Joe,

Here's our current set of energy efficiency policy scans (we are working more on a few others). Also, here's a new ACE3 report on how energy eff. programs (which would be expanded if we adopt a public benefit trust fund) could reduce peak demand. Hope you put this to good use.

Howard Heller
Clean Coal Technologies – N/A

Issue Description: Coal currently provides the basis for over 50% of the electricity generated in the United States and, as the demand for electricity grows, has the potential to play an even greater role in the future as coal is the most abundant and lowest cost domestic fossil fuel available. However, there has been virtually no change in total coal fired capacity over the last decade with new capacity coming on line barely sufficient to replace retiring capacity. This is because power generators are concerned about ever-increasing stringency of regulation of criteria pollutants, while at the same time they are concerned about investment risk in a rapidly de-regulated marketplace. These concerns can be answered in part by new technologies that have been developed under DOE’s Clean Coal technology Program. This program, which was established in 1984 to demonstrate the commercial feasibility of coal-based generation technologies to control emissions of criteria pollutants, is now focused on demonstrating advanced, more efficient coal combustion technologies. While several of these technologies have been successfully demonstrated, they have not yet achieved widespread commercial deployment. The CCT program currently consists of 40 projects, 30 of which are expected to be completed by the end of FY 2000. The combined commitment of the federal government and the private sector totals $5.4 billion, 66% of which has come from the private sector. It is important to note that industry participants are required to submit a plan to repay the government for its share when the project is successfully commercialized.

The Bush Administration has proposed spending of $2 billion over the next ten years for clean coal. To have the greatest impact these funds should be directed to two areas: 1) incentives for the deployment of the already developed technologies in the market place and 2) expansion of the program dollars to address technologies that reduce emissions of the criteria pollutants to an even greater extent while also addressing the need to improve combustion efficiencies in coal based units.

Status: Incentives (tax credits) to encourage early commercial applications of advanced coal-based generation technologies, along with incentives for installation of more efficient control technologies in existing plants were included in legislation introduced as S. 3253 in the 106th Congress. These provisions will be reintroduced in 2001 and support for these tax credit incentives will move commercialization of new coal fired generating technologies forward at a rapid rate. Additional information is included at an attachment.

The budget request for Clean Coal Technologies should be included in the DOE budget requests submitted to the Congress in February, 2001.

Key Issues/Decisions: Should the Administration support incentives to encourage early commercial applications of advanced coal based generation?

What existing clean coal research programs should be expanded or contracted and what new programs should be proposed during the upcoming budget process?

Recommendations: Support legislation that provides a 10% investment tax credit for investments in systems of continuous emissions controls retrofitted to existing coal-based electricity generation units; establishes the same ITC for investment for advanced coal based generating technologies that meet new efficiency standards for both new and repowered units. This would result in significant capacity additions to the electricity generating fleet, additions that are needed to meet current and growing electricity demands, and additions that would allow greater use of coal with lower emissions and greater efficiencies.

To meet demands over the longer term, additional research is required. The current DOE program “Vision 21” a program to develop power plants with near zero emissions, should be accelerated. Research should be focused on supercritical and ultra supercritical plans, advanced gasification/combustion hybrid systems, and on CO2 sequestration options. This research should address the three criteria pollutants (SO2, NOx, Mercury) and should be designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as well.

Timing: The Budget goes to Congress in February, appropriations hearings follow with initial decisions in late spring. Comprehensive energy legislation, including S. 3253, is expected to be actively considered in the first session. The legislation will be introduced by Sen. Murkowski (R-AK) and others in the Senate and Rep. Joe Barton (R-TX) and others in the House.
OUTLINE
The National Electricity and Environmental Technology Act

Title I Accelerated technology research and development program for new and existing coal-based generation facilities
- Authorizes the Secretary, in consultation with the private sector, to establish R&D cost and performance goals that can be achieved by 2007, 2015 and 2020 by existing and new coal-based generation facilities.
- Authorizes the Secretary to study the technologies capable of achieving the performance goals and make recommendations for the programs required to develop those technologies.
- Authorizes the appropriations necessary to carry out the R&D program to advance the technologies identified in the study as being capable of achieving the cost and performance goals.
- Authorizes the Secretary to carry out a power plant improvement initiative that will demonstrate commercial applications to new and existing plants of coal-based technologies that will advance the efficiency, environmental performance and cost competitiveness beyond that of facilities in service or demonstrated to date.
- Authorizes 50% private sector cost sharing along with the use of uncommitted Clean Coal Technology program funds to provide the federal share of the demonstration projects.

