

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

LBL Publications

Title

Defining a Standard Metric for Electricity Savings

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/56k3k97h>

Journal

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Author

Koomey, Jonathan

Publication Date

2009-10-13

DEFINING A STANDARD METRIC FOR ELECTRICITY SAVINGS

Jonathan Koomey*, Hashem Akbari, Carl Blumstein, Marilyn Brown, Richard Brown, Chris Calwell, Sheryl Carter, Ralph Cavanagh, Audrey Chang, David Claridge, Paul Craig, Rick Diamond, Joseph H. Eto, William Fulkerson, Ashok Gadgil, Howard Geller, José Goldemberg, Chuck Goldman, David B. Goldstein, Steve Greenberg, David Hafemeister, Jeff Harris, Hal Harvey, Eric Heitz, Eric Hirst, Holmes Hummel, Dan Kammen, Henry Kelly, Skip Laitner, Mark Levine, Amory Lovins, Gil Masters, James E. McMahon, Alan Meier, Michael Messenger, John Millhone, Evan Mills, Steve Nadel, Bruce Nordman, Lynn Price, Joe Romm, Marc Ross, Michael Rufo, Jayant Sathaye, Lee Schipper, Stephen H. Schneider, James L. Sweeney, Malcolm Verdict, Diana Vorsatz, Devra Wang, Carl Weinberg, Richard Wilk, John Wilson, and Ernst Worrell

*Project Scientist, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and Consulting Professor, Stanford University. JGKoomey@stanford.edu, <<http://www.koomey.com>>

PO Box 20313, Oakland, CA 94620-0313

Other addresses not given because coauthors are too numerous

Version 30

Final version submitted to Environmental Research Letters, after revisions in response to journal reviewers' comments

17 June 2009

Short title: Defining a standard metric for electricity savings

Keywords: Electricity savings, energy efficiency, energy policy, climate change solutions, coal-fired power plants, back-of-the-envelope calculations, Arthur H. Rosenfeld

ABSTRACT

The growing investment by governments and electric utilities in energy efficiency programs highlights the need for simple tools to help assess and explain the size of the potential resource. One technique that is commonly used in that effort is to characterize electricity savings in terms of avoided power plants, because it is easier for people to visualize a power plant than it is to understand an abstraction like billions of kilowatt-hours. Unfortunately, there is no standardization around the characteristics of such power plants.

In this article we define parameters for a standard avoided power plant that have physical meaning and intuitive plausibility, for use in back-of-the-envelope calculations. For the prototypical plant this article settles on a 500-megawatt existing coal plant operating at a 70% capacity factor with 7% T&D losses. Displacing such a plant for one year would save 3 billion kWh/year at the meter and reduce emissions by 3 million metric tons of CO₂ per year.

The proposed name for this metric is the *Rosenfeld*, in keeping with the tradition among scientists of naming units in honor of the person most responsible for the discovery and widespread adoption of the underlying scientific principle in question – Dr. Arthur H. Rosenfeld.

INTRODUCTION

In the three decades since the energy crises of the 1970s we have learned a great deal about the potential for energy efficiency and the means to deliver it cost effectively and reliably (Rosenfeld 1999). Back then, many analysts still held to the now discredited “ironclad link” between energy use and economic activity, which implied that any reduction in energy use would make our society less wealthy (Craig et al. 2002, Koomey 1984, Levine and Craig 1985, Lovins 1979). Now we know (from cross-country comparisons and technical analysis) that there are many ways to produce and consume goods and services, some energy efficient and others not (AIP 1975, Darmstadter et al. 1977, International Energy Agency (IEA) 1997, Schipper and Lichtenberg 1976, Schipper et al. 1992). And we know that the available efficiency resources are enormous, inexpensive, and largely untapped (particularly if whole-system clean-slate redesign is employed), making them an important option for reducing climate risks and improving energy security (APS 2008, Brohard et al. 1998, Brown et al. 2001, Lovins 2005, Lovins et al. 2004). Finally, we know that tapping these resources requires more than getting energy prices right—we’ll also need to further develop and implement cost-benefit-tested non-price policies like minimum efficiency standards, Energy Star labeling programs, utility rebates, “Golden Carrot” incentives, research and development, tax credits, and other programs whose goal is to align private financial incentives with the economic and environmental interests of society as a whole (APS 2008, Brown et al. 2001, Koomey 1990, Koomey et al. 1996, Koomey et al. 2001, Krause and Eto 1988, Krause et al. 1993, Krause et al. 1995, Lovins 1992, Lovins et al. 2004).

The increased focus on energy efficiency for shaping our energy future highlights the need for simple tools to help understand and explain the size of the potential resource. One technique that is commonly used in that effort is to characterize electricity savings in terms of avoided power plants, because it is easier for people to visualize a power plant than it is to understand an abstract concept like billions of kilowatt-hours. Unfortunately, there is no standardization around the size and operational characteristics of such plants.

In this article we propose standard characteristics for an avoided power plant that have physical meaning and intuitive plausibility, for use in back-of-the-envelope calculations and characterizing energy savings results. We also propose naming the annual energy savings of such a plant as a new unit in Art Rosenfeld’s honor (the *Rosenfeld*) because Dr. Rosenfeld continues to be the most prominent advocate of characterizing efficiency savings in terms of avoided power plants.

