The National Coal Council provides advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy on general policy matters relating to coal and the coal industry.

NCC is a Federal Advisory Committee organized under FACA legislation.
Members are appointed to serve by Secretary of Energy
120-125 members

• **Industry** –
  coal suppliers, utility & industrial consumers & coal transportation
• **Support Services** –
  engineering firms, vendors, consultants & attorneys
• **Academics**
• **NGOs** –
  environmental & trade association reps
• **Government** –
  PUC & state energy officials

More than 30 studies conducted for the Secretary of Energy
Prepared by NCC members at no cost to DOE

**Extensive Range of Topics**
- Carbon Management
- Clean Coal Technologies
- Coal & Coal Technology Exports
- Coal Conversion
- Coal’s Image
- Utility Deregulation
- Climate & Clean Air Regulations
- Building New Coal Power Plants
- Industrial Coal Use
- CCUS for EOR
- Value of Existing Coal Fleet
Secretary Moniz’s Charge to NCC – May 2014

... request the NCC conduct a study that assesses the value of DOE’s Carbon Sequestration Program ... The assessment should address the question: “What is industry's assessment of the progress made by the DOE and others regarding cost, safety, and technical operation of CCS/CCUS?

... In other words, how does industry see and accept major technical findings from the CCS/CCUS community, and how do those relate to DOE programs and investments?

... an assessment based on technical soundness and results to date would provide a welcome perspective from leading companies with experience in CCS/CCUS technology.”
Study Leadership & Lead Authors

- **NCC Chair** – **Jeff Wallace**, VP Fuel Services, Southern Company Svcs
- **Coal Policy Committee Chair** – **Fred Palmer**, Senior VP, Peabody Energy
- **NCC CPC Vice Chair** – **Bill Brownell**, Chairman, Hunton & Williams

- **Study Chair** – **Amy Ericson**, President, Alstom Inc.
- **Technical Chair** – **Carl Bozzuto**, Alstom

- **Lead Authors** –
  - **Holly Krutka**, Shenhua Group
  - **Pam Tomski**, Global CCS Institute
  - **Shannon Angielski**, CURC
  - **Carl Bozzuto**, Alstom
  - **Jeff Phillips**, EPRI
Study at a Glance

“Fossil Forward – Revitalizing CCS: Bringing Scale & Speed to CCC Deployment”

- Executive Summary
- Chapter A: The CCS/CCUS Imperative
- Chapter B: Global Status of CCS/CCUS
- Chapter C: Overview of Current DOE CCS/CCUS Programs – Status & Achievements
- Chapter D: CCS/CCUS Deployment Challenges
- Chapter E: Gap Analysis
- Chapter F: Recommendations
“While DOE is indisputably a world leader in the development of CCS technology, the DOE CCS/CCUS program has not yet achieved critical mass.”

- “Without adequate demonstration there can be no commercialization.”
- “There is no point in capturing CO2 if there is no place to use it or store it.”
>> Magnitude of the Problem

- Current # of demonstration projects in operation or under construction globally = 22
  
  Projected need by 2050 = 3,400

- The current global CO2 storage rate = 40 million tons/year
  
  Projected need = 10 billion tons/year

- Cumulative total CO2 emissions 2050 ~ 2,000 billion tons
  
  Projected “safe” level of emissions = 884 billion tons
The CCS/CCUS Imperative

CCS is the only large-scale technology that can mitigate CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel use for electricity generation and key industrial sectors.

IEA Technology Road Map

Note: numbers in brackets are shares in 2050. For example, 14% is the share of CCS in cumulative emission reductions through 2050, and 17% is the share of CCS in emission reductions in 2050, compared with the 6DS.
Not including CCS as a mitigation technology is projected to increase the overall costs of meeting CO$_2$ emission goals by 70-138%.

Climate Change Mitigation Costs Without CCS and Other Technologies
U.S. CO₂ emissions represent less than 16% of world emissions; global and wide-scale implementation of CCS is necessary to meet GHG goals.
Projected Global Coal Consumption Through 2040
Quadrillion BTU/Year ~ EIA Reference Case
Key Recommendations Overview

- In order to achieve CCS at commercial scale, policy parity with other low/no carbon technologies is required.

- Technology and funding incentives must be significantly better coordinated to be effective.

- DOE program goals need far greater clarity and alignment with commercial technology and funding approaches used by industry.

- Funding for CCS RD&D is limited and must be enhanced and focused.

- Public acceptance continues to be a major hurdle.

- GHG control is an international issue in need of international initiatives.
In order to achieve CCS at commercial scale, policy parity with other low/no carbon technologies is required...