Title II Tax credits for emission reductions and efficiency improvements in existing coal-based generating facilities
- Establishes a 10% investment tax credit for investments in systems of continuous emissions controls retrofitted to existing coal-based electricity generating units.
- Establishes a production tax credit (0.34 cents/kWh) for the first 10 years of electricity output from existing coal-based generation units that are repowered with qualifying clean coal technologies.

Title III Tax credits for early commercial applications of advanced coal-based generating technologies
- Establishes a 10% investment tax credit for investment in qualifying advanced coal-based generating technologies for use in new or repowered units.
- Establishes an efficiency-based production tax credit for electricity generated during the first 10 years of operation of a new or repowered unit using qualified advanced coal-based generation technologies. In subsequent years, eligible technologies must achieve increasingly higher levels of efficiency to qualify for the credits.
- Establishes a risk pool amounting to 5% of the cost of the new technologies to help defray the cost of any modifications necessary to achieve design performance levels.

Title IV Refundable or offset credits for electric cooperatives, publicly owned electric utilities and the Tennessee Valley Authority
- Establishes refundable or offset tax credits for electric cooperatives and publicly owned electric utilities.
- Establishes an offset against payments required as an annual return on appropriations by the Tennessee Valley Authority.
TO: Julie Moore  
Director, Energy Department Advisory Committee  

FROM: Jack Gerard  
President & CEO, National Mining Association  

SUBJECT: Answers to Questions Dated 01/05/01  

I. Are there any critical issues that you think rise to the Presidential level for decision in the first year of the new Administration?  

- Enactment of comprehensive national energy policy legislation.  

II. If a short list of top issues facing DOE were being developed, are there any issues that you think should be on that list?  

- **National Energy Policy.** Enactment of comprehensive national energy policy legislation. Recent events clearly demonstrate that America's energy supply infrastructure, including our electric power generating capacity, is perilously strained to meet our growing energy demand. Very little has been done to enhance this infrastructure in recent years, often due to perceived conflict with environmental restrictions. DOE must take a lead role in developing a workable national energy policy. This must include the enactment of comprehensive national energy policy legislation which incorporates incentives for the electric power industry to build new facilities using advanced clean coal technologies and to retrofit existing facilities.  

- **Climate Change.** The Department of Energy should take a lead role in developing and advocating an energy policy component of the Administration’s global climate change policy.  
  - **Domestically:** CO₂ and other non-pollutant greenhouse gasses should only be addressed in the context of climate change, not under the Clean Air Act as part of any “multi-pollutant” strategy.  
  - **Internationally:** There will be a good deal of international pressure to try to complete agreement on all the outstanding issues surrounding the Kyoto Protocol so that countries might begin the ratification process. DOE should take the lead in developing and facilitating the deployment of technologies to address the potential threat of climate change by reducing and/or sequestering greenhouse gas emissions. DOE could take the lead in urging this new path as a substitute for Kyoto.
III. Please identify any other major issues (including budget issues) that you think will require Secretarial involvement.

- Additional funding for CCT Program, in addition to basic coal research, development and demonstration. Considering coal's role in meeting the nation's current and projected energy needs, the funding for coal-specific research, development and demonstration is relatively low compared to research budgets for other sources of energy.

- Under increased funding for Fossil Energy research and development, emphasis should be placed on: the capture and sequestration of CO₂, and additional funding needed for the National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL).

- DOE should fund an evaluation of the most cost-effective mercury control technologies within a spectrum of sub-categories.

- To meet outstanding obligations and support additional Mining Industry of the Future research projects, FY 02 funding allocations for the Office of Industrial Technologies should be increased to at least $10 million. Fossil Energy's co-funding of Mining IOF projects, through their advanced separations and carbon product research programs should be encouraged and funds appropriated accordingly. Additional funding of $3 million should be allocated to the NETL in FY 02 to support university mining-related research.