ARTHUR H. ROSENFELD’S CONTRIBUTIONS

Dr. Rosenfeld (**Figure 1**) made a transition from particle physics to studying energy efficiency at the time of the first oil embargo (Rosenfeld 1999). Over the past 35 years he has been at the forefront of efforts to improve the efficiency of energy use around the world and has devoted special care to making the results of complex energy analysis understandable to a lay audience. For years, Dr. Rosenfeld has characterized oil savings in terms of “Arctic Refuges saved” and electricity savings in terms of “avoided power

plants” to emphasize that supply and demand side policy options are fungible and that replacing power plants with more efficient energy technologies would be beneficial for consumers’ electricity bills and for the environment.

Dr. Rosenfeld has in the past most commonly used a 1000 MW power plant operating at a 60 or 65% capacity factor as the standard power plant avoided by energy efficiency. These assumptions mirrored the capacity and operational characteristics of typical U.S. nuclear power plants circa 1990, but since that time the capacity factors of such plants have increased to about 90%. No new nuclear plants have been completed in the U.S. since 1996, so the appropriateness of this choice of assumptions has decreased over time. More recently, Dr. Rosenfeld has used a 500 MW plant operating 5,000 hours per year as his standard avoided plant (Rosenfeld and Kumar 2001).

CRITERIA

Choosing characteristics of a typical avoided power plant is inevitably somewhat arbitrary—there is no single correct answer. In our view, those choices should meet the following criteria:

- 1) *Simplicity of presentation and ease of recall*: Round numbers of one significant figure should be preferred to more accurate numbers with several decimal places of precision because they are easier to remember and use. Moreover, “average” power plant sizes and capacity factors change each year, so a value with several decimal places of precision would have no longevity in any case.
- 2) *Intuitive plausibility*: The parameters chosen should reflect people’s general understanding of power plants and their operation in the utility system.
- 3) *Physical meaning*: The chosen characteristics should reflect real-world attributes of the physical systems in which power plants are embedded and should be expressed as savings *at the meter* (to account for transmission and distribution losses).
- 4) *Policy relevance*: The main result for avoided power plants would be electricity savings (which is an important metric for energy policy). Carbon savings associated with those energy savings (reflecting climate change, the most important environmental challenge facing humanity) should also be estimated, but electricity savings are the key focus. Costs and avoided non-CO₂ emissions for avoided power plants vary greatly by technology, by country, and over time, so including them would make this task needlessly complicated.

The next step is to assess the key parameters for characterizing power plants to see which choices might meet those criteria. To make that assessment easier, we add two additional constraints:

- 1) *We focus on power plants avoidable in the long run*. Utility emissions savings can be the result of either short run operational changes or long run retirement and construction decisions. Emissions savings from operational changes are much more difficult to characterize in a general way than are long-term changes (analyzing the former is very

situation dependent and typically requires complicated production-cost/dispatch simulation modeling).

2) *We assume that the standard avoided power plant should be coal-fired.* Between 2000 and 2007, 151 new coal-fired power plants were proposed in the United States; 10 have been completed, 25 more are under construction, and 59 have been canceled or indefinitely deferred (Calwell and Moorefield 2008). In 2007, existing coal plants totaled more than 300 GW (out of almost 1,000 GW total installed capacity in the U.S.).

Coal plants generate about half of all U.S. electricity and were responsible for about one third of total U.S. carbon emissions in 2007. They are also ubiquitous in other countries responsible for substantial percentages of world carbon emissions (e.g., China and India). Truly facing the climate challenge will require the retirement or displacement of hundreds or thousands of such plants (Black 2009, Caldeira et al. 2003, Krause et al. 1992, Meinshausen et al. 2009). Finally, the capacity factors of coal plants are relatively insensitive to fuel price changes (compared to natural gas plants) so their operational characteristics are more predictable than for some other plants.

CHARACTERISTICS OF COAL-FIRED POWER PLANTS

This section describes our review of the literature for each key characteristic of coal-fired power plants in advance of choosing parameters for a typical plant.

Capacity

Power plants vary greatly in their capacity (measured in Megawatts, MW, or million watts), which can be expressed as a nameplate (nominal) rating or as net capacity after subtracting out power needed to run the plant.

The Energy Information Administration or EIA (US DOE 2009a) gives characteristics of new conventional power plants for the U.S. Pulverized coal plants with scrubbers fall at 600 MW.

As shown in **Figure 2**¹ the median nameplate capacity for existing non-cogenerating U.S. coal plants in 2007 was 250 MW, with a mean of about 500 MW and a range of less than a MW to about 3500 MW <<http://www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/electricity/page/eia860.html>>. Most of the smaller plants (less than 200 MW) tend to be older (1960s or earlier), while the larger plants tend to be newer (1970s or later).

