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I. Industry Prism
Objectives

- Minimize economic impacts to consumers
- Continue environmental improvements
- Maintain system reliability
- Maintain fuel diversity options
- Develop and deploy new technologies
- Obtain access to capital and cost recovery
- Negotiate myriad political landscapes
Minimizing Consumer Impacts

- Long investment horizons (20-30 years) require some ‘educated predictions’ of expected future legislative, regulatory and policy actions
  - Proper planning means that utilities cannot – and do not – plan one rule at a time; utilities need to take a comprehensive view
- Avoid the cost, uncertainty and delay of litigation
Continue Environmental Improvements

- **Emissions**
  - From 1980 to 2010, the power sector has reduced annual emission of SO$_2$ by 70 percent and NO$_x$ by 70 percent.

- **Demand/generation**
  - Electricity demand has increased 79.0% between 1980 and 2010 and 38.2% between 1990 and 2010.

**Sources**
Maintaining System Reliability

- Preserve system integrity through transmission and by maintaining adequate reserve margins
  - Transmission issues (voltage support, load pockets, etc.) can dictate what units must run
  - Timing and integration of new construction (i.e., before retirement of “old” units)
  - Adequate base load, peaking capacity and renewable capacity
- Coordinated maintenance programs to accommodate retrofit outages
Fuel Diversity and Innovative Generation Technologies are Critical

- Meet future energy demand
- Provide affordable, reliable energy
- Establish energy security
- Generate energy efficiently with minimal environmental impact
Electric Companies Use A Diverse Mix of Fuels to Generate Electricity

- Coal: 44.6%
- Natural Gas: 23.3%
- Nuclear: 20.2%
- Fuel Oil: 0.7%
- Hydro: 6.9%
- Non-Hydro Renewables: 3.6%
- Other: 0.8%

Electric Companies use a diverse mix of fuels to generate electricity.
**Different Regions of the Country Use Different Fuel Mixes to Generate Electricity**

*Includes generation by agricultural waste, landfill gas recovery, municipal solid waste, wood, geothermal, non-wood waste, wind, and solar.

** Includes generation by tires, batteries, chemicals, hydrogen, pitch, purchased steam, sulfur, and miscellaneous technologies.

Sum of components may not add to 100% due to independent rounding.
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Maintain Access to Capital and Cost Recovery

- Wall Street restructuring: access to capital markets and increasing cost of capital for needed utility investments
  - As a capital-intensive industry, reduced access to capital markets at higher costs places a premium on enhanced liquidity and financial flexibility

- PUC approvals processes
  - Approval of Integrated Resources Plans (IRPs)
  - Prudence review of expenditures
  - Least-cost compliance demonstration
  - Avoiding stranded assets (aka premature or improper shutdowns and retirements)
  - Coordination within a state or region – integrated resource planning requirements, reliability organizations
Negotiate Myriad Political Landscapes

- **State**
  - Regulatory and legislative initiatives
  - State/regional GHG programs (AB 32, RGGI, WCI, etc.)

- **Federal**
  - EPA – air, ash, water and greenhouse gas regulation
  - FERC – transmission siting, energy efficiency, market design

- **Administration and Congress**
  - President’s push for a Clean Energy Standard
  - EPA (de)funding?
  - Proposals for regulatory delays
II. Today’s Landscape for Strategic Decisions
## Coal Units by Age, Capacity and Emissions
### U.S. Generating Units, 10 Year Increments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Units*</th>
<th>Generating Units</th>
<th>Total Nameplate Capacity</th>
<th>Total Net Generation Year 2008</th>
<th>Total CO₂ Emissions Year 2008</th>
<th>Total SO₂ Emissions Year 2008</th>
<th>Total NOₓ Emissions Year 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td># Percent of Total</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>GWH</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10 Years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>19,788</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>78,261</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Years</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>541,408</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 Years</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>122.5</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>724,206</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 Years</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>316,029</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 Years</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>187,473</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70 Years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 70 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0003%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Unit Totals</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>329.95</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,868,336</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ventyx, Inc.—EV Suite

MTon = million tons

* Does not include units that came online in 2009
Announced Coal Plant Retirements

- IOUs have announced plans to retire ~20 GW of coal-fired generation between 2010 and 2022
  - ~6% of the coal fleet in 2010
  - Most will be 50-60 years old upon retirement
  - Variety of reasons – fuel and/or compliance costs, consent decrees, age, etc.
  - Some will be replaced with natural gas, which will significantly reduce SO₂, mercury and CO₂ emissions at those plants
- TVA and other non-IOU power entities have announced plans to retire more than 1,000 MW of coal-fired generation
  - TVA may add another 3,700 MW of retirements by 2017
Possible Timeline for Environmental Regulatory Requirements for the Utility Industry

