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Why a SuperOPF Planning Tool?

Proper evaluation or optimization of electricity policies, generator investment, and transmission investment requires prediction of their system-wide, society-wide, and long-term effects.

SuperOPF Planning Tool: Some Highlights

System-wide → Determines flows according to laws of physics
Society-wide → Emissions, their transport, and secondary PM$_{2.5}$ mortality
Long-term → Simultaneously predicts operation, entry, and retirement

Can be used with model of any grid. We are finishing US-Canadian models. Will be publicly available and modifiable.

Damages From the 406 US Coal Plants

Transmission Lines in Our Model

5222 nodes, 8190 generators, 14225 branches
**How the Model Makes Its Predictions**

It finds the combination of plant construction, retirement, and operation that maximizes

- Consumer benefits
  - Annualized construction costs
  - Other Annual fixed costs
  - Operating costs

over each decade, subject to meeting load and respecting network constraints.

---

**More Detail on Features of the SuperOPF Planning Tool**

- Representative hours represent joint distribution of demand, generator availability, wind, and solar
- Demand function at each node (and growth)
- “Direct current” modeling

---

**Dataset of Existing Generators**

- Capacities, heat rates, emission rates, locations, smokestack heights, marginal emission damage, etc.
- Required matching 12 datasets

---

**How We Use Model for this Paper**

- Adjust input parameters to reflect a policy
- Assume average natural gas price of $5 per million Btu
- Simulate a year, allowing generator retirement but not entry
Assumed Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel Type</th>
<th>Annual Total Fixed Costs ($/MW)</th>
<th>Variable Cost $/MWh (in 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coal (Dual Unit Advanced PC)</td>
<td>$35,255</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas (Advanced NGCC)</td>
<td>$20,661</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas (Advanced NGCT)</td>
<td>$12,741</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>$10,236</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>$95,571</td>
<td>$2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar</td>
<td>$5,849</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question & Background

QUESTION

• What would happen if Pigouvian Fees were applied to SO2, NOx, and CO2 emissions?

BACKGROUND

• SO2 and NOx transform to fine particulate matter
• Location and stack height greatly affect the Pigouvian fee per pound of SO2 and NOX
• Geographically detailed grid model therefore helps

CO2 Damage per Ton

• Latest US government estimate for marginal damage from CO2 is around $40 per short ton* (using a 3% discount rate)

Particulate Matter Air Pollution and Cardiovascular Disease: An Update From the American Heart Association

(Circulation, Volume 121(21):2331-2378 June 1, 2010)

"Exposure to PM <2.5 μm in diameter (PM2.5) over a few hours to weeks can trigger cardiovascular disease-related mortality..."

Converting NO\textsubscript{X} and SO\textsubscript{2} Into Estimated Mortality Cost

- Seventy million county-to-county transfer coefficients
- Population per county, and percentage over 30
- Dose-response functions
- $7.4$ per premature death

2. POLICY EVALUATION RESULTS

![Graph showing premature deaths per year from power plant emissions under 4 policies.](image)

![Graph showing percent CO\textsubscript{2} reductions in the Eastern Interconnection under 3 policies.](image)
Annual Costs to Society of Electricity Under Four Policies

Why Is NO\textsubscript{X} & SO\textsubscript{2} Fee More Effective than CO\textsubscript{2} Fee?

- Marginal NO\textsubscript{X} and SO\textsubscript{2} damage per MWh is more heterogeneous than is CO\textsubscript{2} damage per MWh and/or
- Marginal NO\textsubscript{X} and SO\textsubscript{2} damage per MWh is less correlated with marginal direct cost than is CO\textsubscript{2} damage per MWh

Retail Electricity Price Under Four Policies

Summary of Results

- If marginal damages are only charged for CO\textsubscript{2}, there is a 20% reduction in CO\textsubscript{2} but, surprisingly, program costs can be justified by lives saved alone. Retail prices go up by around 3 cents per kilowatt-hour.
- If marginal damages are only charged for health effects, CO\textsubscript{2} is also reduced by 20% and 7000 lives are saved each year with a smaller increase in electricity prices of around 2 cents per kilowatt-hour.
- If marginal damages are charged for both health effects and CO\textsubscript{2}, there is a 30% reduction in CO\textsubscript{2} and around 8,000 lives are saved each year. Average retail rates go up by about 5 cents per kilowatt-hour.
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