

**Susan D. Ritenour**  
Secretary and Treasurer  
and Regulatory Manager

One Energy Place  
Pensacola, Florida 32520-0781

Tel 850.444.6231  
Fax 850.444.6026  
SDRITENO@southernco.com



March 31, 2009

Ms. Ann Cole, Commission Clerk  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee FL 32399-0850

RECEIVED-FPSC  
09 APR -1 PM 12:12  
COMMISSION  
CLERK

Dear Ms. Cole:

Re: Docket No. 090007-EI

Enclosed are an original and fifteen copies of Gulf Power's Environmental Compliance Program Update for the Clean Air Interstate Rule, Clean Air Mercury Rule, and Clean Air Visibility Rule, to be filed in the above referenced docket.

Sincerely,

*Susan D. Ritenour (lw)*

mv

Enclosures

cc: Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, L.L.P.  
Charles A. Guyton, Esq.  
Beggs & Lane  
Jeffrey A. Stone, Esq.

COM	
ECR	
GCL	2
OPC	
RCP	4
SSC	
SGA	+
ADM	
CLK	

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

02882 APR -1 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: **Environmental Cost  
Recovery Clause**

Docket No.: **090007-EI**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been furnished this  
31st day of March, 2009, by regular U. S. Mail to the following:

Martha Carter Brown, Esq.  
Senior Counsel  
FL Public Service Comm.  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee FL 32399-0850

John W. McWhirter, Jr., Esq.  
McWhirter Reeves & Davidson  
P.O. Box 3350  
Tampa, FL 33601-3350

Paula K. Brown, Administrator  
Regulatory Coordination  
Tampa Electric Company  
P. O. Box 111  
Tampa FL 33601

John T. Butler, Esq.  
Attorney for Florida Power & Light  
Company  
700 Universe Boulevard  
Juno Beach FL 33408-0420

Lee L. Willis, Esq.  
James D. Beasley, Esq.  
Attorneys for Tampa Electric Co.  
Ausley & McMullen  
P. O. Box 391  
Tallahassee FL 32302

Cheryl Martin  
Florida Public Utilities Company  
P. O. Box 3395  
West Palm Beach FL 33402-3395

J. R. Kelly  
Office of Public Counsel  
111 W. Madison St., Room 812  
Tallahassee FL 32399-1400

John T. Burnett, Esq.  
R. Alexander Glenn, Esq.  
Progress Energy Service Co.  
P. O. Box 14042  
St. Petersburg FL 33733-4042

Gary V. Perko, Esq.  
Hopping Green & Sams  
P. O. Box 6526  
Tallahassee FL 32314

Paul Lewis, Jr.  
Progress Energy Florida, Inc.  
106 E. College Ave., Ste. 800  
Tallahassee FL 32301-7740

Patricia Ann Christensen  
Associate Public Counsel  
Office of Public Counsel  
111 W. Madison St., Rm. 812  
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Charlie Beck  
Deputy Public Counsel  
Office of Public Counsel  
111 W. Madison St., Rm. 812  
Tallahassee, FL 32399

R. Wade Litchfield, Esq.  
Associate General Counsel for  
Florida Power & Light Company  
700 Universe Boulevard  
Juno Beach FL 33408-0420

Vicki Gordan Kaufman  
John C. Moyle  
118 N. Gadsden Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**JEFFREY A. STONE**

Florida Bar No. 325953  
**RUSSELL A. BADDERS**  
Florida Bar No. 007455

**STEVEN GRIFFIN**  
Florida Bar No. 0627569  
**BEGGS & LANE**  
P. O. Box 12950  
Pensacola FL 32591-2950  
(850) 432-2451

**Attorneys for Gulf Power Company**

---

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE  
COMMISSION**


**Docket No. 090007-EI**

**GULF POWER COMPANY  
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE  
PROGRAM UPDATE**

**for the**

**Clean Air Interstate Rule  
Clean Air Visibility Rule**

*April 1, 2009*



DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

02882 APR -1 09

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

---

---

CONTENTS

**1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... 1**

**2.0 REGULATORY AND LEGISLATIVE UPDATE ..... 4**

**2.1 Clean Air Interstate Rule ..... 4**

**2.2 Clean Air Mercury Rule ..... 5**

**2.3 Clean Air Visibility Rule ..... 5**

**3.0 GULF’S COMPLIANCE PLAN ..... 7**

**3.1 Gulf Power’s Electric Generating System ..... 7**

**3.2 Compliance Options ..... 10**

**3.3 Gulf’s Evaluation of Compliance Options ..... 11**

**4.0 PLANT-BY-PLANT COMPLIANCE PLAN ..... 27**

**4.1 Plant Crist ..... 27**

**4.2 Plant Daniel ..... 30**

**4.3 Plant Smith ..... 33**

**4.4 Plant Scholz ..... 35**

**4.5 Gulf’s Allowance Purchases ..... 37**

**5.0 POTENTIAL NEW ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS ..... 39**

**5.1 New 8-Hour Ozone Standard ..... 39**

**5.2 New Fine Particle Standard ..... 40**

**5.3 Global Climate Issues ..... 41**

**6.0 SUMMARY OF GULF’S COMPLIANCE PLAN ..... 42**

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE  
02882 APR -18  
FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

---

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0-1	Projected 2009-2018 Compliance Plan Capital and O&M Costs by Plant	3
2.1-1	CAIR Emission Reduction Requirements	4
3.1-1	Compliance Plan Capital Expenditures	8
3.1-2	Compliance Plan Plant O&M Expenses	9
3.3-1	Net Replacement Costs - Crist Units 4 through 6	17
3.3-2	Net Replacement Costs - Daniel Units 1 and 2	19
3.3-3	Phase I Economic Viability Study – Crist Unit 4	20
3.3-4	Phase I Economic Viability Study – Crist Unit 5	21
3.3-5	Phase I Economic Viability Study – Crist Unit 6	22
3.3-6	Phase I Economic Viability Study – Crist Unit 7	23
3.3-7	Phase I Economic Viability Study – Daniel Unit 1	24
3.3-8	Phase I Economic Viability Study – Daniel Unit 2	25
3.3-9	Phase I Economic Viability Study – Evaluation Description	26
4.5-1	Gulf Power Allowance Projection and Costs (2009-2017)	38

---

**LIST OF FIGURES**

<b><u>Figure No.</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
5.1-1	Potential Ozone Nonattainment Counties	39
5.2-1	Nonattainment Areas For Annual PM-2.5 and EPA-Recommended Nonattainment Areas For 24-Hr PM2.5	40

---

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) were passed by Congress in 1990, Gulf Power Company (Gulf Power or Gulf) has reviewed and updated its environmental compliance plan as needed on an on-going basis. The goal of this process is to identify reasonable, cost-effective compliance strategies that will minimize the impact on Gulf Power's customers while achieving environmental objectives and assuring compliance with all environmental requirements.

This document is an update of Gulf's original compliance plan approved by the Florida Public Service Commission (Commission or FPSC) in Order No. PSC-07-0721-S-EI. That plan: (a) addressed the requirements of the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR), Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR), and the Clean Air Visibility Rule (CAVR); (b) reviewed the decision process for assuring compliance at Gulf Power; and (c) provided cost estimates for incorporating these requirements at Gulf Power. The document reviewed the specific issues, timing, alternatives, process, and costs necessary for compliance with the new federal rules and the corresponding implementation programs developed by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) and the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ).

On June 22, 2007, the Office of Public Counsel (OPC), the Florida Industrial Power Users' Group (FIPUG) and Gulf filed a petition for approval of a stipulation regarding the substantive provisions of Gulf's compliance plan. That stipulation identified 10 specific components, Phase I, of Gulf's plan as being reasonable and prudent for implementation and set forth a process for review in connection with the three remaining components of the plan. On August 14, 2007, the Commission voted to approve the stipulation with the proviso that Gulf provide an annual status report regarding cost-effectiveness and prudence of the phases in its Plan into which the Company is moving. On September 18, 2008, the Company filed its first annual compliance plan update, which was approved by the FPSC on November 4, 2008.

Since the Commission's approval of Gulf's compliance plan in 2007, there have been a number of developments. Gulf has addressed in several of its intervening filings, as well as in the annual update, changes to schedules of approved projects, such as the addition and cancellation of Activated Carbon Injection (ACI) at Plant Daniel and other compliance plan changes. However, there have been two significant court decisions that have had and will have further impact on Gulf's compliance plan. In February 2008 the District of Columbia Court of Appeals issued an opinion vacating the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) CAMR. The vacatur became effective with the issuance of the court's mandate on March 14, 2008, nullifying CAMR mercury emission control obligations and monitoring requirements. In July 2008, in response to petitions brought by certain states and regulated industries challenging particular aspects of CAIR, the U.S. District Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia issued a decision vacating CAIR in its entirety and remanding it to the EPA for further action consistent with its opinion. On December 23, 2008, however, the Court altered

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

02882 APR-18

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

---

its July decision in response to a rehearing petition and remanded CAIR to the EPA without vacatur, thereby leaving CAIR compliance requirements in place while the EPA develops a revised rule. The Court did not impose a particular schedule by which EPA must alter CAIR but did remind EPA that they did not intend to grant an indefinite stay of the effectiveness of their decision. The States of Florida and Mississippi have EPA-approved plans to implement this rule.