**Ozone (O₃)**
- Revised Ozone NAAQS
- Begin CAIR Phase I Seasonal NOx Cap
- CAIR Vacated
- CAIR Remanded
- CAIR Phase I Annual SO2 Cap
- SO2 Primary NAAQS
- NO2 Primary NAAQS
- CO₂ Regulation (PSD/BACT)
- Final Transport Rule Expected (CAIR Replacement)

**SOx/NOx**
- SO₂ Primary NAAQS Revision
- Final Transport Rule Expected (CAIR Replacement)
- SOx/NOx Secondary NAAQS

**CAIR/Transport**
- Effluent Guidelines proposed rule expected
- Effluent Guidelines Final rule expected
- 316(b) final rule expected

**Water**
- Effluent Guidelines Final rule expected
- Effluent Guidelines Compliance 3-5 yrs after final rule

**PM/PM2.5**
- 316(b) Compliance 3-4 yrs after final rule
- 316(b) final rule expected
- 316(b) Compliance 3-4 yrs after final rule
- PM Transport Rule

**Ash**
- Final Transport Rule
- Transport Rule Phase II Reductions
- Transport Rule Phase I Reductions

**Hg/HAPS**
- Final Transport Rule
- Transport Rule Phase II Reductions
- Transport Rule Phase I Reductions

**CO₂**
- GHG NSPS Proposal
- HAPs MACT final rule expected
- HAPs MACT Compliance 3 yrs after final rule
- Begin Compliance Requirements under Final CCB Rule (ground water monitoring, double liners, closure, dry ash conversion)

**Effluent Guidelines**
- Effluent Guidelines Compliance 3-5 yrs after final rule
National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)

- New 1-hour NO₂ and SO₂ standard in 2010
- Will tighten ozone and PM standards in 2011 and 2012, respectively
  - New ozone and PM standards will drive additional new Transport Rules
- NAAQS continually ratcheted down over time
- State Implementation Plans: EGUs in bulls-eye due to perceived cost-effectiveness
Transport Rule

- Final Transport Rule expected by June 30, 2011
  - Proposal affects power companies in 31 eastern states
  - Emission budgets for NOx and/or SO2 (both for most states)
- Some EEI member companies able to meet requirements due to combination of individual company approaches to addressing environmental issues, state requirements, fuel mix, and settlement agreements; other EEI members have concerns:
  - New reduction requirements must be met only 6 and 30 months after rule is finalized
  - Provides little long-term certainty – requirements will be superseded soon by subsequent Transport Rules addressing the 2010 ozone standards and the 2011 PM standards
  - Constraints on emissions trading
Mercury / HAPs Regulation

- Proposed March 15, 2011 (publication in *Federal Register* pending); November 2011 final rule publication — required by consent decree

- 3-yr compliance timeline after final rule; State have authority to grant 1-yr extension under limited circumstances

- Mercury: numeric emission limit for lignite (coal less than 8,300 Btu/lb), other coal and IGCC—equivalent to a 91 percent reduction from uncontrolled mercury levels in the coal burned

- Acid gases: hydrogen chloride (HCl) numeric emission limit as a surrogate, with an alternate surrogate of SO₂—equivalent to a 91 percent reduction.

- Non-mercury metals: numeric emission limit for total PM as a surrogate, with alternate surrogate of total metals or individual metals

- Organics (including dioxin): Work practice standards requiring the implementation of an annual performance test program
Estimate of annualized compliance costs to the power industry in 2015 are $10.9 billion (2007$) and approximately $10 billion in 2020 and 2030.

EPA projects approximately 9.9 GW of coal-based generation may be retired by 2015.

EPA projects the installation of:
- 81 GW of dry scrubbing controls – 56 GW of dry sorbent injection and 25 GW of dry flue gas desulfurization
- 93 GW of activated carbon injection
- 166 GW of fabric filters (baghouses)

EPA claims this proposed rule will yield annual monetized benefits (in 2007$) of between $59-140 billion (using a 3 percent discount rate).
Cooling Water Intake Structures 316(b)

- Proposed rule signed March 28, 2011; EPA is required to finalize the rule by July 27, 2012

- The proposed rule leaves much to the discretion of the permit writer (and the EPA Region that reviews the permit)

- In general, the rule sets separate standards for impingement mortality and entrainment mortality for units with design intake rates above 2 million gallons per day (MGD)

- There will be a 90 comment period from the time the proposal appears in the *Federal Register*

- EPA estimates the total annualized cost of the rule at $383.8 million
Coal Combustion Residuals (CCR)

- Co-proposal of two options in June (75 Fed. Reg. 35128):
  - Subtitle C, “Special” hazardous waste listing; Subtitle D regulations
  - Beneficial use exempt from regulation
  - Soliciting input on other options, restrictions on beneficial use
- Subtitle C option would reverse 1993 & 2000 Regulatory Determinations
- Majority of states, ash recyclers, industry groups, large number in Congress oppose hazardous waste regulations
- Will significantly impact operations: closure of ash ponds, construction of additional disposal capacity, reductions in beneficial use
- Comments submitted Nov. 2010; Final Rule expected 2012
What is the Potential Impacts of these EPA Rules on Existing Generation Fleet?