IV Are you aware of any significant challenges that will face the new Administration in any of the following areas: Congress, private sector, public sector, interest groups, public perceptions, or the press?

- Congress: enactment of comprehensive national energy policy legislation.

Private/public/press/interest groups: DOE needs to develop and implement a broad-scope, intensive public outreach/education campaign to demonstrate to the public the need to develop our domestic energy resource base, and to transport and use those resources in an environmentally sound manner.

V. Are there any major management or administrative issues that need to be addressed?

- The DOE needs to have an enhanced role in Interagency review/decision-making process on issues affecting access to domestic resources (Department of the Interior), and resource use (Environmental Protection Agency), including global climate change.
The DOE's involvement in the review of EPA's PBT list for metals (currently at OMB) were particularly useful and should continue. In addition, the DOE should complete its metals study.

Proposals to merge the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Office with the Office of Fossil Energy, have been the subject of legislative hearings in recent years. The notion of combining these offices could have serious implications for current coal research programs and coal policy determinations for its future utilization; therefore, these proposals should be rejected.

VI. Are there any significant administrative actions (organizational changes, executive orders, directives, program letters, rulemakings, or lawsuits) that should be reviewed early in the new Administration?

Energy Information Administration (EIA): collection of utility data on fuel purchases and consumption. Electric utilities and non-utility generators have historically been required to provide FERC, and thus EIA, with monthly reports on fuel purchases, fuel consumption and stockpiles. Approval to continue collection of this data is languishing at the OMB. EIA should urge a speedy decision by OMB to renew the requisite forms so that data collection of important information can be resumed. This is especially important in view of the electricity and energy problems facing many parts of the country. Without information, policy makers are acting in a vacuum and decisions that must be made regarding electricity supplies are not informed decisions.

VII. What are the critical pending administrative actions?

- No response to this question.

VIII. Please provide any other information you feel would be helpful.

- DOE should make a formal request of the Clean Air Science Advisory Committee to review the upcoming particulate matter (PM) criteria document expected to be released by EPA in February as part of the periodic review of National Ambient Air Quality Standards, and prepare a report for DOE. The report should assess whether the scientific knowledge exists on the health effects of PM to confidently draw the distinction between the contribution of indoor air versus outdoor air; utility versus other source contributions; and, PM versus confounding factors. The report should also contain an assessment of the gaps that should be filled prior to regulation.

- DOE should continue its investigation regarding speciation of mercury in power plants and their emissions.
DOE should evaluate the electric supply impacts of EPA’s restrictions on necessary repairs and replacements for operation of power plants under its New Source Review Rule.
COMPREHENSIVE
ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION
A Simple Idea That Could Pay Huge Dividends

- Coal-fired power plants are currently subject to over 100 major Clean Air Act requirements and face dozens of new requirements.
- These requirements are duplicative, piecemeal and unnecessarily expensive.
- They have also failed to deliver on their clean air goals.
- All sides benefit when we substitute an integrated emissions reduction strategy that provides industry with flexible mechanisms and long lead times, yet locks in emissions reductions.
EPA's Current and Proposed NOx Regulations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title IV NOx Phase 1</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx NSPS</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR enforcement initiative</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV NOx Phase 2</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx SIP call</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx state petitions</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S./Canada NOx treaty</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (8-hour) NAAQS</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5 NAAQS</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional haze/Class I area visibility</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future NAAQS revisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dates reflect actual or potential implementation of emission controls.
And EPA's Current and Proposed SO₂ Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Title IV SO₂ Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>NSR enforcement initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Title IV SO₂ Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Possible short-term SO₂ NAAQS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Possible Title IV SO₂ Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>PM2.5 NAAQS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Regional haze/Class I area visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future NAAQS revisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dates reflect actual or potential implementation of emission controls*

Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
The comprehensive approach can be an integral component of a national energy strategy

- Industry benefits from the ability to manage expenditures on assets effectively, due to adequate lead times and regulatory certainty
- Air quality benefits are achieved from measurable emissions reductions by a date certain rather than through endless litigation delaying air quality improvements
- Clean generation will become economically viable as more companies will need to meet these targets
- Natural gas markets stressed, this can help to maintain fuel diversity
- Business certainty helps generators make appropriate power supply decisions
The comprehensive approach trades regulatory chaos for a single set of rational, long-term emission reduction targets