This document addresses Gulf's ongoing compliance projects and the reasons Gulf plans to continue these projects. Florida and Mississippi's EPA approved CAIR implementation plans must be met. Gulf Power's compliance plan will be impacted by factors such as: implementation of these rules; the result of EPA's promulgation of a CAIR replacement rule; EPA's, FDEP's, and the MDEQ's responses to court decisions vacating CAMR; changes to existing environmental laws and regulations, the cost of emissions allowances, performance of emission control equipment; and any change in the use of coal. Based on these factors, future environmental compliance costs will continue to be incurred, and projections will be revised. The timing of the requirements and costs incurred will be a function of the compliance options selected, fuel burn, energy demand, fuel sulfur content, availability and prices for allowance purchases, natural gas prices, performance of emission control equipment, and other variables.

A capital and operations and maintenance (O&M) cost summary for Gulf's compliance plan is provided in Table 1.0-1. Detailed capital and O&M costs are provided in Section 3 of this document.

As noted in the Commission's approval of Gulf's original compliance plan, the plan will likely evolve over time, so, at present, only Phase I projects have been approved. Gulf has changed the implementation of some of those projects. This document reflects all the changes to Gulf's compliance plan since the initial plan was approved. As circumstances become clearer, it is reasonable to anticipate further changes.

Gulf Power has remained in compliance with all requirements of the CAAA and has addressed local concerns regarding potential ozone nonattainment in Pensacola and along the Gulf Coast. Implementation of the plan described in this document will help assure continued compliance; however, new ozone standards may still result in the Pensacola area being designated as non-attainment. The FDEP recently released a list of non-attainment areas for ozone to EPA that included both the Pensacola Metropolitan area and Bay County. EPA is expected to make the final designations early next year.

Beyond CAIR and CAVR, many of the future regulatory requirements, especially those needed to attain current and future ozone and fine-particulate ambient standards and reasonable progress visibility requirements, will be aimed at further nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) reductions. However, many of these anticipated requirements are not yet fully developed. With the vacatur of CAMR, it is anticipated that EPA will adopt a rule for maximum achievable control technology (MACT) for power plant mercury



emissions and potentially other hazardous air pollutants (HAPs). As mentioned earlier, the EPA has been ordered to promulgate a new rule addressing the issues in the D.C. Circuit Court's July 2008 CAIR decision. In addition, there are multiple state, federal and international initiatives regarding greenhouse gases (GHG), particularly carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), pending. If adopted, these rules could further impact Gulf's compliance plan. All of this uncertainty reinforces the need for a flexible, robust compliance plan. Accordingly, as decision dates for equipment purchases approach, and as better information relative to regulatory and economic drivers becomes available, the analysis will be updated as needed to enable the selection of the most reasonable and cost-effective compliance alternatives while maintaining future flexibility in the plan.

**Table 1.0-1**  
**Projected 2009-2018 Compliance Plan**  
**Capital and O&M Costs by Plant**

<b>Plant</b>	<b>Phase I Capital Expenditures (\$M)</b>	<b>Phase II Capital Expenditures (\$M)</b>	<b>Phase I O&amp;M Expenses (\$M)</b>	<b>Phase II O&amp;M Expenses (\$M)</b>
Crist	463	0	184	0
Daniel*	315	206	24	8
Smith	1	307	37	4
Scholz	0	0	0.2	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>779</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>12</b>

\*Costs for Gulf Power's ownership portion of Plant Daniel in Mississippi.  
 Note: Allowance cost projections are not included in Table 1.0-1

---

## **2.0 REGULATORY AND LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

This section provides a regulatory and legislative update and review of the CAIR, CAMR, and CAVR.

### **2.1 CLEAN AIR INTERSTATE RULE**

In March 2005, the EPA published the final CAIR, a rule that addresses transport of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions that contribute to nonattainment of the ozone and fine particulate matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in the Eastern United States. This cap and trade rule addresses power plant SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions that were found to contribute to non-attainment of the 8-hour ozone and fine particulate matter standards in downwind states. Twenty-eight eastern states, including Florida and Mississippi, are subject to the requirements of the rule. The rule calls for additional reductions of NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> to be achieved in two phases, 2009/2010 and 2015, as shown in Table 2.1-1.

**Table 2.1-1**

#### **CAIR Emission Reduction Requirements**

<b>Emissions</b>	<b>Phase I reduction from acid rain allocations or current emissions</b>	<b>Phase II reduction from current allocations or current emissions</b>
<b>SO<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>50% (2010)</b>	<b>66% (2015)</b>
<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>50% (2009)</b>	<b>65% (2015)</b>

On July 11, 2008, in response to petitions brought by certain states and regulated industries challenging particular aspects of CAIR, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia issued a decision vacating CAIR in its entirety, and remanding it to EPA for further action consistent with its opinion. In December 2008, however, the U.S. Circuit Court altered its July 2008 decision in response to a rehearing petition and remanded CAIR to the EPA without vacatur, thereby leaving CAIR compliance requirements in place while EPA develops a revised rule. The States of Florida and Mississippi have EPA-approved plans to implement this rule. Compliance with these plans will be accomplished by the installation of additional emission controls at the Company's coal-fired facilities and/or by the purchase of emission allowances. Decisions regarding Gulf's CAIR compliance strategy were made jointly with the CAMR and CAVR compliance plans due to co-benefits of proposed controls.

Gulf Power's overall compliance strategy has been developed in response to numerous federal and state regulatory requirements, many of which remain unaffected by the court's ruling. The court's decision has the potential to impact future decision making regarding capital expenditures, the installation and operation of pollution control equipment, the

---

purchase of emissions allowances, and the carrying cost of the existing emissions allowances. The ultimate impact of this decision, if any, cannot be determined at this time and will depend on subsequent legal action, including future EPA and State rulemaking. However, what is clear for the present is that Gulf must comply with Florida and Mississippi's EPA approved CAIR implementation plans.

## **2.2 CLEAN AIR MERCURY RULE**

In March 2005, the EPA published the final CAMR, a cap and trade program for the reduction of mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants. The rule set caps on mercury emissions to be implemented in two phases, 2010 and 2018, and provided for an emission allowance trading market.

The final CAMR was challenged in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The petitioners alleged that the EPA was not authorized to establish a cap-and-trade program for mercury emissions and instead the EPA must establish Maximum Achievable Control Technologies (MACT) standards for coal-fired electric utility steam generating units. On February 8, 2008, the court issued an opinion vacating the CAMR. The vacatur became effective with the issuance of the court's mandate on March 14, 2008, nullifying CAMR mercury emission control obligations and monitoring requirements.

With CAMR voided, electric generating facilities are no longer required to install mercury controls to meet the CAMR emission limits and are not required to install mercury monitoring equipment to meet the January 2009 monitoring deadline. EPA is expected to initiate a rulemaking proceeding to develop MACT standards for power plants; however, this process could take multiple years to complete. The CAMR court decision does not impact state rules that may continue to be developed in Florida. In addition, it is anticipated that emission controls installed to achieve compliance with CAIR, the Acid Rain Program, ambient air quality rules, and other environmental requirements will continue to result in mercury emission reductions. Future rulemakings could require emission reductions more stringent than those required by the CAMR.

## **2.3 CLEAN AIR VISIBILITY RULE**

The Clean Air Visibility Rule (formerly called the Regional Haze Rule) was finalized in July 2005. The goal of this rule is to restore natural visibility conditions in certain areas (primarily national parks and wilderness areas) by 2064. The rule involves (1) the application of Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) to certain sources built between 1962 and 1977, and (2) the application of any additional emissions reductions which may be deemed necessary for each designated area to achieve reasonable progress by 2018 toward the natural conditions goal. Thereafter, for each 10-year planning period, additional emissions reductions will be required to continue to demonstrate reasonable progress in each area during that period. For power plants, the CAVR allows states to determine that the CAIR satisfies BART requirements for SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>. Extensive studies were performed for each

---

of the company's affected units to demonstrate that additional PM controls were not necessary under BART. States are currently completing implementation plans that contain strategies for BART and any other measures required to achieve the first phase of reasonable progress. The Florida Regional Haze rule, Chapter 62 Part 296.340, F.A.C., requires BART compliance as expeditiously as practicable, but not later than December 31, 2013. The Mississippi Regional Haze State Implementation Plan (SIP) has been submitted to EPA and is currently under review.

---

### **3.0 GULF'S COMPLIANCE PLAN**

#### **3.1 GULF POWER'S ELECTRIC GENERATING SYSTEM**

Gulf Power owns and operates three fossil-fueled generating facilities in Northwest Florida (Plants Crist, Smith and Scholz). Gulf also owns a 50 percent undivided ownership interest in Unit 1 and Unit 2 at Mississippi Power Company's Plant Daniel. This fleet of generating units consists of ten fossil steam units, one combined cycle (CC) unit and one combustion turbine (CT). The name plate generating capacity of Gulf's generating fleet affected by CAIR and/or CAVR is 2,783 Megawatts (MW).

