

## Power Sector CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions by State, 2011 Actuals versus Proposed and Final Clean Power Plan (CPP) Rule

State *	CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions (million short tons)		
	2011 Emissions	Proposed Rule Limits (EBW Estimate)	Final Rule Limits (EPA Actuals)
Alabama	81.5	73.7	56.9
Arizona**	57.6	30.5	30.2
Arkansas	37.7	26.5	30.3
California	40.2	49.1	48.4
Colorado	42.8	32.0	29.9
Connecticut	7.2	5.3	6.9
Delaware	4.2	2.9	4.7
Florida	121.8	83.2	105.1
Georgia	74.7	49.1	46.3
Idaho	0.5	0.6	1.5
Illinois	100.5	89.5	66.5
Indiana	119.8	92.0	76.1
Iowa	41.0	36.7	25.0
Kansas	37.7	30.2	22.0
Kentucky	103.2	86.4	63.1
Louisiana	51.2	29.7	35.4
Maine	2.3	1.2	2.1
Maryland	24.3	12.1	14.3
Massachusetts	15.8	7.8	12.1
Michigan	71.5	51.8	47.5
Minnesota	31.9	19.8	22.7
Mississippi	25.3	18.4	25.3
Missouri	86.7	76.8	55.5
Montana	18.3	16.7	11.3
Nebraska	28.0	23.0	18.3
Nevada	16.0	10.9	13.5
New Hampshire	5.5	2.4	4.0
New Jersey	17.2	6.8	16.6

State*	CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions (million short tons)		
	2011 Emissions	Proposed Rule Limits (EBW Estimate)	Final Rule Limits (EPA Actuals)
New Mexico**	34.0	21.2	12.4
New York	37.3	12.2	31.3
North Carolina	68.0	52.6	51.3
North Dakota	31.3	34.5	20.9
Ohio	122.0	88.9	73.8
Oklahoma	54.2	37.8	40.5
Oregon	7.1	4.3	8.1
Pennsylvania	125.9	72.0	89.8
Rhode Island	3.8	3.3	3.5
South Carolina	41.8	28.1	26.0
South Dakota	3.1	3.0	3.5
Tennessee	44.6	29.1	28.3
Texas	262.0	147.0	189.6
Utah**	37.1	27.4	23.8
Virginia	31.4	24.8	27.4
Washington	8.1	3.5	10.7
West Virginia	79.3	67.0	51.3
Wisconsin	46.1	20.1	28.0
Wyoming	45.3	46.5	31.6

Source: Energy Business Watch. See methodology and caveats following the table.  
 \* The rule does not extend to Alaska and Hawaii, and Vermont has no electric generating units subject to the rule; therefore those states are not listed here.  
 \*\* In the original rule, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah contained Indian territory emissions, which have since been separately addressed in the finalized rule.

Methodology for calculating mass-based limitation estimates for the proposed rule was as follows:

1. Each state's total electricity load in 2012 was multiplied by Annual Energy Outlook 2014's regional load forecast through 2030.
2. Removed existing hydro and most of nuclear generation from the load counts (to match the proposed rule's treatment of this generation) to determine a "covered load" level for the state in 2030.
3. Multiplied this covered load level by EPA's proposed rates for 2030.

Caveats:

1. Rate- and mass-based limitations for Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah are not directly comparable between the proposed and new rule as emissions in Indian territories were addressed differently.
2. Load growth assumptions have likely changed, although the overall effect on mass-based limitations is likely limited.
3. Energy Business Watch analysis of proposed rule assumes 2030 hydropower and nuclear generation equal to the 2011-2013 average.