EIA's *Electric Power Annual 2007* (US DOE 2009b) shows that total capacity for U.S. coal fired power generation is remarkably stable over the period 1996 to 2007, starting and ending at just over 300 GW (**Table 1**). There have been a few retirements and new

¹ See Koomey and Hultman (2007) for similar cumulative distribution graphs describing historical data on nuclear power plants in the U.S.

plants constructed, but the U.S. has seen no significant growth in total coal capacity over this period.

Capacity factors

The capacity factor is defined as

$$\text{Capacity factor} = \frac{\text{Actual generation/year (BkWh)}}{\text{Maximum generation/year (BkWh)}} \quad (1)$$

Dividing numerator and denominator by the number of hours per year (8766 hours when averaged across leap and non-leap years) we get

$$\text{Capacity factor} = \frac{\text{Average output capacity (MW)}}{\text{Rated (maximum) capacity (MW)}} \quad (2)$$

Coal plants can have a wide range of capacity factors: they are usually operated for baseload electricity but are flexible enough to serve all but the lowest of intermediate loads as well. Their capacity factors are relatively insensitive to coal prices though they can be influenced when the price for the main competing fuel in the power sector (natural gas) fluctuates greatly.

New coal plants typically have high capacity factors (up to 90%). Capacity factors for existing plants in the U.S. increased significantly over the 1996 to 2007 period, averaging about 70% (as shown in **Table 1**). The stock of existing plants includes many older plants that are smaller, less efficient, and more polluting than new plants. They have long since been depreciated, so utilities have an incentive to keep them running as long as the marginal costs are not too high (and as long as environmental regulations do not impose additional costs or constraints that make them uneconomic).

Transmission and distribution losses

Table 2 shows data from EIA's *Electric Power Annual 2007* (US DOE 2009b) on the supply and disposition of electricity in the U.S. from 1995 to 2007. Losses are expressed as a percentage of the sum of electricity sales, direct use by power plants, and exports. These losses range from 5.7% to 7.2% with a simple average of 6.7% over that period.

Carbon emissions factors for fossil fuels

The EIA <<http://www.eia.doe.gov/environment.html>> gives historical data on the carbon content of fuels for U.S. electric utilities. The data for the latest year available (2006), expressed in higher heating value (HHV) terms, are shown in **Table 3**. Coal emits almost 80% more carbon than natural gas per unit of heat released.

Power plant efficiencies

Large coal steam plants have HHV efficiencies of 30-40%, depending on their age, level of pollution control, and technology type. For typical new 600 MW coal plants in 2008,

EIA gives an estimate of 37% HHV efficiency (US DOE 2009a). The average efficiency of existing coal steam plants in the U.S. for the period 1996 to 2007, derived using the heat content of utility coal from US DOE (2008) and the other parameters in **Table 1**, is 33%, which doesn't vary much over this period.

DEFINING THE ROSENFELD

We experimented with different combinations of plant capacities and capacity factors to meet the criteria listed above, focusing mainly on the characteristics of existing U.S. coal plants. We choose this approach because of the rich data characterizing these plants and because most existing coal plants will need to be retired if we're to substantially reduce carbon emissions by the middle of this century, as climate stabilization requires.

As summarized in **Table 4** and **Figure 3**, we've defined the Rosenfeld unit assuming the average coal plant capacity of 500 MW, a capacity factor of 70% (the average capacity factor of existing U.S. coal plants in from 1996 to 2007), and system-wide T&D losses of 7% (rounded up from 6.7% for ease of recall). This combination of parameters would yield annual electricity delivered at the meter of about 3 BkWh/year. Using the carbon burden for U.S. utility coal and the efficiency of average existing coal steam plants, the emissions saved are almost exactly 3 million metric tons of CO₂ (Mt CO₂) per year.

If measured in terms of site energy, there are 100 Rosenfelds per exajoule, and in primary energy terms there are about 30 Rosenfelds per exajoule. Another nice equivalence factor that emerges from these numbers is that each kWh of coal-fired electricity delivered to the meter emits about 1 kg of CO₂.

USING THE ROSENFELD

This simplification aids in the creation of quick calculations and cogent interpretation of analysis results from studies of energy efficiency. To use the Rosenfeld, analysts have to remember the numbers associated with the power plant characteristics (500 MW, 70% capacity factor, 7% T&D losses, 33% HHV efficiency), and the number 3 (which evokes 3 billion kWh saved at the meter, 3 million metric tons of carbon dioxide avoided per year, and 30 Rosenfelds per exajoule of primary energy).

Consider the recent authoritative study on energy efficiency by the American Physical Society (APS 2008). Figure 25 in that study shows potential U.S. residential sector efficiency savings of almost 600 billion kWh/year in 2030. What does that number mean in terms of power plants avoided?

Six hundred billion kWh/year is the equivalent of about 200 Rosenfelds (600/3), or 200 typical coal fired power plants, which together emit 600 million metric tons of CO₂ per year. This simple calculation adds real physical meaning to the electricity savings (but it's no substitute for more sophisticated approaches). Other important studies that would have benefitted from using this approximation include Brown et al. (2008), EPRI (2009), Koomey et al. (1991), Meier et al. (1983) Rosenfeld and Hafemeister (1988), Rosenfeld et al. (1993), and any other efficiency potentials studies that don't include a full integrated analysis of supply and demand-side options.

