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**What are the Key Rule Provisions?**

On June 2, the EPA under Section 111(d) set CO₂ emissions standards on existing fossil electric generation units (EGUs)

- EPA reviewed existing emissions reductions methods to establish the Best System of Emissions Reduction (BSER)
- BSER is applied to each state’s current fossil EGU emissions rate to set state-specific fossil emissions rate standards for 2020 – 2030
- Option 1: interim goal for 2020 – 2029 (to meet on average) and a final goal for 2030 and beyond; EPA is also considering Option 2: less stringent but sets earlier goals over 2020 – 2024 with final goal for 2025 and beyond
- States given flexibility in how to meet the standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline for Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed standards are designed to bring emissions to 30% below 2005 levels.

Sources: CO₂ from EPA CEMS, EIA total generation, and projections from EPA IPM results under Option 1 No Cooperation.
BSER includes four methods of emissions reduction, assessed for feasibility in each state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BSER Building Block</th>
<th>EPA Basis for BSER Determination</th>
<th>EPA Estimated Average Cost</th>
<th>% of BSER CO₂ Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Increase efficiency of fossil fuel power plants</strong></td>
<td>EPA reviewed the opportunity for coal-fired plants to improve their heat rates through best practices and equipment upgrades, identified a possible range of 4–12%, and chose 6% as a reasonable estimate. BSER assumes all coal plants increase their efficiency by 6%.</td>
<td>$6–12/ton</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Switch to lower-emitting power plants</strong></td>
<td>EPA determined for re-dispatching gas for coal that the average availability of gas CCs exceeds 85% and that a substantial number of CC units have operated above 70% for extended periods of time, modeled re-dispatch of gas CCs at 65–75%, and determined 70% to be technically feasible. BSER assumes all gas CCs operate up to 70% capacity factor and displace higher-emitting generation (e.g., coal and gas steam units).</td>
<td>$30/ton</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Build more low/zero carbon generation</strong></td>
<td>EPA identified 5 nuclear units currently under construction and estimated that 5.8% of all existing nuclear capacity is &quot;at-risk&quot; based on EIA analysis. BSER assumes the new units and retaining 5.8% of at-risk nuclear capacity will reduce CO₂ emissions by operating at 90% capacity factor. EPA developed targets for existing and new renewable penetration in 6 regions based on its review of current RPS mandates, and calculated regional growth factors to achieve the target in 2030. BSER assumes that 2012 renewable generation grows in each state by its regional factor through 2030 (up to a maximum renewable target) to estimate future renewable generation.</td>
<td>Under Construction: $0/ton &quot;At-Risk&quot;: $12–17/ton</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Use electricity more efficiently</strong></td>
<td>EPA estimated EE deployment in the 12 leading states achieves annual incremental electricity savings of at least 1.5% each year. BSER assumes that all states increase their current annual savings rate by 0.2% starting in 2017 until reaching a maximum rate of 1.5%, which continues through 2030.</td>
<td>$16–24/ton</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CO₂ Rate Standards on Existing Fossil Units

The EPA standards are not intuitive emission rates. Some BSER blocks reduce the numerator (CO₂ emissions) and others increase the denominator (qualified MWh).

Source: Derived from EPA 111(d) technical support document: rate calculation for Option 1.
Rule Provisions

Fossil Unit Emission Rate Standards by State

Source: Derived from EPA 111(d) technical support document: rate calculation for Option 1.
EPA’s Projected Impacts
2030 Fleet Capacity and Generation Mix

- Even though non-hydro renewables are 33% of the BSER blocks, IPM projections add only 2% more non-hydro renewables by 2030 vs. BAU
- Assumed energy efficiency and coal-to-gas re-dispatch dominate

EPA Projected Generation (TWh) by 2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>BAU (TWh)</th>
<th>Option 1: No Cooperation (TWh)</th>
<th>Change (TWh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>(452)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas CC</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>(64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hydro RE</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,557</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,051</strong></td>
<td><strong>(506)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EPA IPM
EPA’s Projected Impacts

Projected 2030 Emissions Reductions

States listed in order of declining current emission rates.

Year 2030 Emissions from IPM
Policy Case (Option 1) minus Business as Usual

Source: EPA IPM
EPA’s Projected Impacts

EPA Indicative CO₂ Prices (No Cooperation)