- A comprehensive emissions reduction approach includes several elements:
  - Nitrogen oxides (NOx) reductions
  - Sulfur dioxides (SO₂) reductions
  - Mercury (Hg) reductions
  - Possible greenhouse gas component
  - New Source Review (NSR) reform
  - Flexibility mechanisms
  - Financial incentives

- Requires congressional action
The Holy Grail

- Establishes a single set of reduction requirements with adequate lead times and market-based implementation mechanisms
- Ensures utilities will make more effective use of their compliance dollars
- Lowers costs of emission reductions, thereby keeping electric rates affordable
- Facilitates creative approaches to a broader menu of emission reductions, allowing greater reductions in a timely manner
- Consistent with air quality and public health goals established in the Clean Air Act
In sum, the comprehensive approach makes sense from many perspectives.

- Society gains from lower costs
- Air quality gains from more certain reductions
- Electricity sector gains from greater certainty and flexibility
Bonneville Power Administration
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BPA strikes load reduction deal with Alcoa

PORTLAND, Ore. – The Bonneville Power Administration and Alcoa Inc. have agreed on
150 megawatts of reduction in electrical consumption at the company’s Wenatchee smelter
beginning this week. The action will help keep power flowing to Northwest consumers and save
Columbia River water for fish during this year’s energy shortage.

“Alcoa has responded to our call for load reduction in a way that will reduce BPA’s costs
and involve no forced terminations of employees for the duration of this agreement with BPA,”
said Steve Wright, BPA acting administrator.

The production curtailment is expected to be temporary. Similar to many other load
management programs being initiated across the West under these extremely high priced market
conditions, BPA is seeking mutually beneficial arrangements to “buy back” power from large
industrial consumers.

BPA will pay Alcoa for the reduced power consumption at a price that is “less than
market prices but at a level that still benefits Alcoa and keeps employees whole” Wright added.
“This is a good outcome for both consumers and the company’s workers.”

This differs from a transaction with Golden Northwest Aluminum announced earlier in
which BPA resells power at market rates and the benefits are divided between the agency and the
company. Alcoa’s contract, which extends through June, contains other terms.

-more-
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Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
In a separate transaction involving no payments, BPA agreed to shift a portion of the power scheduled to Alcoa's Intalco smelter at Ferndale, Wash., from January and February to March and April. This will make more power available to other Northwest consumers in the first two months when it's most needed.

###
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Obtained and made public by the Natural Resources Defense Council, March/April 2002
Power sales to benefit company and ratepayers

PORTLAND, Ore. – The Bonneville Power Administration and Golden Northwest Aluminum Inc. have agreed on a plan to re-market electricity purchased by the company and use some of the revenue to benefit plant employees and Northwest ratepayers.

Golden Northwest Aluminum purchases electricity under contract from BPA to produce aluminum at smelters in Goldendale, Wash., and The Dalles, Ore. The company announced Tuesday that it was further curtailing production at the facilities and reselling the power at current market rates.

The re-sale of power through September should generate about $400 million in revenue, the actual amount depending on market prices. Under Golden Northwest's agreement with BPA, proceeds from the sales would be used as follows:

- To benefit Northwest ratepayers by dedicating 20-25 percent of the proceeds, or about $100 million, to BPA to help defray the agency's costs of operating in the current market, which is characterized by high and extremely volatile costs;
- To invest up to $100 million in a new gas-fueled combustion turbine and a wind energy project that will benefit the Northwest's power system;
- To continue paying wages and benefits to employees of the smelters during the period that the smelters are operating at a reduced level of production;

-more-
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• To cover the costs of curtailing operations at the plants;

• To make other investments that improve the long-term competitiveness of the plants.

"This transaction will mean economic security for workers, better long-term prospects for the smelters and, we expect, more energy for the region," said Bill Richardson, U.S. Energy Secretary. "If other Northwest aluminum producers curtail production in the next few months, they should look to this agreement as a model."