Another widely used approximation for understanding carbon reductions is that of the “Stabilization wedge”, popularized by Pacala and Socolow (2004). Each wedge represents cumulative carbon reductions over a 50-year period of 25 billion metric tons of carbon, or 91.7 billion metric tons of CO₂. Each Rosenfeld saves 3 million tons of CO₂ per year, so a full wedge is equivalent to 91,700/3 or about 30,000 Rosenfelds (equivalent to fully eliminating 600 coal-fired power plants [or 300 GW] for their entire 50-year lifetimes).

For those situations where the avoided carbon emissions would be quite different from those of a coal plant, we show **Table 5**, which gives the relationship between the carbon emissions factors for a coal plant and average emissions factors for different power plant technologies (from US DOE (2009a)), for the power sectors of different countries (from US DOE (2009b) for the U.S. and Wheeler and Ummel (2008) for other countries), and for California (from Mahone et al. (2009)). Natural gas plants are significantly less carbon intensive than coal. In places where the avoided power plant is an advanced natural gas combined cycle (typical for recently constructed gas plants) the emissions per kWh are 63% lower than that of an existing coal plant, resulting in annual emissions displaced of about 1 million metric tons of CO₂ per year for one Rosenfeld of electricity savings. In addition, Table 5 shows that China and India, two of the largest and most rapidly growing economies, have average power sector carbon emissions factors that are close to that of the existing coal plant used in this study, indicating that most of their electricity generation comes from coal.

LIMITATIONS

All simplifications are imperfect, and this one is no exception. The specific characteristics of electricity systems (like power plant capacity factors, efficiencies, coal carbon content, and line losses) all vary greatly around the world. Thus, no single number will apply everywhere, and trying to create an approximation that perfectly characterizes all situations is futile and antithetical to the spirit of this entire exercise. So we accept that this simplification is useful, but limited.

The Rosenfeld is most useful when applied to studies of energy efficiency in isolation from the electricity supply side, because it lends context to such studies that otherwise would require a detailed analysis of avoided power plants. Even given the limitations of an approximation like this, the contextual depth and conceptual understanding that it can bring to energy efficiency studies make it well worth applying.

One of the most important caveats to the use of this simplification relates to the load shape impacts of efficiency options, which are typically summarized in terms of conservation load factor or CLF (Koomey et al. 1990a, Koomey et al. 1990b). The Rosenfeld approximation is most accurately applied to electricity savings from a broad efficiency portfolio with CLFs between 50% and 100%.² It should not be used for

² Studies that estimate peak demand impacts for a broad range of efficiency options typically calculate aggregate CLFs close to the average utility load factor of about 60%. For example, the

efficiency options with low CLFs that save electricity mostly at times of peak load (like those for air conditioners), because the avoided power plants are more likely to be gas-fired peaking plants with characteristics quite different from those of coal plants.

It is most appropriate to apply the Rosenfeld to annual electricity savings. To fully displace a power plant, which typically lasts for fifty years, efficiency savings will need to continue for the life of that plant. Analysts should use caution when treating cumulative electricity savings over time with this approximation.

Policy studies assessing the emissions reductions from efficiency and supply side options will generally distinguish between the average and marginal emissions factors for the power system. The marginal emissions factor is the reduction in emissions from decreased power generation divided by the amount of electricity savings driving those reductions (it can be calculated for either the short or long run). The estimated long-run marginal emissions savings may or may not equal the emissions savings for coal plants calculated above (and they vary greatly by utility, state, or country, as shown in Table 5). Care must therefore be used when applying the Rosenfeld to the results from emissions reduction studies.

To retire a power plant, the most important condition is that there be a resource to displace the generation of that plant, be it energy efficiency or another power plant. Of course, the choice of *which* power plant to retire is a function of economics—more specifically, it is a function of the economic incentives facing the electric utility, and the utility's incentives may or may not be aligned with the optimal outcome for society. Many existing coal plants are fully depreciated and their marginal costs are low. In the absence of a change in policy, the utility won't retire these plants—instead, new resources will be deferred or other, higher marginal cost resources will be displaced.

The amount of carbon savings calculated in this article for one Rosenfeld (based on an avoided existing coal plant) assumes that one or more additional things happen to affect this economic calculus:

- 1) A price on carbon emissions will be put in place that significantly raises the marginal cost of coal plants;
- 2) Increased regulation of criteria pollutant emissions will create large retrofit costs or increased marginal costs (many existing coal plants have up until now been "grandfathered" so that they are allowed to emit many more criteria pollutants than new coal plants); and/or
- 3) Retiring coal plants will become an explicit policy goal and incentives or standards will be put in place to encourage this outcome.

comprehensive study by Rufo and Coito (2002), which estimated CLFs for electricity efficiency options throughout the California economy, found the aggregate CLFs in the various scenarios to range between 57% and 66%.

Because of the urgency of the climate problem and because of coal's significant contribution to it, we believe these changes are likely for many countries in the coming decade. Each of these actions represents a significant shift from the status quo, but more importantly, they represent an internalization of societal costs that heretofore have not been included in the operational and investment decisions of electric utilities. They are not by themselves sufficient to guarantee significant coal plant retirements, but in combination with investments in energy efficiency or new low carbon power generation resources (which would be the driving force for such retirements) they would allow that outcome.

