



**PROJECT RESULTS**  
**EVALUATION OF TIGHTER FEDERAL EMISSIONS CAPS**  
**FOR ELECTRIC GENERATING UNITS**

June 5, 2007

**BACKGROUND**

- **Purpose:** This project evaluated an emission control strategy for Electric Generating Units (EGUs) that further reduced emissions beyond current federal requirements throughout the eastern US via a tighter regional cap and trade program. Emissions reductions and costs were estimated in comparison to the federal program.
- **Why EGUs:** Emissions from EGUs contribute to regional haze in Class I areas throughout the eastern US. Therefore, states must evaluate strategies for reducing emissions from EGUs as part of their efforts to achieve reasonable progress in improving visibility at Class I areas.
- **Which Model:** To predict future emissions from EGUs, the Mid-Atlantic/Northeast Visibility Union (MANE-VU) and other Regional Planning Organizations have followed the example of the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in using the Integrated Planning Model (IPM<sup>®</sup>), an integrated economic and emissions model. IPM projects electricity supply based on various assumptions and develops a least-cost solution to generating needed electricity within specified emissions targets.
- **Strategy:** EPA's Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) and Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) will reduce SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and mercury emissions in the eastern US. This project evaluated an emission control strategy for EGUs that tightened CAIR throughout the eastern US. Emissions reductions and costs were estimated.
- **Model Runs:** IPM runs are defined by numerous economic and engineering assumptions.
  - EPA developed Base Case v.2.1.9 using IPM to evaluate the impacts of CAIR and the Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR). (Recently, EPA updated their input data and developed Base Case v.3.0. **Due to timing, all of the following runs were based on EPA Base Case v.2.1.9 with some updates and corrections.**)
  - VISTAS CAIR Base Case. The Regional Planning Organizations collaborated with each other to update EPA Base Case v.2.1.9 using more current data about EGUs with more realistic fuel prices, creating an IPM run called VISTAS PC\_1f. This VISTAS IPM implementation is the one that has been used in regional air quality modeling for ozone and haze state implementation plans.
  - MARAMA CAIR Base Case. MANE-VU, through MARAMA, contracted with ICF to prepare two new IPM runs. The MARAMA CAIR Base Case run was based on the VISTAS PC\_1f run and underlying EPA Base Case v.2.1.9, with some of the information



overall reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> emissions to be achieved through the implementation of CAIR Plus as compared to CAIR.

**Table 3: NO<sub>x</sub> Budgets in the CAIR/CAIR Plus Region (Thousand Tons)**

Year	NO <sub>x</sub> Ozone Season Budget		NO <sub>x</sub> Annual Budget	
	MARAMA Base Case	MARAMA CAIR Plus Policy Case	MARAMA Base Case	MARAMA CAIR Plus Policy Case
2009	568	623	1,722*	1,553*
2010	568	623	1,522	1,353
2012	568	415	1,522	902
2015	518	395	1,370	858
2018	485	382	1,268	829

\*Includes NO<sub>x</sub> Compliance Supplement Pool of 199,997 tons included in 2009.

Note: The 2015 budgets as modeled in IPM are the average of the budgets over the period 2013-2017. The actual ozone season NO<sub>x</sub> budgets proposed are 485 thousand tons in CAIR and 382 thousand tons in CAIR plus for 2015. The actual annual NO<sub>x</sub> budgets proposed are 1,268 thousand tons in CAIR and 829 thousand tons in CAIR plus for 2015.

- As shown below in Table 4 from the final draft ICF report, the CAIR Plus run required a greater number of SO<sub>2</sub> allowances be retired for each ton of pollution discharged. The effect of this was to reduce the total amount of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions allowed within the CAIR Plus region.

**Table 4: SO<sub>2</sub> Allowance Retirement Ratios in the CAIR/CAIR Plus Region**

Year	SO <sub>2</sub> Allowance Retirement Ratio	
	MARAMA Base Case	MARAMA CAIR Plus Policy Case
2009	1.00	1.00
2010	2.00	2.50
2012	2.00	2.94
2015	2.52	3.32
2018	2.86	4.16

Note: The 2015 retirement ratios as modeled in IPM are the average of the retirement ratios over the period 2013-2017. The actual retirement ratios are 2.86 for CAIR and 3.57 for CAIR Plus for 2015.