A summary of the Compliance Plan capital projects and associated expenditures through 2018 is provided in Table 3.1-1. The projected plant O&M expenses associated with the capital projects are included in Table 3.1-2. The cost information is provided by plant and by project.

**Table 3.1-1  
Compliance Plan Capital Expenditures**

A    B    C    D    E    F    G    H    I    J  
\$ in Thousands

	Prior Years**	2009
<b>By Plant</b>		
<b>Plant Crist</b>		
Mercury Monitoring		
Unit 6 SCR	5,270	14,215
Units 4-7 Scrubber	332,229	251,585
<b>Plant Scholz</b>		
Mercury Monitoring	556	
<b>Plant Smith</b>		
Unit 2 Baghouse*		
Unit 1 SNCR	7,603	696
Unit 2 SNCR	2,254	229
Mercury Monitoring	1,964	
Units 1-2 Scrubber *		
CAIR Parametric Monitor	229	
<b>Plant Daniel</b>		
Mercury Monitoring	7	(7)
Unit 1 SCR*		
Unit 2 SCR*		
Units 1 & 2 Scrubber		
Unit 1 SNCR		
Unit 1 Low NOx Burners	170	1,274
Unit 2 SNCR		
Unit 2 Low NOx Burners	3,265	161
<b>By Project</b>		
Mercury Monitoring	2,527	(7)
SCRs	5,270	14,215
Scrubbers	332,229	251,585
SNCRs	9,857	925
Baghouse		
CAIR Parametric Monitor	229	
Low Nox Burners	3,435	1,435
<b>Annual Total</b>	<b>353,547</b>	<b>268,153</b>

\* Phase II projects that have not been approved for ECRC recovery

\*\* 2006-2008 expenditures

Expenditures presented for Plant Daniel represent Gulf's ownership portion.

Allowance cost projections are not included in Table 3.1-1

**Table 3.1-2  
Compliance Plan Plant O&M Expenses**

	\$ in Thousands		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	2008	2009										
<b>By Plant</b>												
<b>Plant Crist</b>												
Mercury Monitoring												
Unit 6 SCR												
Units 4-7 Scrubber	366	1,739										
<b>Plant Scholz</b>												
Mercury Monitoring		18										
<b>Plant Smith</b>												
Unit 2 Baghouse*												
Unit 1 SNCR		1,700										
Unit 2 SNCR		1,640										
Mercury Monitoring												
Units 1-2 Scrubber*												
CAIR Parametric Monitor												
<b>Plant Daniel</b>												
Mercury Monitoring	145	7										
Unit 1 SCR*												
Unit 2 SCR*												
Units 1&2 Scrubber												
Units 1 & 2 SNCR(s)												
Unit 1 Low NOx Burners												
Unit 2 Low NOx Burners												
Activated Carbon Injection	71											
<b>By Project</b>												
Mercury Monitoring	145	25										
SCRs												
Scrubbers	366	1,739										
SNCRs		3,340										
Baghouse												
CAIR Parametric Monitor												
Low Nox Burners												
Activated Carbon Injection	71											
<b>Annual Total</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>5,104</b>										

\* Phase II projects that have not been approved for ECRC recovery  
 Expenses presented for Plant Daniel represent Gulf's ownership portion.  
 Allowance cost projections are not included in Table 3.1-2

---

## 3.2 COMPLIANCE OPTIONS

A comprehensive environmental compliance planning evaluation considers a range of options for economically meeting the energy needs of Gulf Power's customers. Gulf Power investigated four major options for environmental compliance:

- Dependence on allowance purchases
- Fuel switching
- Retrofit of environmental emission controls to existing generating units
- Retirement of existing generating units and replacement with new or purchased generation

Combinations of these options were also considered.

### 3.2.1 Allowance Purchase Option

The CAIR rule proposed a new cap and trade program. Cap and trade programs use a market-based approach to reduce emissions. The program sets a cap, or limit, for each pollutant such as SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>, which is then divided into emission allowances that are allocated to each affected source. Sources are allowed to determine the most reasonable, cost-effective way to comply. Facilities may install environmental emission controls, use fuel switching, replace the generating units, rely on the emission allowance market, or use some combination of these options.

In addition to the already existing SO<sub>2</sub> (acid rain) and seasonal NO<sub>x</sub> (ozone) allowance markets, the CAIR introduced an additional allowance market for annual NO<sub>x</sub>.

### 3.2.2 Fuel Switching Option

Fuel switching refers to instances where an electric generating unit's primary fuel is changed to reduce emissions. For certain facilities, NO<sub>x</sub> emissions can be reduced by burning high-moisture, low-Btu sub-bituminous coals, while mercury emissions can be reduced by utilizing coal lower in mercury content. In Gulf's case, fuel switching to lower sulfur coal was shown under the Acid Rain Program to be a cost effective means for reducing emissions of SO<sub>2</sub>.

### 3.2.3 Retrofit Options

Retrofit options refer to additional environmental emission controls that can be installed on existing generating units. As discussed in Section 2, affected coal-fired electric generating units would be required to comply with SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> limits under CAIR and CAVR, if the units are to continue to operate. These reductions may be met by installing additional SO<sub>2</sub>, and NO<sub>x</sub>



---

emission controls on existing units. Currently, the proven control technology of choice for SO<sub>2</sub> reduction is wet scrubbing. For NO<sub>x</sub> removal, there are a number of proven emission controls available such as Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR), Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR), and Low NO<sub>x</sub> Burners (LNBs).

### **3.2.4 Retirement and Replacement Option**

A retirement and replacement evaluation is used to compare retrofit compliance options to premature retirement and replacement of specific generating units in order to determine the most reasonable, cost-effective compliance option. These evaluations are performed at two levels of detail: (1) a less detailed retirement/replacement evaluation and (2) a more detailed site specific replacement evaluation. The retirement option is typically more applicable to smaller, older, less efficient coal plants that cannot financially support the addition of environmental controls. The evaluation methodology and the evaluation results are discussed in Section 3.3.4.

## **3.3 GULF'S EVALUATION OF COMPLIANCE OPTIONS**

### **3.3.1 Evaluation of Allowance Purchase Option**

The two existing emissions allowance markets (SO<sub>2</sub> and seasonal NO<sub>x</sub>) have proven to be fundamentally driven by supply and demand. However, over time, many speculative investors have begun entering the allowance markets, particularly the SO<sub>2</sub> market, introducing considerable volatility and uncertainty concerning the price and availability of allowances.

The costs of compliance with the SO<sub>2</sub> programs represent a major portion of Gulf Power's total environmental compliance program cost. With the high price volatility, the future price and availability of allowances cannot be treated as predictable; therefore, depending solely on the market for SO<sub>2</sub> compliance presents a large risk for Gulf Power's customers. Additionally, should allowances not be available, Gulf Power might be forced to operate higher cost units while curtailing operation of lower cost units in order to maintain compliance.

The CAIR program introduced an additional allowance market for annual NO<sub>x</sub>. This market was expected to emerge as soon as the states finalized their implementation plans. Indeed, EPA has populated the annual NO<sub>x</sub> accounts. Due to the December 2008 court decision leaving CAIR intact, these allowances are necessary for continued operation after January 1, 2009. In addition, the seasonal NO<sub>x</sub> program will be implemented in Florida and Mississippi.

Total dependence on these commodity markets for compliance would be very risky and potentially costly for Gulf Power and its customers. The market does, however, provide realistic opportunities for reducing costs through selected and limited purchases of allowances in conjunction with other options to achieve cost effective compliance.

---

In summary, in order for the allowance market based approach to be an appropriate solution for Gulf Power's compliance shortfall, these allowance markets must be established, reasonably stable, and have sufficient quantities of allowances available. Furthermore, to avoid short-term supply and demand volatility, these conditions must be met with sufficient lead time to allow time to pursue other options such as constructing emission controls. Given the timing of construction schedules and the compliance deadlines for the new rules, Gulf Power could not wait to see if stable allowance markets emerged. These overall uncertainties eliminated the exclusive use of an all allowance purchase option from consideration.

### **3.3.2 Evaluation of Fuel Switching Option**

Fuel switching was shown under the Acid Rain Program to be cost effective for reducing emissions of SO<sub>2</sub>. For certain facilities, NO<sub>x</sub> emissions can be reduced by burning high-moisture, low-Btu sub-bituminous coals, and some coals are lower in mercury content than others. However, for the magnitude of emission reductions required by CAIR and CAVR, fuel switching is no longer a viable option.

### **3.3.3 Evaluation of Retrofit Options**

Having determined that neither an all allowance plan nor an all fuel switching plan would be feasible or desirable, Gulf Power was left with the primary options of either retrofitting units or retiring and replacing units (and, if necessary, supplementing those options with allowance purchases or fuel switching). However, before making a comparison of retrofit and replacement options, Gulf Power first had to choose among competing retrofit options. Those selections of the best retrofit options were discussed in Gulf's original compliance plan and have not changed; therefore, they are not repeated here.