CONCLUSIONS

The Rosenfeld can best be used in rough back-of-the-envelope calculations and high-level summaries of analysis results for less technical audiences. If an efficiency technology or policy would save 3 BkWh per year at the meter, it saves one Rosenfeld, or one 500 MW coal plant operating at 70% capacity factor in that year (assuming 7% T&D losses). It also saves 3 million metric tons of CO₂/year (assuming all the savings come from conventional coal plants). In addition, avoiding 600 coal-fired power plants of this size over their 50 year lifetimes (i.e. 50 x 600 or 30,000 Rosenfelds) saves the same amount of carbon dioxide (about 90,000 MtCO₂) as one Pacala/Socolow wedge, which is a nice link to another widely used analytical simplification of this type.

These parameters satisfy the initial criteria of simplicity of presentation, ease of recall, intuitive plausibility, physical meaning, and policy relevance. We encourage other analysts to use this new unit as a way to increase conceptual understanding of the scope of the climate challenge and to honor Art Rosenfeld, whose efforts to create a more hopeful and sustainable future continue to inspire us all.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The original idea for this article came from Chris Calwell of Ecos Consulting. Jonathan Koomey, who was a Ph.D. student of Dr. Rosenfeld's from 1985 to 1990, conducted the analysis and the writing, with comments and other contributions from the coauthors (who are all friends and colleagues of Art's). Many colleagues reviewed the drafts, including Rob Socolow, and two anonymous reviewers, and we owe them our thanks. Glenn McGrath and Channele Wirman at EIA deserve our special thanks for supplying data from and timely explanations about the EIA-860 and EIA-906/920/923 data files. All errors and omissions are the authors' responsibility alone.

This work was supported, in part, by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231.

REFERENCES

APS. 2008. *Energy Future: Think Efficiency*. College Park, MD: American Physical Society. September. < <http://www.aps.org/energyefficiencyreport/>>

Black, Richard. 2009. 'Safe' climate means 'no to coal' BBC News, April 29 2009 [cited. < <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/8023072.stm>>

Brohard, Grant J., Merwin L. Brown, Ralph Cavanagh, Lance E. Elberling, George R. Hernandez, Amory Lovins, and Art Rosenfeld. 1998. *Advanced Customer Technology Test for Maximum Energy Efficiency (ACT2) Project: The Final Report*. San Francisco, CA: PG&E. < http://207.67.203.54/Qelibrary4_p40007_documents/ACT2/act2fnl.pdf>

Brown, Marilyn A., Mark D. Levine, Walter Short, and Jonathan G. Koomey. 2001. "Scenarios for a Clean Energy Future." *Energy Policy (Also LBNL-48031)*. vol. 29, no. 14. November. pp. 1179-1196.

Brown, Rich, Sam Borgeson, Jonathan Koomey, and Peter Biermayer. 2008. *U.S. Building-Sector Energy Efficiency Potential*. Berkeley, CA: Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. LBNL-1096E. September. < <http://enduse.lbl.gov/info/1096E-abstract.html>>

Caldeira, Ken, Atul K. Jain, and Martin I. Hoffert. 2003. "Climate Sensitivity Uncertainty and the Need for Energy Without CO₂ Emission " *Science*. vol. 299, no. 5615. pp. 2052-2054. <<http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/299/5615/2052>>

Calwell, Chris, and Laura Moorefield. 2008. *Efficiency in a Climate-Constrained World: Are We Aiming High Enough?* Asilomar, CA: August 2008.

Craig, Paul, Ashok Gadgil, and Jonathan Koomey. 2002. "What Can History Teach Us?: A Retrospective Analysis of Long-term Energy Forecasts for the U.S." In *Annual Review of Energy and the Environment 2002*. Edited by R. H. Socolow, D. Anderson and J. Harte. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc. (also LBNL-50498). pp. 83-118.

EPRI. 2009. *Assessment of Achievable Potential from Energy Efficiency and Demand Response Programs in the U.S. (2010 - 2030)*. Palo Alto, CA: Electric Power Research Institute. 1016987. January 14. < <http://mydocs.epri.com/docs/public/000000000001018363.pdf>>

Koomey, Jonathan G. 1984. *Energy Policy in Transition: The Rise of Conservation*. A.B. Honors Thesis, History of Science Department, Harvard University.

Koomey, Jonathan G., Celina Atkinson, Alan Meier, James E. McMahon, Stan Boghosian, Barbara Atkinson, Isaac Turiel, Mark D. Levine, Bruce Nordman, and Peter Chan. 1991. *The Potential for Electricity Efficiency Improvements in the U.S. Residential Sector*. Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory. LBL-30477. July.

Koomey, Jonathan G., and Nathan E. Hultman. 2007. "A reactor-level analysis of busbar costs for U.S. nuclear plants, 1970-2005." *Energy Policy*. vol. 35, no. 11. November. pp. 5630-5642. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2007.06.005>>

Koomey, Jonathan G., Arthur H. Rosenfeld, and Ashok K. Gadgil. 1990a. "Conservation Screening Curves to Compare Efficiency Investments to Power Plants." *Energy Policy*. vol. 18, no. 8. October. pp. 774-782.

