

EMF Scenario Design (Second-Round) Highlights:

Baseline case:

- Please use 2009 AEO Stimulus reference case, focusing on oil prices and real GDP.
- Link for variables reported in Annual Energy Outlook 2009 AEO stimulus reference case: <http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/servicerpt/stimulus/index.html>
- Extensions beyond 2030 (end of AEO projections) will require modeler assumptions. They might be calibrated to be consistent extensions of (but necessarily equal to) the AEO trends over the last 5 or 10 years of their projection. Please discuss with EMF headquarters if you need further guidance.
- Standardize on your model's exogenous variables (maybe GDP) with this reference case.
- If oil prices are endogenous and you usually consider a range of price paths, please try to select one that is closer to AEO 2009 stimulus results.
- Please report as many fuel prices shown in the EMF model output worksheet as you can. This effort will be helpful for comparing results across models.
- EIA has included the following programs from The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) in its Stimulus reference case: Weatherization and assisted housing, Energy efficiency and conservation block grant programs, State energy programs, energy efficiency funding for Federal buildings, Plug-in hybrid vehicle tax credit, Electric vehicle tax credit, Updated tax credits for renewables, Loan guarantees for renewables and biofuels, Support for carbon capture and storage (CCS), and Smart grid expenditures.

Carbon tax case:

- All taxes are adjusted for inflation and are expressed in 2007\$.
- All energy sources are taxed at \$30 per ton of carbon dioxide equivalent in 2010.
- Tax rate is increased by 5%, inflation adjusted, each year.
- Please assume that all tax revenues are recycled back to the economy in as neutral a manner as possible. In computable general equilibrium models, this assumption means that revenues are returned to households as a lump-sum, equal dividend to each household. In models with aggregate demand macroeconomic relationships, this procedure may require that the federal deficit will not change. No specific government energy-efficiency or other targeted program should be financed with these revenues. Please discuss with EMF staff if you still have a question.

General energy sales tax case:

- All energy sources are taxed at the same 15% excise tax rate (approximately, \$2.50 per million BTU in 2010). New price = reference price x (1.15) in 2010.
- All percent taxes (15%) are applied to delivered not primary energy.
- Please see attached Table 1 for derivation of this tax.
- BTU tax level is increased by 5%, inflation adjusted, each year. Tax level (\$/MMBTU) in 2011 = tax level (\$/MMBTU) in 2010 x (1.05), etc.
- Please use the same revenue recycling assumptions as in the carbon tax case.

Residential, Commercial and Transportation Sector Standards:

- There appears to be some merit in considering standards and equipment cost subsidies separately rather than as one “all-in” policy package. This revision is the major change between the cases discussed at the meeting.
- Building Codes increase as specified in the Waxman-Markey Bill. See attached Table 2.
- Energy-efficiency standards are improved for selected new building and equipment in the residential and commercial sectors.
- Light vehicle fuel economy standards are increased to President Obama’s proposed standards that require a minimum passenger car fuel economy of 39 miles per gallon and a light truck fuel economy of 30 miles per gallon by model year 2016. The standards are ramped up linearly for model years 2012 through 2016 and held constant after 2016. Table 3 provides the CAFE standards in the form of minimum fuel economy requirements and as parameter values for NHTSA’s continuous function formula that is used to determine minimum fuel economy by vehicle footprint.
- New equipment with energy efficiencies below these standards are not allowed to enter the market.
- Please contact EMF headquarters if you need additional guidance on implementing this case.

Reduced Costs for New Equipment:

- Case can be considered as either a subsidy for new capital costs or the benefits of successful RD&D.
- Reduce the capital costs of new energy-efficiency units in the residential and commercial sectors.
- For each new unit with energy efficiency that exceeds the least efficient unit available (i.e., the current standard), please reduce its cost by 50% of the difference between its cost relative to the least efficient unit available (i.e. the current standard).
- Please contact EMF headquarters if you need additional guidance on implementing this case.

Standards with Carbon Fee: Combine assumptions for carbon fee and standards.

Reduced Equipment Costs with Carbon Fee: Combine assumptions for carbon fee and reduced costs for new equipment.

7% Solution or “Magic Bullet”:

- “Magic Bullet” is a diagnostic rather than a policy scenario. Since it ignores possible cost implications of reducing the discount rate, there will be no efforts to see if society’s welfare improves.
- Consumers select energy equipment based solely upon costs using a 7% discount rate.
- Please do not adjust other constraints for market barriers, consumer heterogeneity and intangible costs in addition to direct equipment and energy costs. Please do not adjust other assumptions, such as payback periods, diffusion rates, etc.

Removed Scenarios:

- The addition of several new second-round scenarios has required the elimination of two first-round cases: oil taxes and non-price energy conservation programs where consumers selected the most energy-efficient units available during that year.
- Two other cases discussed at the meeting have also not been included: the flat price and frozen technology cases for evaluating the role of prices and other factors in energy intensity trends.

