of energy generated. In the case of property that conserves or more efficiently deploys energy, such as smart grid and metering technologies, or that reduces greenhouse emissions, the appropriate measure is levelized cost of measured reduction in energy consumption or greenhouse gas emissions, which factors the cost per kilowatt of energy saved or ton of carbon captured. Section 48C mentions the "full supply chain" and, in the case of reductions in energy consumption or greenhouse gas emissions, the Secretary should also consider emissions reductions in other parts of the supply chain that are enabled by the applicant project.

Finally, the legislation directs the Secretary to consider projects that have the shortest project time from certification to completion. ARRA's overarching goal is to create jobs as quickly as possible; the credit is intended to benefit firms that are able to move quickly and with certainty.

Through the Chair, I would like to ask Senator BAUCUS to confirm his agreement with my description of these factors.

Mr. BAUCUS. I most certainly agree with the Senator's description and I thank him for his collaboration in developing this robust new tax credit.

IDAHOANS SPEAK OUT ON HIGH ENERGY PRICES

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, in mid-June, I asked Idahoans to share with me how high energy prices are affecting their lives, and they responded by the hundreds. The stories, numbering well over 1,200, are heartbreaking and touching. While energy prices have dropped in recent weeks, the concerns expressed remain very relevant. To respect the efforts of those who took the opportunity to share their thoughts, I am submitting every e-mail sent to me through an address set up specifically for this purpose to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is not an issue that will be easily resolved, but it is one that deserves immediate and serious attention, and Idahoans deserve to be heard. Their stories not only detail their struggles to meet everyday expenses, but also have suggestions and recommendations as to what Congress can do now to tackle this problem and find solutions that last beyond today. I ask unanimous consent to have today's letters printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First of all thank you for all your efforts to help the people of Idaho and the USA.

We have a disabled daughter that lives on a very small income. We subsidize her income monthly and daily. It is all she can do to make ends meet. We are retired and on fixed income. Even before these terrible gas price increases and using "level pay" for

heating and cooling all year round, trips to the many doctors and Elks Rehab, it is all but impossible for her to maintain a lifestyle where she can pay all her bills and eat.

How very sad our country has come to this. We seem to be able to help everyone else in the world but not our own citizens.

Everyone in the news keeps saying it will not do any good for years if we start drilling and building refineries. Well, we have to start somewhere and sometime. Foreign countries are virtually taking our oil resources and we are standing by and letting it happen. What is so hard to understand about our dilemma? It affects our source of food and many other vital areas that are urgent to our very survival. Let us bring back our capability to support ourselves by reactivating our nuclear capabilities. We have the technology and even some facilities that were up and running. Why did not we stick with a good thing when we were using it?

As far as drilling and the environmentalists are concerned, since when do the minority control the majority? Granted, we need to protect the environment but we all know it can be done along with doing what we need to do to survive. What good is it to be so radical and prevent every effort to improve our stability if no one is around to enjoy it? Think about it.

SHIRLEY, Boise.

I appreciated your letter and am happy to be able to share how difficult it has become for me, as a single mother who works in Boise, but lives in Middleton. Every day, my salary is reduced because of the additional costs of commuting to work. Additionally, my home and water are heated by propane, so making it thru this past winter was especially difficult. I had to call on my church leaders for assistance 3-4 times to pay the propane bills. The \$600 stimulus check issued by the government was not even enough to cover the cost for one bill. I had to come up with the additional \$180 shortage on my own. Needless to say, the stimulus check did not "stimulate" much of anything.

We are in a national crisis, and something must be done now. My husband walked away from our family approximately three years ago, leaving me with four children and two mortgages to pay on less than \$25,000 per year income. I cannot afford to file for divorce because my funds are so limited—so I am just stuck. I do not want to lose my home, but that is becoming more of a potential outcome each day. It breaks my heart to see the things I have worked my whole life for slowly dwindle away. So much for the "American Dream".

I feel powerless and frustrated much of the time as I have to choose whether to buy fuel to be able to go to work, or buy food for my family. It is just a vicious circle. Please tell our elected officials that we need their help now!

GRACE, Middleton.

Thank you for your letter. Yes, we are scared at the direction our economy has taken, which all appears to be caused by the horrendous rise in gasoline prices—and who do we blame for this—Congress, of course! How can you sit by and let the oil companies rake in billions of dollars in profits through pure greed. I have never liked overregulation of business, but I think now they need some regulating, as do all those who are profiting by this miserable situation.

We are on a fixed income: Social Security, small pension (that never changes) and a 401K saved while working—which by the way is shrinking due to the stock market problems. The only thing that can be done about our income would be a decent cost-of-living rise in the Social Security next January.