Koomey, Jonathan G., Arthur H. Rosenfeld, and Ashok K. Gadgil. 1990b. *Conservation Screening Curves to Compare Efficiency Investments to Power Plants: Applications to Commercial Sector Conservation Programs*. Proceedings of the 1990 ACEEE Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings. Asilomar, CA: American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy.

Krause, Florentin, Wilfred Bach, and Jonathan G. Koomey. 1992. *Energy Policy in the Greenhouse*. NY, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Levine, Mark D., and Paul P. Craig. 1985. "A Decade of United States Energy Policy." In *Annual Review of Energy 1985*. Edited by J. M. Hollander. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc. pp. 557-587.

Lovins, Amory B. 1979. *Soft Energy Paths: Toward a Durable Peace*. New York, NY: Harper Colophon Books.

Lovins, Amory B. 2005. *Energy End-Use Efficiency*. Rocky Mountain Institute for InterAcademy Council (Amsterdam). September 19. <http://www.rmi.org/images/other/Energy/E05-16_EnergyEndUseEff.pdf>

Lovins, Amory B., E. Kyle Datta, Odd-Even Bustnes, Jonathan G. Koomey, and Nathan J. Glasgow. 2004. *Winning the Oil Endgame: Innovation for Profits, Jobs, and Security*. Old Snowmass, Colorado: Rocky Mountain Institute. September. <<http://www.oilendgame.com>>

Mahone, Amber, Snuller Price, and William Morrow. 2009. *Developing a Greenhouse Gas Tool for Buildings in California: Methodology and User's Manual*. San Francisco, CA: Energy and Environmental Economics, Inc. January. <http://www.ethree.com/E3_Public_Docs.html>

Meier, Alan, Jan Wright, and Arthur H. Rosenfeld. 1983. *Supplying Energy Through Greater Efficiency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Meinshausen, Malte, Nicolai Meinshausen, William Hare, Sarah C. B. Raper, Katja Frieler, Reto Knutti, David J. Frame, and Myles R. Allen. 2009. "Greenhouse-gas emission targets for limiting global warming to 2 degrees C." *Nature*. vol. 458, April 30. pp. 1158-1162. <<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v458/n7242/full/nature08017.html>>

Pacala, S., and Rob Socolow. 2004. "Stabilization Wedges: Solving the Climate Problem for the Next 50 Years with Current Technologies " *Science*. vol. 305, no. 5686. August 13. pp. 968-972. <<http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/305/5686/968>>

Rosenfeld, Arthur, Celina Atkinson, Jonathan G. Koomey, Alan Meier, Robert Mowris, and Lynn Price. 1993. "Conserved Energy Supply Curves." *Contemporary Policy Issues*. vol. XI, no. 1. January (also LBL-31700). pp. 45-68.

Rosenfeld, Arthur H. 1999. "The Art of Energy Efficiency: Protecting the Environment with Better Technology." In *Annual Review of Energy and the Environment 1999*. Edited by J. M. Hollander. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc. pp. 33-82.

Rosenfeld, Arthur H., and David Hafemeister. 1988. "Energy-efficient Buildings." In *Scientific American*. April 1988. pp. 78-85.

Rosenfeld, Arthur H., and Satish Kumar. 2001. *Tables to Convert Energy or CO2 (saved or used) to Familiar Equivalents - Cars, Homes, or Power Plants (US Average Data for 1999)*. Sacramento, CA: California Energy Commission. May. <http://www.energy.ca.gov/commissioners/rosenfeld_docs/Equivalence-Matrix_2001-05.pdf>

US DOE. 2008. *Annual Energy Review 2007*. Washington, DC: Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. DOE/EIA-0384(2007). June. <<http://www.eia.doe.gov/aer/>>

US DOE. 2009a. *Assumptions to the Annual Energy Outlook 2009, with Projections to 2030*. Washington, DC: Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. DOE/EIA-0554(2009). March. <<http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/aeo/assumption/>>

US DOE. 2009b. *Electric Power Annual 2007*. Washington, DC: Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. DOE/EIA-0348(2007). January 21.

Wheeler, David, and Kevin Ummel. 2008. *Calculating CARMA: Global Estimation of CO2 Emissions From the Power Sector*. Center for Global Development. Working Paper 145. May. <<http://www.cgdev.org/content/publications/detail/16101/>>

Figure 1: Arthur H. Rosenfeld






Figure 2: Cumulative distribution of capacity for existing U.S. coal-fired power plants in 2007



Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration, Form EIA-860 Annual Generator Report Database <<http://www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/electricity/page/eia860.html>>.