### **3.3.4 Evaluation of Retrofit versus Replacement Options**

Selection between retrofit and replacement options is based upon a financial assessment of which option ultimately is expected to be the most reasonable, cost effective alternative for Gulf's customers. The analyses examines the relative cost of dispatching the System (a) with the retrofit technology in place and (b) with having retired the unit without making the retrofit and instead, replacing it with new or purchased capacity. The analyses included all Gulf Power units that would require environmental controls under Phase I of CAIR and are anticipated under CAVR.

This analysis is run at both a less detailed level (Phase I) and using a more detailed methodology (Phase II). The basic methodology is the same for both types of analyses, but the Phase I analysis employs some simplifying but more stringent assumptions. The Phase I level analysis uses a lower-cost replacement alternative than is used in the more detailed Phase II methodology (essentially peaking capacity with energy priced at the Southern electric system's marginal cost of energy instead of an equivalent amount of CC capacity replacing the unit that would be

---

retired). Consequently, if a retrofit option passes the more stringent Phase I level analysis, it will pass the more detailed Phase II analysis that uses a higher cost, site-specific replacement option. The employment of this Phase I methodology allows a quick, yet more stringent evaluation of financial viability and is an excellent indicator of which retrofit options need a more detailed evaluation. The Phase II evaluation focuses on a comparison of continued unit operation with replacement by a CC. The detailed evaluation also includes more refined production cost modeling and cost implications to the transmission system. Changes in production cost, capital, and other fixed costs are captured in the comparison analysis to help determine the most economical option.

### **Phase I Methodology**

The Phase I economic analysis creates a comparison of the costs over a period from the current year until the planned retirement date for each unit at which a retrofit is being contemplated. The costs of operating the retrofitted unit, its affect on system dispatch costs, and the need to purchase allowances to meet any remaining emission shortfalls (all of which are characterized as “Incremental Costs”) are compared to the cost of a generic peaking unit and System replacement energy costs. To calculate those associated energy costs, Gulf assumes energy purchases from the Southern electric system at the System incremental cost. The costs associated with capacity to replace a unit and the associated energy costs are characterized as “Avoided Cost,” as these are the costs that are avoided by operating the retrofitted unit.

The analysis compares the net present value (NPV) on a \$/kW basis of the two cost streams over the period analyzed to determine which has the lower cost on a net present value basis. The difference between the Avoided Cost associated with replacement and the Incremental Costs of operating the retrofitted unit is characterized as “the overall net contribution of continued operation.” If the replacement option cost was lower than the retrofit option cost, then this value would be negative. The control schedules are based on potential CAIR, CAVR and ozone non-attainment requirements.

### **Avoided Cost**

Avoided cost includes capacity and energy costs. These costs are properly characterized as benefits, as they are the costs avoided due to operating the retrofitted unit. The avoidance of these costs is a benefit to Gulf Power and its customers.

Capacity costs are the costs of a peaking generator used for system reliability to meet peak loads. These costs for the replacement option in the Phase I analysis are based on a peaking capacity price forecast that assumed short-term purchases from the market until 2014 and the economic carrying cost of a self-build combustion turbine thereafter.

Energy costs in the Phase I analysis are developed using the Strategist<sup>®</sup> model. Strategist<sup>®</sup> is a production cost model commonly employed throughout both the Southern electric system and

---

the utility industry. The avoided energy cost for each retrofitted unit is calculated by determining the average energy purchase costs during the hours the retrofitted unit operated each year. This methodology simplifies avoided energy cost calculations for use in Phase I potential retirement candidates.

### **Incremental Costs**

Incremental costs include fuel, O&M, capital, and emission allowance costs (NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and CO<sub>2</sub>) necessary for continued operation of the retrofitted facility. Mercury allowances were not included in the Strategist<sup>®</sup> model due to the vacatur of CAMR. Further, given that CAIR's vacatur was stayed by the Court, NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> allowance costs necessary to comply were included.

The fuel and allowance price assumptions are based on Southern Company forecasts developed by polling external and internal subject matter experts. Southern Company provides primarily near term projections based on its experience with the short term markets and relies primarily on an external consultant for its long term forecast. The Strategist<sup>®</sup> model is then provided total annual fuel and emissions costs based on the economic operation of the retrofitted unit for the base case and the two CO<sub>2</sub> sensitivities for the remaining life of the unit. O&M costs for the retrofitted unit include labor, materials, overheads, and engineering and support services. Four-year projections of the retrofitted unit's incremental O&M costs were developed. The O&M costs of the retrofitted unit over its remaining life are calculated using a moving average of the projections for the first 4 years and escalating the resulting value for inflation.

The incremental capital costs for the remaining life of the retrofitted unit were based on capital expenditures projected for each retrofitted generating unit. These projected capital expenditures were necessary to keep the units running through the analysis period at the current level of operation. Future capital expenditures for environmental controls were also included.

### **Sensitivities**

Gulf's September 2008 CAIR/CAMR/CAVR Compliance Plan update included the results of a Phase I base case analysis and two sensitivities that were developed around uncertainty in CO<sub>2</sub> legislation. These planning sensitivities were developed in order to capture variations in the operating environments that would affect the retirement dates of the units. The sensitivities were developed by Southern Company based on input from subject matter experts within Southern Company. The sensitivities were based on \$10/Ton CO<sub>2</sub> and \$20/Ton CO<sub>2</sub> (2008\$) starting in 2015 escalating at 5% above inflation. The Phase I analysis has not been updated since the September 2008 filing because Gulf's economic analyses have not been finalized using the updated 2009 planning assumptions.

---

## Summary of Study Results

Tables 3.3-3 through 3.3-8 summarize the results of the September 2008 Phase I analysis. The tables illustrate costs and benefits of continued operation of each of the units with environmental controls over the remaining life of each unit for the base case and both CO<sub>2</sub> sensitivities. Assumptions for the timing and installation of environmental controls are listed at the bottom of the table. A description of each line item included in the evaluation is also included on Table 3.3-9.

In most reasonable sensitivities analyzed for Gulf's units with proposed retrofit projects, continuing to operate the existing unit with the retrofit option has a NPV lower than the cost to replace the unit. Under higher CO<sub>2</sub> penalties (\$20/Ton) and moderate fuel prices, the evaluation indicates it would be cost effective to replace the units by 2020; however, under those conditions, the higher demand and higher related price for natural gas that would result would likely provide enough economic margin to continue to operate the coal units. Customers will also continue to benefit from the value of diversity in future fuel costs with the retrofit of existing coal units instead of Gulf increasing its reliance on gas.

The September 2008 Phase I level results indicate there is a savings shown by continuing to operate each generating unit as opposed to replacing it with new or purchased capacity and System energy purchases for both the base case (No CO<sub>2</sub>) and \$10 CO<sub>2</sub> sensitivity. By adding the net contribution values for the base case shown in Tables 3.3-3 through 3.3-8, the savings for Plants Crist and Daniel are \$1.9 billion and \$1.2 billion, respectively, under the No CO<sub>2</sub> case, and \$1.3 billion and \$0.9 billion, respectively, under the \$10 CO<sub>2</sub> sensitivity. Under the extreme \$20 CO<sub>2</sub> sensitivity, which does not recognize a corresponding increase in natural gas prices, Crist Units 4 through 6 and Daniel Units 1 and 2 are indicated to retire by 2020. Crist Unit 7 remains economic even under the most severe CO<sub>2</sub> sensitivity.

## Phase II Methodology

The Phase II analysis focuses on a comparison of continued operation with retrofits to replacement by a combined cycle unit. This evaluation also includes more refined production cost modeling and cost implications to the transmission system. Changes in production cost, capital, and other fixed costs are captured in the comparison analysis to help determine the most economical option. In the September 2008 Phase II analysis the System production costs were generated with the Strategist<sup>®</sup> model using a thirty-year period (2008 – 2037) with the updated 2008 Energy Ventures Analysis, Inc (EVA) published forecasts for allowances and the Southern Company 2009 Fuel Forecast Update. Fixed costs associated with the continued operation of the existing generating units were based on projections of annual O&M and the NPV of the revenue requirements associated with incremental capital investment necessary to keep the unit operational over the 30-year evaluation period. Replacement, installation capital, fixed O&M, and continue to operate capital, are site specific costs developed by Southern Company Engineering and Construction Services. Replacement capacity costs are expressed as a credit of

---

Engineering and Construction Services. Replacement capacity costs are expressed as a credit of CC capacity cost for all replacement MWs that exceed the amount being replaced. The NPV of the difference between replacement cost and unit operational cost is calculated to determine the overall net contribution. The annual cost difference is present-valued and accumulated to determine if there is an economic retirement date. The units analyzed and the dates utilized in the retirement detailed analyses were determined based on the units impacted by the CAIR and CAVR control deadlines and time required for replacement combined cycles to be built. These control deadlines are based on potential CAIR, CAVR, and ozone non-attainment requirements.

As in the Phase I analysis, the September 2008 Phase II analysis incorporated the base case and two planning sensitivities that were developed around uncertainty in CO<sub>2</sub> legislation. These planning sensitivities were developed by Southern Company based on input from subject matter experts both externally and internally within Southern Company. The sensitivities were based on \$10/Ton CO<sub>2</sub> and \$20/Ton CO<sub>2</sub> (2008\$) starting in 2015 escalating at 5% above inflation. The units analyzed in Phase II are Crist Units 4 through 6 and Daniel Units 1 and 2. The Phase II analysis has not been updated since the September 2008 filing because Gulf's economic analyses have not been finalized using the updated 2009 planning assumptions.