Table 1: Comparable CO2, BTU and Oil Taxes

| | 2010 | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--|-------|--|
| Tax | | | | |
| <u>Carbon</u> | <u>\$30.00</u> | | | \$ per metric ton |
| BTU | \$1.76 | | | \$ per million BTU |
| BTU-delivered | \$2.46 | | | \$ per million BTU |
| Expenditures | \$1,217.94 | | | \$ billion |
| Average Price | \$16.96 | | | \$ per million BTU |
| <u>BTU-delivered %</u> | <u>14.48%</u> | | | |
| BTU x Renew | \$1.85 | | | \$ per million BTU |
| <u>Oil</u> | <u>\$26.85</u> | | | \$ per barrel |
| Levels | | | | |
| CO2 | 5880.08 | | | million metric tons |
| BTU | 99946.39 | | 99.95 | trillion BTU quad (10 ¹⁵) BTU |
| BTU-delivered | 71820.14 | | 71.82 | trillion BTU quad (10 ¹⁵) BTU |
| BTU x Renew | 95215.52 | | 95.22 | million barrels quad (10 ¹⁵) BTU |
| Barrels | 6569.19 | | 6.57 | million barrels billion barrels |
| Revenues | | | | |
| CO2 | \$176,402 | | | million dollars |
| BTU | \$176,402 | | | million dollars |
| BTU-delivered | \$176,402 | | | million dollars |
| BTU x Renew | \$176,402 | | | million dollars |
| Oil | \$176,402 | | | million dollars |
| Oil | | | | |
| conversion | 5.80 | | | |
| Qd BTU | 38.10 | | | |
| B Barrels | 6.57 | | | |
| MMBD | 18.00 | | | |

Yellow values derived from AEO 2009 Reference case.

Oil converted to million barrels and energy to trillion BTU under “Levels”.

Entries under “Tax” show BTU and oil fees needed to equate “Revenues.”

Table 2: Buildings Sector Standards for EMF25 Standards Case

Residential and Commercial – adopt updated building codes as described in the Waxman-Markey proposed legislation

| Residential Products | Date | Level | Installed Cost (\$2007) |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Central AC and Heat Pumps | 2016 | 16 SEER | \$3500 |
| Furnaces (fossil) | 2018 | 90 AFUE | \$2200 |
| Boilers | 2018 | 85 AFUE | \$3400 |
| Refrigerators | 2014 | 460 kWh/yr | \$650 |
| Freezers | 2014 | 350 kWh/yr | \$450 |
| Clothes Dryers (electric) | 2014 | 3.48 EF | \$450 |
| Electric Water Heater | 2013 | .95 EF | \$470 |
| Gas Water Heater | 2013 | .64 EF | \$475 |
| Gas Cooktop | 2012 | .42 EF | \$500 |
| Dishwashers | 2018 | .65 EF | \$750 |
| Room AC | 2014 | 10.8 EER | \$370 |
| Clothes Washers | 2015 | 1.72 MEF | \$750 |
| Linear Fluorescent Lamps | 2012 | 28 watts | \$7.00 |
| Torchiere Lamps | 2016 | 154 watts | \$2.22 |
| Reflector Lamps | 2012 | 50 watts | \$4.10 |

| Commercial Products | Date | Level | Typical Capacity | Installed Cost (\$2007) |
|--|-------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Centrifugal Chillers | 2016 | 6.1 COP | 350 tons | \$425/ton |
| Reciprocating Chillers | 2016 | 2.8 COP | 100-200 tons | \$465/ton |
| Rooftop AC | 2016 | 11.7 EER | 90,000 Btu/hr | \$7800 |
| Rooftop Heat Pump | 2016 | 11.7 EER/ 3.4COP (heat) | 90,000 Btu/hr | \$7800 |
| Gas-fired Furnace | 2012 | 82% Thermal Efficiency | 400,000 Btu/hr | \$3150 |
| Oil-fired Furnace | 2012 | 83% Thermal Efficiency | 400,000 Btu/hr | \$3900 |
| Gas-fired Boiler | 2013 | 85% Combustion Efficiency | 440,000 Btu/hr | \$9000 |
| Supermkt Display Case | 2012 | 21 MWh/yr | 20,000 Btu/hr | \$6078 |
| Supermkt Refrigeration Compressor Rack | 2012 | 1000 MWh/yr | 1,050 MBtu/hr | \$122,550 |
| Supermkt Refrigeration | 2012 | 120 MWh/yr | 1,520 | \$44,120 |

| Commercial Products | Date | Level | Typical Capacity | Installed Cost (\$2007) |
|---|------|--|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Condenser | | | mBtu/hr | |
| Reach-in Refrigerator | 2016 | 2400 kWh/yr | 3,000 Btu/hr | \$2650 |
| Vending Machines | 2012 | 2400 kWh/yr | 700 Btu/hr | \$1639 |
| Automatic Ice Makers | 2015 | 3750 kWh/yr | 500 lbs/day | \$2647 |
| Halogen Reflector Lighting | 2012 | Halogen infrared (IR) | 1172 system lumens | \$70.60* |
| Linear Fluorescent Lighting ≤ 4 foot | 2014 | High efficiency lamps w/ High Efficiency fixture | 3500 system lumens | \$84.30* |
| Metal Halide Lighting | 2015 | system efficacy | system lumens | |
| High Bay Application | | 55.9 lumens/watt | 16250 | \$321.60* |
| Low Bay Application | | 49.5 lumens/watt | 9600 | \$352.00* |

*Commercial lighting costs represent lighting system – include lamps/ballast/fixture + installation

Table 3: CAFE Standards for EMF25 Standards Case

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| Passenger Car | 32.7 | 34.3 | 35.9 | 37.5 | 39.0 |
| Light Truck | 26.4 | 27.1 | 27.8 | 28.6 | 30.0 |
| Parameter Values for Continuous Function Formula | | | | | |
| Passenger Car | | | | | |
| Parameter A | 32.8 | 34.4 | 36.0 | 37.6 | 39.2 |
| Parameter B | 24.9 | 25.8 | 26.6 | 27.5 | 28.4 |
| Parameter C | 51.4 | 51.4 | 51.4 | 51.4 | 51.4 |
| Parameter D | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Light Truck | | | | | |
| Parameter A | 27.9 | 28.7 | 29.4 | 30.2 | 31.0 |
| Parameter B | 21.6 | 22.1 | 22.7 | 23.2 | 23.7 |
| Parameter C | 56.4 | 56.4 | 56.4 | 56.4 | 56.4 |
| Parameter D | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 |