Figure 3: Summary of the Rosenfeld unit



1 Exajoule (primary energy) $\sim$ 30 Rosenfelds

1 Pacala/Socolow Wedge $\sim$ 30,000 Rosenfelds =
600 Rosenfelds each year for 50 years

Table 1: Characteristics of existing U.S. coal-fired power plants

	Coal fired capacity GW	Net generation TWh	Capacity factor %	Coal consumed in million short tons	Heat content of utility coal MBtu/short ton	Average HHV Efficiency %
1996	313	1,795	65.2%	907	20.55	32.9%
1997	314	1,845	67.2%	932	20.52	32.9%
1998	316	1,874	67.7%	946	20.52	32.9%
1999	315	1,881	68.1%	950	20.49	33.0%
2000	315	1,966	71.0%	995	20.51	32.9%
2001	314	1,904	69.2%	973	20.34	32.8%
2002	315	1,933	70.0%	988	20.24	33.0%
2003	313	1,974	72.0%	1014	20.08	33.1%
2004	313	1,978	71.9%	1021	19.98	33.1%
2005	313	2,013	73.3%	1041	19.99	33.0%
2006	313	1,991	72.6%	1031	19.93	33.1%
2007	313	2,016	73.6%	1047	19.91	33.0%
Average			70.2%			33.0%

(1) Coal consumed, capacity, and net generation include all coal-fired power plants in the U.S., including utility and non-utility central station plants as well as industrial cogeneration plants.

(2) Coal fired capacity, net generation and coal consumed taken from US DOE (2009b). Heat content of coal taken from Table A-5 in US DOE (2008). MBtu = million Btus.

(3) Capacity factor calculated from capacity and net generation assuming 8760 hours for non-leap years and 8784 hours for leap years.

(4) Power plant efficiency (higher heating value) calculated by converting net generation to Btus assuming 3412 Btus/kWh and then dividing by the product of coal consumed and heat content of utility coal.

Table 2: U.S. average transmission and distribution (T&D losses) over time

	Total electric industry sales TWh	Direct use TWh	Total exports TWh	Losses and unaccounted for TWh	T&D losses %
1996	3101	153	3	231	7.1%
1997	3146	156	9	224	6.8%
1998	3264	161	14	221	6.4%
1999	3312	172	14	240	6.9%
2000	3421	171	15	244	6.8%
2001	3394	163	16	202	5.7%
2002	3465	166	16	248	6.8%
2003	3494	168	24	228	6.2%
2004	3547	168	23	266	7.1%
2005	3661	150	20	269	7.0%
2006	3670	147	24	266	6.9%
2007	3765	159	20	264	6.7%
Average					6.7%

- 1) Data on electric industry sales, direct use, exports, and losses are taken from US DOE (2009b).
- 2) T&D losses calculated as a percentage of sales plus direct use plus exports.

Table 3: Direct carbon emissions factors for fuels used to generate electricity

	M tons C/quad	kg C/GJ	gC/kWh.f	<i>Index NG = 1.0</i>
Natural gas	14.47	13.7	49.4	<i>1.00</i>
Distillate oil	19.95	18.9	68.1	<i>1.38</i>
Utility residual fuel	21.29	20.2	72.6	<i>1.47</i>
Utility coal	25.83	24.5	88.1	<i>1.78</i>

(1) Carbon emissions factors (Mt-C/quadrillion Btus) taken from EIA data for 2006 (downloaded from <<http://www.eia.doe.gov/environment.html>>). It is unclear if these data have already built in a combustion fraction but we assume so. Combustion fractions are typically very close to 1.0 for fossil fuels in utility plants in any case.

(2) All energy values based on higher heating value (HHV) of the fuels.

(3) kWh.f = energy content of fuel converted to kWh using 3412 Btu/kWh.

Table 4: Estimating electricity delivered and carbon emitted from a typical coal plant in the U.S.

	Units	Value	Notes
<i>Electricity generated</i>			
Capacity	MW	500	1
Capacity factor	%	70%	2
Hours per year	hours	8766	3
Assumed T&D losses	%	7%	4
Total electricity generated at the busbar	Billion kWh/year	3.07	5
Total electricity delivered to the meter	Billion kWh/year	2.87	6
Site energy (HHV)	Quadrillion Btus/year	0.010	7
	Exajoules/year	0.010	8
Primary energy (HHV)	Quadrillion Btus/year	0.032	9
	Exajoules/year	0.034	8
<i>Carbon emitted</i>			
Coal carbon burden (based on HHV)	gC/kWh.fuel	88.1	10
Efficiency (based on HHV)	%	33%	11
Carbon burden at the busbar	gC/kWh.elect generated	267	12
Carbon burden at the meter	gC/kWh.elect delivered	286	13
Carbon emissions	Million metric tons C/yr	0.82	14
	Million metric tons CO ₂ /yr	3.01	15

(1) Capacity is based on average existing U.S. coal plants from EIA-860 survey results as summarized in Figure 2 <<http://www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/electricity/page/eia860.html>>.

(2) Capacity factor is the average for existing US coal plants from 1996 to 2007 from Table 1.

(3) Hours per year is an average over leap years and non-leap years.

(4) T&D (Transmission and distribution) losses are typical for the U.S. utility system (from Table 2), rounded up to 7% for ease of recall.

(5) Total electricity generated at the busbar is the product of capacity, capacity factor, and hours per year, expressed using the American notation of billion equaling 10⁹.