### **Plant Crist Units 4 through 6**

The purpose of this evaluation was to determine the economic benefits of retiring Plant Crist Units 4 through 6 in May of 2014 and replacing the units with the lowest cost option. The evaluation also included estimates of transmission cost implications and dismantlement costs associated with a potential retirement. It was assumed in this study that the replacement combined cycle unit would be placed on the Plant Crist site. The evaluation retired and replaced Crist Units 4 through 6 with one 2x1 G series CC in June of 2014, avoiding the Crist 6 SCR installation in the fall of 2012.

Crist 7 was excluded from this evaluation due to the large economic value indicated in the Phase I evaluation. Since Crist 7 already has an SCR and is scheduled to have a scrubber operational in 2009, nearly all of its environmental retrofit costs are either spent or committed. At this point in the construction of the Plant Crist scrubber, eliminating Crist Units 4 through 6 from the project scope would not result in significant, if any, cost savings. For this reason, all of the remaining cost of the Crist scrubber was allocated to Crist Unit 7. Even with this allocation, Crist Unit 7 remains the most economic choice to be controlled.

### **Transmission and Dismantlement Cost Assumptions**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5





1  
2


Partial dismantlement cost estimates for Crist Units 4 through 6 were based on a 2008 study. The results of that study indicated that for Crist Units 4 through 6 the projected cost is \$5.5 million in 2008\$.

**Results**

An economic evaluation of the CC replacement option was performed to compare customer costs over a thirty-year period from 2008-2037. The CC replacement option was compared back to the cost of continuing operation of Crist 4 through 6 with the SCR installed on Crist 6.

Table 3.3-1 summarizes the additional fuel (System Production Cost), capital, and O&M costs for the CC replacement options for the September 2008 base case and two sensitivity cases. It shows that the No CO<sub>2</sub> and \$10 CO<sub>2</sub> cases would result in a total cost to the customer of \$936.6 million and \$643.4 million, respectively, if Crist Units 4 through 6 were replaced with a combined cycle unit. Under the higher \$20 CO<sub>2</sub> penalty and the current fuel forecast, the evaluation indicated there would be a total cost to the customer of \$376.9 million, if Crist Units 4 through 6 were replaced with a combined cycle unit. Under such a high CO<sub>2</sub> penalty, the higher demand and related higher price for natural gas that would result would likely provide an even greater economic margin to continue to operate the coal units.

**Table 3.3-1  
Net Replacement Costs – Crist Units 4 through 6**



---

## Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2

The purpose of this evaluation was to determine the economic benefits of retiring Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2 in December of 2014 and replacing the units with the lowest cost option. The evaluation also included estimates of transmission cost implications and site closure costs associated with a potential retirement. It was assumed in this study that the replacement CC would be placed on the Plant Daniel site. The evaluation retired and replaced Daniel Units 1 and 2 with two 2x1 G series CC's in January of 2015, avoiding the Daniel Units 1 and 2 SCRs in the fall of 2014 and the spring of 2015, respectively, and the fall 2013 Scrubber installation.

### **Transmission and Site Closure Cost Assumptions**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

Site closure cost estimates for Daniel Units 1 and 2 were based on a 2008 study. The results of that study indicated that for Daniel Units 1 and 2, the projected cost is \$33.2 million in 2008\$, which included the closure of the ash pond.

### **Results**

Table 3.3.2 summarizes the additional fuel (System Production Cost), capital, and O&M costs for the CC replacement options for the September 2008 base case and two scenarios analyzed. It showed that for the No CO<sub>2</sub> and \$10 CO<sub>2</sub> cases there would be a total cost to Gulf's customers of \$669.2 million and \$365.0 million, respectively, to replace Daniel Units 1 and 2. Under the higher \$20 CO<sub>2</sub> penalty, and the current fuel forecast, the evaluation indicated there would be a total cost to Gulf's customers of \$50.4 million to replace Daniel Units 1 and 2. Under such a high CO<sub>2</sub> penalty, the higher demand and higher related price for natural gas that would result would likely provide an even greater economic margin to continue to operate the coal units.



---

**Table 3.3-2 Net Replacement Costs – Daniel Units 1 and 2**



A


B

C

D

TRADE SECRET - PROTECTED

Table 3.3-3  
Phase I Economic Viability Study - Crist Unit 4

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

*Environmental Controls*

*Scrubber*

*SCR*

2009

N/A

A


B

C

D

TRADE SECRET - PROTECTED

**Table 3.3-4**  
**Phase I Economic Viability Study - Crist Unit 5**

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

*Environmental Controls*  
Scrubber  
SCR

2009  
N/A

A

B

C

D

TRADE SECRET - PROTECTED

Table 3.3-5  
Phase I Economic Viability Study - Crist Unit 6

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

*Environmental Controls*

*Scrubber*

*SCR*

2009

2012

A


B

C

D

TRADE SECRET - PROTECTED

**Table 3.3-6**  
**Phase I Economic Viability Study - Crist Unit 7**



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

*Environmental Controls*

*Scrubber*

*SCR*

2009

*Existing*

A

B

C

D

TRADE SECRET - PROTECTED

Table 3.3-7  
Phase I Economic Viability Study - Daniel Unit 1

	2013	2014
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
<i>Environmental Controls</i>		
<i>Scrubber</i>		
<i>SCR</i>		

A


B

C

D

TRADE SECRET - PROTECTED

Table 3.3-8  
Phase I Economic Viability Study - Daniel Unit 2



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

*Environmental Controls*  
*Scrubber*  
*SCR*

2013  
2015

---

TRADE SECRET – PROTECTED

**Table 3.3-9**  
**Phase I Economic Viability Study – Evaluation Description**

*Economic Screening Analysis*  
*NPV of Study Period in 2008 \$/kW*

<b>Generating Unit</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Avoided Cost Based Benefits</b>	
Energy	The value of System lambda (marginal energy costs) during the hours the unit is running
Avoided Capacity Benefit	The projected value of peaking capacity based on the long term cost of a new CT
<b>Avoided Cost Benefits</b>	<b>Total Avoided Costs</b>
<b>Incremental Costs</b>	
Fuel	The fuel cost to operate the existing unit
SO <sub>2</sub>	The cost of SO <sub>2</sub> emissions based on SO <sub>2</sub> allowance costs and unit emissions
NO <sub>x</sub>	The cost of NO <sub>x</sub> emissions based on NO <sub>x</sub> allowance costs and unit emissions
CO <sub>2</sub>	The cost of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions based on CO <sub>2</sub> penalties and unit emissions
Hg	The cost of Hg emissions based on Hg allowance costs and unit emissions
O&M	The fixed and variable O&M costs (including environmental) to operate the unit
Capital Expenditures	The capital necessary to continue to operate and meet environmental compliance
<b>Total</b>	<b>Total Incremental Costs</b>
<b>Net Contribution</b>	<b>Avoided Cost Benefits minus Incremental Costs</b>
<b>MW Capacity</b>	<b>Average Net Generating Capacity</b>
<b>Net Contribution in Thousands of Dollars</b>	<b>Net Contribution in Thousands of Dollars</b>
<b>Economic Retirement Date</b>	<b>Year that maximum accumulated net contribution occurs</b>



---

## **4.0 PLANT-BY-PLANT COMPLIANCE PLAN**

### **4.1 Plant Crist**

Plant Crist is a four-unit, coal-fired electric generating facility located just north of Pensacola, Florida. Three older natural gas and oil-fired units at the site have been retired. Units 4 and 5 each have a nameplate rating of 93.7 MW and Units 6 and 7 have nameplate ratings of 369 MW and 578 MW, respectively. All four units were affected under the Acid Rain Program, and the plant has operated on low-sulfur coals since the 1990s to lower SO<sub>2</sub> emissions. All four units are equipped with low-NO<sub>x</sub> burner systems. Plant Crist Units 4, 5 and 6 have SNCR systems, while Crist Unit 7 is equipped with a SCR system.

For compliance with CAIR and later with CAVR and potential NAAQS, Plant Crist needs significant SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> reductions. Gulf Power forecasts that without additional emission controls Plant Crist would exceed allowance allocations for SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>. Only a few technologies have demonstrated the ability to provide the needed emission reductions at the commercial scale required for Plant Crist.

For CAIR requirements at Plant Crist, a thorough assessment was conducted to compare the retrofit controls versus retirement and replacement options for compliance. As noted under Section 3.2, fuel switching or exclusive reliance on allowance purchases were eliminated as viable options for Gulf Power. Retrofit options, as well as retirement and replacement options, are each reviewed below specifically for Plant Crist.

#### **4.1.1 Plant Crist Retrofit Options**

##### **Plant Crist Units 4 through 7 Flue Gas Desulphurization Scrubber Project**

Very high levels of SO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions can be achieved by flue gas desulphurization. There are no other commercially available options for SO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions at the level needed to assure compliance with CAIR and CAVR and address the significant local concerns in the Pensacola area.