Stephen Wright, BPA administrator, said the agreement is a positive outcome for Northwest ratepayers given the fact that Golden Northwest has a right to remarket the power under existing contracts.

"The revenues will help offset BPA’s increasing costs due to skyrocketing market prices," he said. "The proceeds will also help Golden Northwest Aluminum to deal with higher electricity prices in the next few years. In the longer term, the revenue should help the company to secure its own sources of power so that it no longer has to rely on direct purchases from BPA to operate economically."

Brett Wilcox, CEO of Golden Northwest, said the agreement was necessary because of the unprecedented high level of price volatility in the West Coast markets. The company had reduced production by about 40 percent in September due to the cost of non-BPA power purchases needed to run the plants at full capacity in this current round of curtailments, production is being cut back to about 10 percent of capacity.

Wright said two other aluminum producers in the region, Kaiser and Columbia Falls Aluminum, have similar re-marketing rights under contracts signed in 1995. The contracts allow them to re-market the power in order to mitigate the risk of having to purchase BPA power when aluminum markets are poor and production is curtailed. In 1995, when BPA executed these agreements, no one contemplated that power markets would be as high and as volatile as they have been in recent months.

Under the agreement, Golden Northwest will invest in new generating facilities but may purchase power if such purchases appear to better serve the long-term economic prospects of the plants. Golden Northwest would use the power from such investments and purchases to supplement the subscription power the plants will buy from BPA under new contracts after September 30, 2001.

In the contract, Golden Northwest agrees that it has no right under current law to receive direct service from BPA after Sept. 30, 2006, and the contract requires that the company refrain from making any political or legal case that it does have such a right.
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BPA inks an innovative aluminum agreement with McCook Metals

PORTLAND, Ore. - BPA and McCook Metals Group (McCook) have signed an agreement intended to ensure the long-term viability of the Longview aluminum smelter, benefit Northwest ratepayers served by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), and help save much needed water for fish.

"The incredibly high market prices we are currently experiencing creates the opportunity for this transaction," said BPA Acting Administrator Steve Wright. "This agreement will lower costs for Northwest ratepayers, preserve water for fish, provide compensation for Longview employees while the plant is shutdown, create financing for new resources the region needs and lead to the Longview plant being off the BPA system after 2006."

The agreement calls for removing 420 average megawatts (one third the power needed to run a city the size of Seattle) of demand from the BPA system at a time when BPA's resources are stretched to the limit due to a near-record low water year and soaring energy prices. BPA will purchase McCook's 420 average megawatts at less than half the market price.

McCook will purchase and renovate the Longview smelter, previously owned by Reynolds Metals and Alcoa, creating a state-of-the-art, energy efficient smelter operation. The company will use revenues from the power sale to BPA to secure financing and, at the same time, provide full wages and benefits to its employees for the duration of the curtailment.

-more-
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Michael Lynch, Chairman of McCook Metals said, "By demonstrating our commitment to the region's power needs, the long-term future of the plant, and the security of our employees, we have secured a prosperous future for Longview Aluminum. The arrangements will serve as a model for the future of the industry."

McCook will voluntarily curtail some portion of the output at the Longview plant for a 16-month period, reducing demand on BPA. Between March and September 30th of this year, BPA will purchase power from McCook at less than half the current market price. BPA is able to get such an attractive price because unlike Golden Northwest and Columbia Falls, Reynolds Metals did not have remarketing rights in their contract with BPA. Between October 2001 and April 2002, BPA will get the power back from McCook at virtually no cost. Beginning in April of 2002, BPA will supply McCook 100 average megawatts for plant operation.

"Not having to serve this load next winter is a tremendous benefit to Northwest ratepayers because we will not have to go out and buy power on the open market" said Wright.

McCook also will work with Enron to develop a 500-megawatt combustion turbine plant that will provide power for smelter operations at the Longview plant. McCook is confident that the new station will meet all its power needs. With this new resource, McCook has agreed to make no claims on BPA power after 2006 and support new legislation that would assure that they would be off the system after 2006.

McCook metals is the second largest aluminum plate company in North America, producing specialty products for aircraft, aerospace and defense industries, such as aluminum-lithium alloy plate for NASA's Space Shuttle Program and for military aircraft.
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