Sources and Notes:
EPA IPM Option 1, No Cooperation scenario. Map shows “shadow prices” on emissions rate constraint, expressed in $/ton of CO₂. Table reports total compliance costs.
# Market-Based Trading Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Trading Product</th>
<th>CO₂ Allowances (Mass-Based)</th>
<th>CO₂ Offsets (Rate-Based)</th>
<th>Zero-CO₂ MWh (Rate-Based)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Does a Fossil Plant Comply?</td>
<td>• 1 ton of CO₂</td>
<td>• 1 ton of CO₂</td>
<td>• 1 MWh of generation from a zero-CO₂ resource (like a Renewable Energy Credit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are Credits Allocated or Created?</td>
<td>• Purchase 1 allowance for every ton of CO₂ emitted</td>
<td>• Purchase enough offsets to meet rate formula: ( \frac{\text{CO}_2 \text{ Emitted} - \text{CO}_2 \text{ Offsets}}{\text{MWh Generated}} )</td>
<td>• Purchase enough allowances to meet rate formula: ( \frac{\text{CO}_2 \text{ Emitted}}{\text{MWh Gen} + \text{MWh Credits}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Existing Programs</td>
<td>• RGGEI, California AB32, Europe, Quebec</td>
<td>• Alberta (somewhat similar)</td>
<td>• REC programs under existing state RPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **CO₂ Allowances (Mass-Based)**: 1 ton of CO₂
- **CO₂ Offsets (Rate-Based)**: 1 ton of CO₂
- **Zero-CO₂ MWh (Rate-Based)**: 1 MWh of generation from a zero-CO₂ resource (like a Renewable Energy Credit)
Wholesale prices would be higher under mass-based CO₂ trading:

- **Mass-based:**
  - Fossil generators must pay for every ton of carbon produced, increasing dispatch costs and wholesale prices.
  - They or consumers could be compensated through allowance auction revenues.

- **Rate-based:**
  - Fossil units only have to pay for enough CO₂ to reduce their emissions rate to the standard.
  - In many states, the rate exceeds that of gas CCs, so they will earn revenue from creating offsets when they run (reducing energy their offer price!)

### Sources and Notes:
Illustrative calculation assumes that coal-to-gas switching is the marginal CO₂ abatement opportunity, resulting in equal coal and gas dispatch prices.
Inefficiencies Under Rate-Based Trading

Rate-based approaches will create substantial dispatch inefficiencies between states and some resource types. Two examples:

**Different Dispatch Prices for Identical Plants in Neighboring States**
Production shifts into the state with a more lax standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Fuel and Variable O&amp;M Costs</th>
<th>Gas CC Revenue from CO₂ Offsets</th>
<th>Offer Price Offset Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>$15/ton CO₂, 741 lbs/MWh Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$15/ton CO₂, 1,783 lb/MWh Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identical “New” and “Existing” Gas CCs**
Existing CCs at advantage compared to new.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CO₂ Coverage Status</th>
<th>CO₂ Offsets</th>
<th>Offer Price Offset Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New CC</td>
<td>Not Covered Under 111(d)</td>
<td>Earns CO₂ Offset Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Compliance: Rate vs. Mass
Potential 2030 Energy Price Impacts

2030 Average and Range of Prices by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>BAU Mass-Based</th>
<th>BAU Rate-Based</th>
<th>PJM Mass-Based</th>
<th>PJM Rate-Based</th>
<th>SPP + ERCOT Mass-Based</th>
<th>SPP + ERCOT Rate-Based</th>
<th>MISO Mass-Based</th>
<th>MISO Rate-Based</th>
<th>WECC Mass-Based</th>
<th>WECC Rate-Based</th>
<th>NPCC Mass-Based</th>
<th>NPCC Rate-Based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERC + FL</td>
<td>$50 - $70</td>
<td>$50 - $75</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $85</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $85</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJM</td>
<td>$50 - $70</td>
<td>$50 - $75</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $85</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $85</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP + ERCOT</td>
<td>$50 - $70</td>
<td>$50 - $75</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $85</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $85</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISO</td>
<td>$50 - $70</td>
<td>$50 - $75</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $85</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $85</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WECC</td>
<td>$50 - $70</td>
<td>$50 - $75</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $85</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $85</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPCC</td>
<td>$50 - $70</td>
<td>$50 - $75</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $85</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $85</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
<td>$60 - $80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources and Notes:
BAU and Rate-based prices are from EPA IPM results for year 2030 under Option 1: Regional cooperation, showing simple average and range of prices by region. Mass-based prices are approximate, starting with the BAU price and adding regional CO₂ price assuming a gas CC is the marginal energy resource.
Takeaways

- **EPA’s Proposed Rule**
  - Will achieve substantial emissions reductions within the confines of EPA’s authority
  - Standards vary widely across states based on numerous assumptions about sources of potential target reductions, which many states are questioning (e.g. Texas)
  - Individual state standards don’t directly indicate relative compliance burdens
  - The rule treats resources with similar emissions asymmetrically

- **Key Compliance Questions for States** (other than disputing their standards)
  - Whether and how to cooperate with other states to reduce compliance costs
  - Whether to convert to mass-based compliance or at least *mass-based trading*, which efficiently puts all carbon abatement options on a level playing field. Higher wholesale prices are not worse for consumers if they own allowance auction revenues.
  - If not converting to mass-based, find other ways to remedy inefficiencies caused by the rate’s exclusion of new CCs, most nuclear, and hydro

- **Implications for Asset Values**
  - Nuclear: value highly depends on the rate-based vs. mass-based trading
  - Coal: loses substantial value
  - Gas: a slight winner, esp. with rate-based trading that inefficiently excludes new
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