The National Coal Council recommends that:

- DOE take a stronger position on the need for policy parity with respect to funding allocations
- DOE take a stronger position on the need for policy parity with respect to incentive mechanisms and subsidies applied to near zero emission energy technology
Potential Benefit from Policy Parity

- Current capacity by initial year of operation (gigawatts)
- Cumulative total wind capacity (gigawatts)
- 1603 Grant eligibility expires (end of 2011)
- Wind allowed to choose PTC or 30% ITC or 1603 Grant (2009)
- PTC allowed to expire for 10 months (Dec. 2003)
- PTC allowed to expire for 3 months (Dec. 2001)
- PTC allowed to expire for 6 months (Dec. 1999)
- First Minnesota wind mandate (1994)
- Texas RPS (1999)
- RPS policies added in over 25 states (2000-10)
Policy Dis-Parity

- DOE CCS R&D Program = $200+ million annually
- Coal provides about 37-40% of U.S. electricity generation
- DOE Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy = $1.9 billion ($775 million in direct support of renewables)
- Residential rooftop solar provides 0.43% of U.S. electricity generation.
DOE RD&D Budget for Coal: Excluding $3.4 billion Recovery Act Funding

Treasury Grants: Subsidies for Renewable Project Deployment in 2009 Recovery Act = $20 billion
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY Loan Programs
Breakdown by Program and Company (in billions)

Since 2009 the DOE Has Guaranteed $34.7 Billion in Loans

- AREVA: $2 bn
- Georgia Power: $8.3 bn
- Ford Motor: $5.9 bn
- Nissan: $1.5 bn
- ATVM: $16 bn
- 1703: 30% $10.3 bn
- 1705: 46% $16 bn
- NRC Energy: $3.8 bn
  - Abengoa: $2.8 bn
  - NextEra Energy: $2.3 bn
  - Prologis: $1.6 bn
  - Coitnness Energy: $1.3 bn
  - Solar Reserve: $0.7 bn
  - Elexon: $0.6 bn
  - Solvay: $0.3 bn
  - Abound Solar: $0.4 bn
  - Other: $2 bn

Source: U.S. Department of Energy, Loan Programs Office.
Produced by Veronique de Rugy, Mercatus Center at George Mason University.
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Key Recommendation

Funding for CCS RD&D is limited and must be enhanced and focused...

- DOE continue fostering a portfolio of technologies for implementing CCS and “prime the pump” with early stage funding for promising concepts. NCC recommends that after technologies reach TRL 4, DOE cull its support to only those technologies which show a clear promise of meeting or exceeding DOE’s CCS performance goals.

- DOE continue to develop a plan for demonstrating second generation and transformational CCS technologies showing cost and performance advantage at a scale of 25-50 MW by 2020 and make subsequent budget request to carry out the plan.
The National Coal Council recommends that:

- DOE develop a plan to have a total of 5-10 GW of CCS/CCUS demonstration projects in operation in the U.S. by 2025

- DOE expand the RCSP program to identify and certify at least one reservoir in each region that is capable of storing a minimum of 100 million tons of CO2 at a cost of less than $10/ton by 2025

- All federal incentives for CCS demonstration projects undergo a coordinated review for their combined adequacy and effectiveness in supporting CCS deployment in time to achieve the installation of storing a minimum of 100 million tons of CO2 at a cost of less than $10/ton by 2025

- Concerted effort be undertaken by DOE to identify and pursue creative mechanisms to finance CCS/CCUS projects
Funding for DOE programs is inconsistent with DOE goals. DOE programs have been inadequately funded at levels that are insufficient to achieve the aggressive goals of the program.
DOE CCPI Program

CCPI does not appear to have a high success rate. Only a small number of projects have been selected for funding. Ratio of Federal Grant to Total Project Cost = 5-18%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations Ceased</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Applications Submitted</th>
<th>Applications Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total Federal Grant</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Federal Cost Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Energy California</td>
<td>$408 M</td>
<td>$4 B</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Texas Clean Energy</td>
<td>$450 M</td>
<td>$2.5 B</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRG Energy</td>
<td>$167 M</td>
<td>$1 B</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Kemper Energy</td>
<td>$293 M</td>
<td>$6.1 B</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$1.752 B</td>
<td>$13.6 B</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
>> CCS Gap Analysis Assessment

**CCRP Technology Development Timeline**

*An Aggressive Schedule*

### 2nd-Generation

- **2020**
  - R&D Complete
  - Major Components Ready for Demonstration

- **2025**
  - Initial Deployments of Components and Integrated Systems

- **2030**
  - Deployments Attain Full "Nth-of-a-Kind" Potential of R&D Cost and Performance Targets

### Transformational

- **2030**
  - R&D Complete
  - Major Components Ready for Demonstration

- **2035**
  - Initial Deployments of Components and Integrated Systems

- **2040**
  - Deployments Attain Full "Nth-of-a-Kind" Potential of R&D Cost and Performance Targets

NETL
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In 2009, ARRA provided an additional $1 billion to fully fund FutureGen; $800 M to CCPI to enable a 3rd Solicitation for CCS projects; $1.52 billion for an Industrial CCS RFP; and $70 million for geologic storage site characterization and training.
Key Recommendation

**DOE Program Goals need far greater clarity and alignment with Commercial Technology and Funding Approaches Used by Industry...**