- Numerous analyses on potential impacts of EPA rulemaking
- Every analysis uses different assumptions making comparison difficult
- Estimates of cumulative coal plant retirement range from ~30 to 70 GW
- Very few of the analyses consider future regulation of CO2
- Addressing GHG emissions and EPA regulations will be costly
  - Could cost up to $200 billion in additional CAPEX by 2015
  - Industry already has capital expenditures of $80 billion annually
GHG Regulation

- Motor vehicle GHG regulation forces stationary source GHG regulation
- EPA Tailoring Rule modified permitting rules to exclude small sources (at least for several years)
  - Legal basis uncertain – numerous lawsuits because CAA reinterpreted by EPA
- Affected sources must go through Best Available Control Technology (BACT) reviews – EPA guidance in late 2010
- GHG NSPS being developed for fossil power generators and refineries, including for existing sources
Climate Legislation

- Progress during 111th Congress, but Senate unable to close the deal
- Some House members taking hits for “yes” votes on Waxman-Markey
- Prospects in 112th Congress?
  - Cap-and-trade is on life support
  - All proposals have same problem: need 60 votes
- EPA regulatory activity remains a catalyst
State Climate Activities

- Regional programs continuing, albeit at different levels
  - RGGI (12 states)
  - MGGA (6 states)
  - WCI (6 states)

- CA law to take effect in 2012; some uncertainty due to recent court decision

- Overall state activity could increase in absence of federal legislation...

- ... *but* level of state opposition to increased costs in this economic landscape also is growing
Some courts have allowed states/individuals to sue GHG emitters under common law tort principles:

- **AEP v. Connecticut (U.S. Dec. 6, 2010):** Federal common law action that seeks CO2 emissions reductions from five electric utilities; Supreme Court review granted and oral arguments scheduled for April 19, 2011.

- **Comer v. Murphy Oil (U.S., Jan. 10, 2011):** Federal and state tort law suit that seeks monetary damages from CO2 emitters for Hurricane Katrina impacts; Supreme Court denied review of 5th Circuit decision, effectively reinstating district court decision barring suit.

- **Kivalina v. ExxonMobil:** Native community seeking damages for moving village because of rising sea levels; district court disallowed suit, but appeal pending in 9th Circuit.

In absence of legislation, tort suits against GHG emitters are expected to increase, following tobacco and asbestos precedents.
Summary of Industry’s Predicament

- Industry will need to comply with pending EPA regulations on air, water, and coal ash on or around 2015
  - Will require retrofit, retirement or replacement of substantial portion of existing coal fleet in short period of time
  - Could impact reliability; need to assess feasibility; regional differences
- Yet, without a long-term carbon policy, industry faces the possibility of stranded investments
- Need both a satisfactory resolution of the current regulatory challenges and a long-term legislative solution on carbon to allow for the most efficient transition to a cleaner generation fleet
III. Additional Considerations
Attributes of Natural Gas

“Natural gas is the cleanest fossil fuel. It emits:
- Approximately 80% less sulfur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide per megawatt hour (MWh) than coal;
- No mercury or particulates;
- And, 55% less carbon dioxide per MWh than coal”

“Forward natural gas prices are lower than coal on a dollars per MWh basis and are expected to stay lower until 2020”

“Gas usage in the utility sector was up an average of 6% year over year for the first half of 2010 compared to 2009”

1. Speech by Exelon CEO John Rowe, March 8, 2011, to the American Enterprise Institute
U.S. Shale – A Game Changer?
Gas Production Potential

Source: Tristone Capital, Devon Energy
Nominal Natural Gas Price for Electric Power (AEO 2011 Ref. Case)

Average Growth Rate (2009-2035) = 3.3%

U.S. Energy Information Administration
Independent Statistics and Analysis
Background:

Since Congress passed the Staggers Rail Act of 1980, more than 40 mergers and consolidations have decreased the number of Class 1 railroads from over 40 to only seven.

Four of these major railroads control more than 94 percent of the industry’s revenue and own over 90 percent of the country’s track miles.

(i.e., there is a lack of rail-to-rail competition, which has led to an increase in the number of captive shippers, rising rail rates, and, some would argue, deterioration in service quality.

Over 60% of the coal produced in the U.S. is shipped via rail.

Approximately 98% of sub-bituminous coal (i.e., PRB) is transported via rail.
Potential Concerns

- While some utilities own coal cars and spur tracks, they are usually dependent on only one of 4 major railroads for shipments.

- The decreased energy demand (recession), plus near-term retirement of smaller, older plants and early retirement for some number of additional plants due to new EPA regulations may impact the amount of coal shipped by rail, especially out of the Midwest, which may or may not initiate better transportation rates for utilities.
IV. Concluding Remarks