A scrubber was the only SO<sub>2</sub> compliance option for Crist Units 6 and 7, and because of their size and emissions, these units were the best, most cost-effective candidates for SO<sub>2</sub> scrubbing and mercury removal. Gulf's plan focuses on placing this scrubber on the largest Gulf Power generating units first and delaying emission controls and costs on other smaller units and plants. Installing additional ductwork and boiler controls to include Crist Units 4 and 5 was also cost-effective and increased incremental SO<sub>2</sub> and mercury emission reductions. The Crist scrubber project is projected to reduce SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by approximately 50,000 tons per year. With these reductions, Gulf Power will be able to reasonably manage compliance with its SO<sub>2</sub> allowance bank and some market purchases of allowances as required.

---

In terms of timing, the Crist scrubber was needed for Phase I CAIR compliance in 2010. Even if the CAIR rule had been vacated, Gulf Power anticipated that the Crist Scrubber project would still be needed for Crist Units 6 and 7 to comply with CAVR by 2013. Given that the Crist Scrubber project was still needed for CAVR compliance, regardless of the resolution of CAIR and the new rule that EPA promulgates, the issue Gulf faced was whether or not to defer the Crist Scrubber project for several years. During 2008, Gulf determined that the Crist Scrubber project should proceed for a variety of reasons. First, over \$175 million of equipment had already been ordered. Second, significant construction had already occurred, and the construction workforce had been fully mobilized; deferral would have significantly increased the total project costs. The project was approximately 55% complete at the end of 2008. Demobilization would have meant the potential loss of personnel already on site. Deferral for three years until 2012 to meet 2013 CAVR requirements would have increased the project construction cost by approximately \$53 million. The associated increase in AFUDC, which Gulf would seek for recovery, would have been at least \$45 million. Thus, deferral would have cost around \$100 million. Third it was also reasonable to anticipate that EPA and/or FDEP would act again to address the same issues in the replacement to the CAIR rule when it is developed. If they do, the scrubber project would continue to be the best, most cost-effective means of limiting SO<sub>2</sub> and mercury emissions, with Gulf potentially facing increased costs in order to meet accelerated in- service dates.

### **Plant Crist Unit 6 SCR Project**

The Plant Crist Unit 7 SCR became operational in 2005, significantly reducing emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> from the plant. This project was called for under an agreement with the FDEP. The agreement also called for additional NO<sub>x</sub> reductions at Plant Crist Units 4 through 6 up to and including a SCR for Unit 6. Additional NO<sub>x</sub> reductions are needed at Plant Crist, and only SCR technology will provide the additional increment needed. The SCR on Unit 6 will be important for Pensacola to achieve attainment with the new 8-hour ozone standard and addresses significant local pressures to continue NO<sub>x</sub> reductions from the plant. In addition, the Crist Unit 6 SCR was also needed for CAIR and CAMR compliance. While CAMR compliance is no longer required, CAIR requirements still remain applicable. The Crist Unit 6 SCR will still be needed to satisfy FDEP requirements, the new 8-hour ozone standard, and local pressure to reduce NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. Gulf has deferred the in-service date for the Crist Unit 6 SCR from 2010 to 2012.

#### **4.1.2 Plant Crist Comparison of Retrofit versus Retirement and Replacement**

The initial selection between retrofit and retire/replacement options for Plant Crist was based upon a financial assessment and analysis to determine the most reasonable, least cost option for Gulf Power and its customers. The analysis examined the relative cost of dispatching the Gulf system (a) with the retrofit technology in place and (b) with having retired the Crist unit(s) without making the retrofit and instead, replacing it with capacity from another generation source.

---

This analysis was run at both a less detailed level (Phase I) and using a more detailed methodology (Phase II). The basic methodology was the same for both types of analyses, but the Phase I analysis employed some simplifying but more stringent assumptions. For Phase I, the costs of operating the retrofitted units and its affect on system dispatch costs and the need to purchase allowances to meet any remaining emissions (all of which are characterized as “incremental costs”) were compared to the cost of a generic peaking unit and associated energy costs. The September 2008 Phase I level results indicated there is a savings shown by continuing to operate each generating unit as opposed to replacing it with new or purchased capacity and System energy purchases for both the base case (No CO<sub>2</sub>) and \$10 CO<sub>2</sub> sensitivity. The projected NPV cost savings or benefit to Gulf and its customers for Gulf’s Environmental compliance plan for Plant Crist ranged from \$0.8 billion - \$1.9 billion over the period 2008 through the affected units’ planned retirement dates.

The Phase II analysis focused on a comparison of continued operation with unit replacement by a combined cycle and included Crist Units 4, 5, and 6. This evaluation also included more refined production cost modeling and cost implications to the transmission system. Changes in production cost, capital and other fixed costs were captured in the comparison analysis to help determine the most economical option. The September 2008 Phase II results showed that the No CO<sub>2</sub> and \$10 CO<sub>2</sub> cases would result in a total cost to the customer of \$936.6 million and \$643.4 million, respectively, if Plant Crist Units 4, 5, and 6 were retired and replaced with a new combined cycle unit. Under the higher \$20 CO<sub>2</sub> penalty and the 2008 fuel forecast the evaluation indicated it would be a total cost to the customer of \$376.9 million if Plant Crist Units 4, 5, and 6 were retired and replaced with a new combined cycle unit. Under such a high CO<sub>2</sub> penalty, the higher demand and higher related price for natural gas that would result would likely provide an even greater economic margin to continue to operate the coal units.

#### **4.1.3 Plant Crist Emission Monitoring Requirements**

Mercury continuous emission monitoring systems for Plant Crist Units 4 through 7 and the common scrubber stack were included as part of Gulf’s original CAIR, CAMR and CAVR compliance plan approved by the Commission. The Plant Crist Units 4 through 7 mercury monitors that were previously scheduled to be placed in service during 2008 have been removed from the current projection. These monitors are no longer required because EPA approved Gulf’s petition for an extension of the deadline for installation of mercury monitors at Plant Crist until after the scrubber is completed. The granting of this petition eliminated the need for the plant to install four mercury monitors that would only be needed from January 1, 2009 until the completion of the scrubber later in 2009. With CAMR voided, electric generating facilities are no longer required to install mercury monitoring equipment to meet the January 2009 monitoring deadline. In response to the CAMR vacatur, Gulf has delayed further mercury monitoring capital costs until at least 2010.

---

#### **4.1.4 Conclusions for Plant Crist**

Based on this assessment, the retrofit of Crist Units 4 through 7 with a single flue gas desulfurization scrubber and the addition of a SCR on Unit 6 are the best options for compliance with CAIR, CAVR, the new 8-hour ozone standard, potential mercury regulation and a potential fine particulate NAAQS. These are the only technologies that offer the necessary emission reductions for SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> and when used together, the scrubber and the SCRs on Units 6 and 7 will capture mercury. The scrubber is anticipated to be required as part of the CAVR “reasonable progress program.” Further fuel switching will not reduce emissions to the required level. Allowance purchases are too uncertain and risky as a sole compliance option, especially for annual NO<sub>x</sub>. The September 2008 Phase II analysis indicated that retirement and replacement of the units with a combined cycle unit is not economically feasible relative to retrofit of the existing units under all the CO<sub>2</sub> compliance cost scenarios analyzed.

#### **4.2 Plant Daniel**

Gulf Power’s ownership interest at Plant Daniel is associated with two coal-fired electric generating units that each have a nameplate rating of 548.2 MW. Gulf Power and Mississippi Power Company each own 50 percent of Daniel Units 1 and 2. The plant is operated by Mississippi Power employees. The facility is located just north of Pascagoula, Mississippi, with direct transmission access across Alabama and into Florida. Both coal-fired units were affected under the Acid Rain Program and have operated on low-sulfur coals since the 1990s to lower SO<sub>2</sub> emissions. These New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) units are relatively low NO<sub>x</sub> emitters, and as a result, Gulf and Mississippi Power have been able to delay installation of controls and associated costs required under the Acid Rain Program.

For compliance with CAIR and later with CAVR, Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2 need significant SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> reductions. Only a few technologies have demonstrated the ability to provide the needed emission reductions at the commercial scale required for the coal units at Plant Daniel. In light of the CAIR and CAMR developments, some of the proposed Plant Daniel projects have been canceled or deferred.

For CAIR and CAVR requirements at Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2, an assessment was conducted to compare retrofit controls versus retirement and replacement options for compliance. As noted under Section 3.2, further fuel switching and complete reliance on allowance purchases were eliminated as viable options for all of Gulf Power’s units, including its share of Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2. Retrofit options, as well as retirement and replacement options, are each reviewed below specifically for Plant Daniel.



---

## **4.2.1 Plant Daniel Retrofit Options**

### **Plant Daniel Unit 1 and Unit 2 Flue Gas Desulfurization Scrubber Project**

Very high levels of SO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions can be achieved by flue gas desulfurization. There are no other commercially available options for SO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions at the level needed to assure compliance with CAIR and CAVR.