- DOE and Industry prioritize projects critical to achieving goals consistent with the need to bring CCS technologies up to Technology Readiness Level 9

- DOE establish interim goals that are more amenable to testing for scale up of CCS technologies that show promise towards meeting the cost and performance goals

- A targeted number of projects or GW’s be established with dates of operation that are consistent with overall emission reduction targets

- Future QER reports examine CCS infrastructure needs for a comprehensive nationwide CCS/CCUS system

- DOE undertake a general equilibrium model study to determine if the goal of CCS cost parity by 2035 is adequate and consistent with the overall CO2 reduction goals
Current DOE CCS Program

Stages of CO2 Capture Technology R&D

**Progress Over Time**

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION**

**TRL 2–4**
Lab/Bench-Scale Testing

- Short duration tests (hours/days)
- Low to moderate cost
- Medium to high risk of failure
- Artificial and simulated operating conditions
- Proof-of-concept and parametric testing

**TRL 5–6**
Pilot-Scale Field Testing

- Longer duration (weeks/months)
- Higher cost
- Low to medium risk of failure
- Controlled operating conditions
- Evaluation of performance and cost of technology in parametric tests to set up demonstration projects

**TRL 7–9**
Demonstration-Scale Testing

- Extended duration (typically years)
- Major cost
- Minimal risk of failure
- Variable operating conditions
- Demonstration at full-scale commercial application
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While DOE has enabled advancement of CCS technology, existing portfolio of 70 projects are predominantly small and in early stages of development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Key Technology</th>
<th>Number of R&amp;D Projects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TRL 1</td>
<td>TRL 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Combustion Capture</td>
<td>Solvents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sorbents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membranes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid/Novel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Combustion Capture</td>
<td>Solvents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sorbents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membranes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid/Novel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compression</td>
<td>Compression</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Need for fresh, transformational ideas
“Wave” of bench scale projects approaching graduation (1/2 of portfolio)
Up to 12 candidate ≤1MW pilots progressing toward large pilot scale
Capital and operating costs for projects with CCS are more expensive than conventional technologies, carrying greater commercial risk.
Risk-based Project Analysis Employed in Commercial Scale Underwritings
Key Recommendation

GHG Control – International Issue in need of International Initiatives

- DOE maintain its current CCS/CCUS international collaboration efforts including Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum and US-China Clean Energy Research Center

- DOE pursue international partnerships in commerce for CCS/CCUS demonstrations in CO2 intensive developing nations. Focus to be given to CO2 utilization and storage projects to increase global knowledge and acceptance of commercial scale CO2 storage

- DOE actively advance the recently announced collaboration with China on a water producing, commercial scale CCUS project

- DOE propose an international pool of funds specifically set up for the implementation of CCS demonstration projects at scale

- DOE consider programs and policies to promote the purchase of US manufactured CCS equipment for international CCS demonstration projects
The planned amount of CO$_2$ captured and stored is declining and nowhere near the tons required.
International Partnerships
Global Status of CCS/CCUS

Global Gasification Projects

- Planned (2018)
- Construction (2015)
- Operating (2013)
Key Recommendation

Public Acceptance continues to be a major hurdle...

- DOE increase its existing CCS/CCUS public engagement, education and training activities targeting counties and states with demonstration projects and regions that have potential infrastructure developments.

- DOE incorporate into its outreach/education program experience from existing projects, including direct discussions with people that operate such projects and those that live near them.

- DOE create a University Carbon Systems Research Program so as to place engineering students in summer internships focused on CCS/CCUS technologies.
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Revitalizing CCS
Bringing Scale and Speed to CCS Deployment

NCC History of Support for Advanced Coal Technologies

NCC 9 Major Studies on Carbon Management 2000-2015

• R&D Needs for Sequestration of CO2 – May 2000
• Coal-Related GHG Management – May 2003
• Coal: America’s Energy Future – March 2006
• Technologies to Reduce or Capture & Store CO2 – June 2007
• The Urgency of Sustainable Coal – May 2008
• Expediting CCS Development: Challenges & Opportunities – March 2011
• Harnessing Coal’s Carbon Content to Advance the Economy, Environment & Energy Security (CCS-EOR) – June 2012
• Fossil Forward – Revitalizing CCS: Bringing Scale & Speed to CCS Deployment – January 2015
NCC History of Consistent Findings & Recommendations

- Enhancing efficiency of existing coal fleet is a first step toward reducing CO2 emissions; New Source Review (NSR) disincentivizes power plant operators from pursuing efficiency improvements.
- R&D must be pursued simultaneously on numerous GHG technologies and storage options with the aim of developing a portfolio of options suitable for various applications.
- Employ DOE-industry partnerships to demonstrate technologies on a large-scale basis to reduce technology costs and expedite commercial availability.
- International partnerships are necessary to advance GHG technology solutions and global adoption.
- Financial incentives and federal funding support are vital, especially for early mover and FOAK projects.
- Deployment of CCS/CCUS technologies offers the most impactful opportunity to achieve CO2 emission reductions.