## RESULTS

- Strengthening CAIR would achieve significant emission reductions, increase the use of natural gas, decrease the use of coal, and drive the construction of new, cleaner plants.
- The final draft ICF report projects that CAIR Plus would reduce national SO<sub>2</sub> emissions in 2018 from all fossil and non-fossil fuel-fired Electric Generating Units (EGUs) by 845,300 tons per year, from 4,785,600 to 3,940,300 tons per year, an 18% reduction.
  - SO<sub>2</sub> emissions in 2018 from all fossil and non-fossil fuel-fired EGUs are projected to decline by 31% in the MANE-VU region, 12% in the Midwest, 29% in the Southeast, and 15% in the Central States. The CAIR Plus strategy would not apply in the West, so emissions there would grow by 5%. (See report, Table 8.)

- The report also projects that CAIR Plus would reduce national NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in 2018 from all fossil and non-fossil fuel-fired Electric Generating Units (EGUs) by 480,500 tons per year, from 2,065,600 to 1,585,100 tons per year, a 23% national reduction (27% in MANE-VU) (Table 9).
- The report projects that the annualized incremental cost of the CAIR Plus policy (over and above the cost of the CAIR program) would be \$2.57 Billion (1999\$) in 2018 (Table 5). This includes the annualized capital costs of new control equipment and new plants, fuel costs, and variable and fixed operation and maintenance costs. This is a 2% increase (Table A5.8).
- The report projects that the marginal cost of SO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions as manifested in the projected SO<sub>2</sub> allowance prices would increase from \$1,106 (1999\$/ton) in 2018 with CAIR to \$1,392 (1999\$/ton) with CAIR Plus, a 26% increase (Table 6).
- The report estimates that with CAIR Plus, in the US an additional 17 gigawatts (GWs) of coal plant capacity would be controlled by SO<sub>2</sub> scrubbers and an additional 65 GW controlled by SCR (for NO<sub>x</sub>) as compared to the projected controls under CAIR (Table 7).
- The costs and benefits listed above reflect that in comparison to the CAIR base case,
  - more new plants would be built under a CAIR Plus strategy, and more older plants would be retired; newer plants would have lower emissions (pp. 15-17);
  - the generation mix would change towards lower emission intensive fuel and plant types, including more IGCCs (pp. 16-17); and
  - natural gas-fired generation would increase and generation from coal steam EGUs would decrease after 2012, as the CAIR Plus SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> policies continue to become more stringent. (See p. 15.)

## MORE INFORMATION

- The final draft ICF report summarizing the results of the MARAMA CAIR and CAIR Plus runs is available at [www.manevu.org](http://www.manevu.org) under Publications—Reports. It is also posted at [www.marama.org](http://www.marama.org) under regional haze, projects, MANE-VU future year emissions inventories.
- Information about the VISTAS CAIR Base Case run is summarized in an appendix to the report. More information is also posted at [www.ladco.org](http://www.ladco.org) under regional air quality planning, G. IPM Emissions Summaries.

## TECHNICAL OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Representatives from each MANE-VU state have participated in reviewing draft materials prepared under this project. Team members include:

New Hampshire: Andy Bodnarik, Liz Nixon, Jeff Underhill  
 Connecticut: David Wackter  
 Delaware: David Fees, Mohammed Majeed  
 District of Columbia: Stan Tracey, Ram Tangirala  
 Maine: Tom Downs  
 Maryland: Tad Aburn, Diane Franks, Brian Hug  
 MARAMA: Susan Wierman, Patrick Davis, Julie McDill

New Jersey: Chris Salmi, Ray Papalski  
 New York: Ron Stannard, Gopal Sistla, John Kent  
 Pennsylvania: Dean Van Orden, Wick Havens  
 Rhode Island: Karen Slattery  
 OTC: Chris Recchia, Anna Garcia, Doug Austin  
 Massachusetts: Stephen Dennis  
 Vermont: Paul Wishinski

**CONTACT INFORMATION:** Susan Wierman or Julie McDill, MARAMA ([swierman@marama.org](mailto:swierman@marama.org) or [jmcdill@marama.org](mailto:jmcdill@marama.org))