The Daniel scrubber project continues to be an effective means of reducing SO<sub>2</sub> and mercury emissions. It is still anticipated that this scrubber project may be required for CAVR compliance, even if it is not required for compliance with CAIR or potential mercury regulation. These large, co-owned units are the most efficient units owned by Gulf Power. A wet scrubber has been determined to be the only viable SO<sub>2</sub> retrofit compliance option for Plant Daniel.

The Daniel scrubber project is projected to reduce Gulf's SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by approximately 14,000 tons per year (Gulf Power ownership share). With these reductions, Gulf Power will be able to reasonably manage compliance using its SO<sub>2</sub> allowance bank and some market purchases of allowances as required. The scrubber is currently scheduled for completion in 2013, but its timing will continue to remain flexible based on the status of environmental regulations. For CAIR, the scrubber would minimize the reliance on a very volatile SO<sub>2</sub> allowance market and assure compliance for Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2.

### **Plant Daniel NO<sub>x</sub> Reduction Projects**

Additional NO<sub>x</sub> controls were scheduled for Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2 under the Phase I CAIR annual and seasonal NO<sub>x</sub> cap and trade allowance programs. The Daniel Unit 1 and 2 Low NO<sub>x</sub> burners were planned for Phase I CAIR annual and seasonal NO<sub>x</sub> cap and trade allowance programs. The Daniel Unit 2 Low NO<sub>x</sub> burners were installed during 2008. The Daniel Unit 1 Low NO<sub>x</sub> burner project that was originally scheduled to be placed in-service during 2009 had been delayed during 2008, pending the outcome of the CAIR decision. Now that the CAIR rule has been remanded to EPA and remains in effect, the Low NO<sub>x</sub> burner project at Daniel Unit 1 has been rescheduled to be placed in-service during 2010.

Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2 were previously scheduled to receive SNCR retrofits in 2011 and 2012, respectively. Expenditures for these projects were projected to begin in 2009. Plant Daniel planned to operate the SNCRs until the SCR were placed in-service. The SNCR projects have since been removed from the compliance schedule, and the SCR installation has been accelerated by two years. The Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2 SCR are planned for operation in 2014 and 2015, respectively, to help meet the requirements of CAIR and 8-hour ozone nonattainment. The SCR projects have been accelerated based on the new 8-hour ozone standard that Gulf anticipates will require these controls in an earlier time period than previously planned.

---

These SCRs, along with the Unit 1 and 2 scrubber, also provide a co-benefit of significantly reducing mercury emissions. The schedule for these proposed SCRs remains flexible and will be continuously re-evaluated. While CAMR compliance is no longer required, CAIR requirements still remain applicable. The Daniel SCRs will also be needed to achieve attainment with the new 8-hour ozone standard.

### **Plant Daniel Activated Carbon Injection**

During 2007, capital expenditures for Activated Carbon Injection systems at Plant Daniel were added to Gulf's compliance plan. The ACI projects were scheduled to be placed in-service by January 1, 2010 in anticipation of CAMR Phase I. The projects were added due to concerns that the mercury allowance market would not develop in time to ensure compliance during the first year of Phase I.

Based on the vacatur of the CAMR ruling, the ACI projects have been removed from the compliance schedule and budget projections. The need for ACI at Plant Daniel will be reexamined as new mercury regulation emerges.

#### **4.2.2 Plant Daniel Comparison of Retrofit versus Retirement and Replacement**

Selection between retrofit and retirement/replacement options for Plant Daniel was based upon a financial assessment and analysis to determine the least cost option for Gulf Power and its customers. The analysis examined the relative cost of (a) completing the retrofit project and operating the retrofitted unit with (b) retiring the Daniel units without making the retrofit and instead, replacing them with capacity from another generation source.

This analysis was run at both a less detailed level (Phase I) and using a more detailed methodology (Phase II). The basic methodology was the same for both types of analyses, but the Phase I analysis employed some simplifying but more stringent assumptions. For Phase I, the costs of operating the retrofitted units and its affect on system dispatch costs and the need to purchase allowances to meet any remaining emissions (all of which are characterized as "incremental costs") were compared to the cost of a generic peaking unit and associated energy costs. The September 2008 Phase I level results indicated there was a savings shown by continuing to operate each generating unit as opposed to replacing it with new or purchased capacity and System energy purchases for both the base case (No CO<sub>2</sub>) and \$10 CO<sub>2</sub> sensitivity. The projected NPV cost savings or benefit to Gulf and its customers for Gulf's Environmental compliance plan for Plant Daniel ranged from \$0.6 billion - \$1.2 billion over the period 2008 through the affected units' planned retirement dates.

The Phase II analysis focused on a comparison of continued operation with unit replacement by a combined cycle. This evaluation also included more refined production cost modeling and cost implications to the transmission system. Changes in production cost, capital and other fixed costs were captured in the comparison analysis to help determine the most economical option. The September 2008 Phase II results showed that for the No CO<sub>2</sub> and

---

\$10 CO<sub>2</sub> cases there would be a total cost to Gulf's customers of \$669.2 million and \$365.0 million, respectively, if Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2 were replaced instead of being retrofitted. Under the higher \$20 CO<sub>2</sub> penalty and the 2008 fuel forecast, the evaluation indicated there would be a total cost to Gulf's customers of \$50.4 million, if Plant Daniel Units 1 and 2 were replaced instead of being retrofitted. Under such a high CO<sub>2</sub> penalty, the higher demand and higher related price for natural gas that would result would likely provide an even greater economic margin to continue to operate the coal units.

#### **4.2.3 Plant Daniel Emission Monitoring Requirements**

Based on the 2008 CAMR vacatur, the Daniel mercury monitors have been removed from the compliance schedule and the budget. This decision will be reexamined as new mercury regulation emerges.

#### **4.2.4 Conclusions for Plant Daniel**

Based on this assessment, the retrofit of Daniel Units 1 and 2 with a flue gas desulphurization scrubber, the installation of low-NO<sub>x</sub> combustion controls, and the addition of SCRs on both units are the best options for compliance with CAIR, CAVR, and the 8-hour ozone standard at Plant Daniel. These technologies offer the necessary emission reductions for SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and when used together, the scrubber and the SCRs will also capture mercury. The scrubber may also be required as part of the CAVR "reasonable progress program." Fuel switching will not reduce emissions to the required level. Allowance purchases are too uncertain and risky as a sole compliance option, especially for annual NO<sub>x</sub>. The Phase II analysis indicated that retirement and replacement of the units with a combined cycle unit is not economically feasible relative to retrofit of the existing units under all of the CO<sub>2</sub> compliance cost scenarios analyzed.

### **4.3 Plant Smith**

Plant Smith includes two coal-fired electric generating units (Unit 1 and Unit 2) along with an oil-fired combustion turbine and a natural gas-fired combined cycle unit. The facility is located just north of Panama City, Florida. Plant Smith Unit 1 has a nameplate rating of 149.6 MW, and Unit 2 has a nameplate rating of 190.4 MW. Both coal-fired units were affected under the Acid Rain Program, and the plant has operated on low-sulfur coals since the 1990s to lower SO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Both units are also equipped with low-NO<sub>x</sub> combustion systems. Unit 1 has special low-NO<sub>x</sub> burner tips, and Unit 2 has low-NO<sub>x</sub> burners and separated overfired air.

For compliance with CAIR, the new 8-hour ozone standard, and later with CAVR, Plant Smith needs significant SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> reductions. Only a few technologies have demonstrated the ability to provide the needed emission reductions at the commercial scale required for Plant Smith.

---

For CAIR and CAVR requirements at Plant Smith, an assessment was conducted to compare retrofit controls versus retirement and replacement options for compliance. As noted under Section 3.2 fuel switching and exclusive reliance on allowance purchases were eliminated as viable options for Gulf Power. Retrofit options and retirement and replacement options are each reviewed below specifically for Plant Smith.

#### **4.3.1 Plant Smith Retrofit Options**

##### **Plant Smith SNCR and NO<sub>x</sub> Reduction Projects**

Installation of SNCRs for Plant Smith Units 1 and 2 are needed for Phase I CAIR compliance in 2009. In addition to CAIR compliance, the SNCRs are needed to assist in maintaining local compliance with the more stringent 8-hour ozone standard. The Smith Unit 2 SNCR was placed in-service in the fall of 2008, and the Smith Unit 1 SNCR will be placed in-service during the spring of 2009.

##### **Plant Smith Units 1 and 2 Flue Gas Desulfurization Scrubber Project**

The Plant Smith scrubber project has been included in the Gulf Power environmental compliance plan because the requirements of CAVR will likely lead to a scrubber being required for Plant Smith Units 1 and 2. This decision is based upon anticipated CAVR command and control requirements. In addition, the scrubber will provide the added benefit of reducing mercury emissions. The scrubber project is currently planned for operation in 2017. This schedule and decisions about the Plant Smith scrubber remain very flexible. This scrubber would offer the same benefits as the scrubbers previously discussed for Plants Crist and Daniel.

##### **Plant Smith Unit 2 Baghouse**

The Plant Smith Unit 2 baghouse project has been included in the Gulf Power Environmental compliance plan because potential mercury regulation will likely lead to additional controls being required for Plant Smith. The baghouse project is currently planned for operation in 2018. The schedule and decisions about the Plant Smith Unit 2 baghouse remain very flexible.