(6) Total electricity delivered to the meter is total electricity generated divided by (1 + percentage T&D losses).

(7) Site energy in quadrillion Btu/year calculated by multiplying kWh per Rosenfeld at the meter by 3412 Btus/kWh.

(8) Quadrillion btus converted to exajoules using the factor 1055.1 joules/Btu.

(9) Primary energy in quadrillion Btu/year calculated by converting the efficiency described in footnote 11 to a heat rate (primary energy per kWh), then multiplying that heat rate times (1 + percentage T&D losses) and multiplying again by the number of kWh per Rosenfeld.

(10) The carbon burden of coal is expressed in grams of carbon (C) per kWh of fuel (fuel converted to kWh assuming 3412 Btus/kWh). This carbon burden is taken from EIA for 2006, as described in Table 3.

(11) Power plant efficiency, in Higher Heating Value (HHV) terms, is the average for existing US coal plants from 1996 to 2007 from Table 1.

(12) Carbon (C) burden at the busbar (calculated in grams of carbon per kWh generated) is calculated as the ratio of the coal C burden from Table 3 and the power plant efficiency (both in HHV terms).

(13) C burden at the meter is the carbon burden at the busbar times (1 + percentage T&D losses).

(14) C emissions in million metric tons are the product of electricity consumed at the meter and the C burden at the meter.

(15) Carbon dioxide emissions in million metric tonnes are equal to C emissions times the ratio of molecular weights of carbon dioxide (44) and carbon (12).

Table 5: Carbon emissions factors for electricity delivered to the meter

	<i>Fuel</i>	<i>Efficiency HHV</i>	<i>Emissions factor gC/kWh fuel</i>	<i>Emissions factor gC/kWh.elect.delivered</i>	<i>Index Existing coal = 1.0</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<i>Existing plants</i>						
	Steam turbine Coal	33.0%	88.1	286	1.00	1, 2
	Steam turbine Residual oil	32.8%	72.6	237	0.83	1, 3
	Steam turbine Distillate oil	32.8%	68.1	222	0.78	1, 3
	Steam turbine Natural gas	32.6%	49.4	162	0.57	1, 3
	Gas turbine Distillate oil	25.8%	68.1	282	0.99	1, 3
	Gas turbine Natural gas	29.8%	49.4	177	0.62	1, 3
	Combined cycle Distillate oil	31.0%	68.1	235	0.82	1, 3
	Combined cycle Natural gas	45.8%	49.4	115	0.40	1, 3
<i>New plants</i>						
	Steam turbine, scrubbed Coal	37.1%	88.1	254	0.89	1, 4
	Advanced combined cycle Natural gas	50.5%	49.4	105	0.37	1, 4
<i>Average power sector carbon emissions factor by country 2007 [Rank in 2007 power sector emissions in square brackets]</i>						
	China [1]			279	0.98	5
	United States [2]			174	0.61	6
	India [3]			259	0.91	5
	Russia [4]			156	0.54	5
	Germany [5]			197	0.69	5
	Japan [6]			117	0.41	5
	United Kingdom [7]			179	0.63	5
	Australia [8]			287	1.00	5
	South Africa [9]			296	1.03	5
	South Korea [10]			143	0.50	5
	Indonesia [18]			213	0.74	5
	France [27]			28	0.10	5
	Brazil [44]			16	0.06	5
	<i>World average 2007</i>			175	0.61	5
	<i>California 2008</i>					
	Average			119	0.42	7
	Marginal			156	0.55	7

(1) Emissions factors for fossil fuels taken from Table 3.

(2) Steam turbine efficiency for average existing US coal plants from 1996-2007 taken from Table 1.

(3) Steam turbine, gas turbine, and combined cycle efficiencies for existing oil and gas plants calculated from higher heating value (HHV) heat rates in the Electric Power Annual 2007 (US DOE 2009b), Table A7, which represent an average for existing plants in 2007. The Electric Power Annual table does not differentiate between residual oil and distillate oil steam turbine efficiencies so we assume these are the same.

(4) Efficiencies for 2008 new plants derived from heat rates in Assumptions to the AEO 2009 (US DOE 2009a), Table 8.2.

(5) Carbon emissions factors for the power sectors in different countries and the world in 2007 taken from the CARMA database <<http://www.carma.org>>, documented in Wheeler and Ummel (2008). We apply 7% T&D losses to the CARMA emissions factors to bring them back to the meter, fully cognizant of the substantial differences in line losses between these countries but lacking any consistent data source for those losses. The total power sector emissions for the top 10 countries in 2007 represents about 77% of the world power sector total.

(6) Average carbon emissions factors for the U.S. in 2007 derived from CO₂ emissions for central station and combined heat and power plants reported by the Electric Power Annual 2007 (US DOE 2009b) and the sum of utility sales, electricity exports, and internal electricity use for industrial customers from Table 2 (also taken from Electric Power Annual 2007).

(7) California average and marginal power sector emissions for 2008 derived as a simple average from the typical hourly average and marginal emissions factors in the model documented in Mahone (2009) and corrected for 7% transmission and distribution losses to estimate the emissions factor at the meter.