#### **4.3.2 Plant Smith Comparison of Retrofit versus Retirement and Replacement**

Gulf's March 2007 CAIR/CAMR/CAVR compliance plan included results of an economic analysis that was performed to assess the costs over a period from 2006 until the current planned retirement date for the two coal-fired Plant Smith units. The costs of operating the retrofitted units and its affect on system dispatch costs and the need to purchase allowances to meet any remaining emission limits (all of which are characterized as "incremental costs") were compared to the cost of a generic peaking unit and associated energy costs. The results



---

of the analysis indicated there was a savings associated with retrofitting and continuing to operate each generating unit at Plant Smith, as opposed to replacing the generation.

The Plant Smith economic analysis has not been updated because Gulf has not made any changes to the Plant Smith compliance strategy, other than delaying completion of the mercury monitor installation. In addition, the majority of the expenditures for Phase I environmental projects at Plant Smith were incurred prior to 2009. An updated analysis will be performed before Gulf moves forward with the Plant Smith scrubber and baghouse projects. Both of these projects are included in Phase II of Gulf's compliance plan which has not yet been approved for ECRC recovery.

#### **4.3.3 Plant Smith Emission Monitoring Requirements**

CAIR required the installation of a parametric emission monitoring system on the Plant Smith combustion turbine during 2007. Gulf will continue to incur future maintenance expenses to ensure accurate accounting of emissions. In response to the CAMR vacatur, Gulf has delayed further mercury monitoring capital costs until at least 2010.

#### **4.3.4 Conclusions for Plant Smith**

The retrofit of Smith Units 1 and 2 with SNCR, a flue gas desulfurization scrubber, and a baghouse are the best options for compliance with CAIR, CAVR, and potential mercury regulation at Plant Smith. These technologies offer the necessary emission reductions for SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>. The Smith Unit 2 SNCR was placed in-service in the fall of 2008 and the Smith Unit 1 SNCR will be placed in-service during the spring of 2009. The Plant Smith mercury monitoring project has been delayed until at least 2010. The schedule and decisions regarding the Plant Smith scrubber and baghouse, Phase II projects, remain very flexible. These projects are included in Gulf's compliance plan for future review and approval.

Fuel switching will not reduce emissions to the required level. Allowance purchases are too uncertain and risky as a sole compliance option, especially for annual NO<sub>x</sub>. Retirement and replacement of the units is not economic relative to retrofit of the existing units. The scrubber may also be required as part of the CAVR "reasonable progress program."

#### **4.4 Plant Scholz**

Plant Scholz consists of two coal-fired electric generating units that each have a nameplate rating of 49 MW. The facility is located in Jackson County, Florida. Both units were affected under the Acid Rain Program, and the plant has operated on low-sulfur coals since the 1990s to lower SO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Because these units are small and older, NO<sub>x</sub> averaging was used to achieve compliance with the NO<sub>x</sub> requirements under the Acid Rain Program without the installation of emission control equipment.

---

For CAIR and CAVR requirements at Plant Scholz, a thorough assessment was conducted to compare retrofit controls versus retirement and replacement options for compliance. As noted under Section 3.2, fuel switching and exclusive reliance on allowance purchases were eliminated as viable options for Gulf Power. Because this small plant is nearing retirement, significant investments in capital equipment to reduce emissions cannot be justified economically. The plant will utilize Company-wide allowance trading options to comply up until the Scholz units are retired, repowered, or replaced.

#### **4.4.1 Plant Scholz Emission Monitoring Requirements**

The Scholz mercury emission monitoring system was being installed during February of 2008 when the court issued an opinion vacating the CAMR. Gulf completed the Scholz installation but postponed certification of the system due to pending regulatory uncertainty regarding quality assurance and reference testing protocols required for certification. Gulf's 2009 ECRC budget projection includes general O&M expenses for the Plant Scholz mercury monitor.

#### **4.4.2 Conclusions for Plant Scholz**

For CAIR and CAVR requirements at Plant Scholz, a thorough assessment was conducted to compare the various options for compliance. Fuel switching, allowance purchases, and emission control retrofit versus retirement and replacement were all evaluated as options for compliance. The plant will utilize Company-wide allowance trading options to comply until it is retired, repowered, or replaced.

---

## 4.5 GULF'S ALLOWANCE PURCHASES

Although the retrofit installations set forth in Gulf's compliance plan significantly reduce emissions, they will not result in Gulf achieving CAIR compliance levels without the purchase of some emission allowances. Thus, Gulf's environmental compliance plan calls for the purchase of allowances. The emission allowances Gulf Power projects it needs to purchase, along with estimated costs, are shown in Table 4.5-1. The purchase of allowances in conjunction with the retrofit projects comprises the most reasonable, cost-effective means for Gulf to meet CAIR and CAVR requirements.

Gulf's SO<sub>2</sub> allowance purchases are intended to address: a) the projected shortfalls in 2009 (Acid Rain Program) and 2010-2013 (CAIR) and b) create a buffer of allowances in the event actual emissions varied materially from projections. At this time, Gulf has a projected SO<sub>2</sub> allowance bank of pre-2010 allowances to be carried forward into 2010, the first year of CAIR compliance for SO<sub>2</sub>. Gulf projects a need to purchase CAIR annual and seasonal NO<sub>x</sub> allowances beginning this year.

**Table 4.5-1  
Gulf Power Allowance Projection and Costs  
(2009-2017)**

**Annual Emissions in Excess of Allocations**

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
SO <sub>2</sub>	15,178	9,903	7,720	5,038	4,812	0	0	0	0
Seasonal NO <sub>x</sub>	2,287	2,016	2,029	1,075	1,032	897	808	732	704
Annual NO <sub>x</sub>	4,993	5,439	4,563	3,183	2,622	2,360	1,322	1,045	916

A      B      C      D      E      F      G      H

**Cost of Emissions in Excess of Allocations (\$ in thousands)\***

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
1 SO <sub>2</sub>	\$8,832	[REDACTED]							
2 Seasonal NO <sub>x</sub>	\$1,372								
3 Annual NO <sub>x</sub>	\$21,176								
4 Total Cost	\$31,380								

\* Projected cost is at forecasted prices of the spot market in a given year; forecast includes pending transactions and commitments to purchase. No costs for SO<sub>2</sub> are projected beginning in 2010 due to banked SO<sub>2</sub> allowances.

FCR-21 Run

TRADE SECRET

## 5.0 POTENTIAL NEW ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS

### 5.1 New 8-Hour Ozone Standard

In 2004-2005, the EPA revoked an ozone standard that was based on one-hour ozone levels and published two sets of final rules for implementation of a new, more stringent ozone standard based on eight-hour average levels. State implementation plans, including new emission control regulations necessary to bring ozone nonattainment areas into attainment, were required for most nonattainment areas by June 2007. In June 2007, EPA again proposed revisions to the current ozone standard.

In March 2008, the EPA finalized its revisions to the eight-hour ozone standard, increasing its stringency. The EPA plans to designate nonattainment areas based on the new standard by 2010, and new nonattainment areas within Gulf Power's service territory are expected.

State implementation plans will be developed for these areas by 2013. These SIPs will prescribe emission control measures designed to bring areas into attainment. Although designation of a number of new nonattainment areas is anticipated, specific designations and any subsequent SIP control measures will be based in part on air quality measurements to be made in the future. The ultimate outcome of this matter cannot be determined at this time and will depend on subsequent legal action and/or future nonattainment designations and regulatory plans. Potential nonattainment counties under the new standard are shown below.





Figure 5.1-1 Potential Ozone Nonattainment Counties



The control strategy for further reducing emissions of ozone will be affected by the strategy implemented for compliance with the CAIR as discussed in Section 2.1.

## 5.2 New Fine Particulate Standard

During 2005, the EPA's fine particulate matter nonattainment designations became effective for several areas within Southern Company's service area in Alabama and Georgia. State plans for addressing the nonattainment designations under the existing standard were due by April 2008 and could require further reductions in SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from power plants. In September 2006, the EPA published a final rule which increased the stringency of the 24-hour fine particulate matter air quality standard. The state-recommended nonattainment areas are shown on the map below; actual EPA designations of areas which fail to meet this newly revised standard were issued in December 2008. The ultimate outcome of this matter depends on the development and submittal of the required state plans and resolution of pending legal challenges and, therefore, cannot be determined at this time.



Updated: 1/15/2009

**Figure 5.2-1 Nonattainment Areas for Annual PM-2.5 and EPA-Recommended Nonattainment Areas for 24-Hr PM2.5**

---

### 5.3 Global Climate Issues

Federal legislative proposals that would impose mandatory requirements related to greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy standards continue to be strongly considered in Congress, and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions has been identified as a high priority by the current Administration. The ultimate outcome of these proposals cannot be determined at this time; however, mandatory restrictions on the Company's greenhouse gas emissions could result in significant additional compliance costs that could affect future unit retirement and replacement decisions and results of operations, cash flows, and financial condition if such costs are not recovered through regulated rates.

In April 2007, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that EPA has authority under the Clean Air Act to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from new motor vehicles. The EPA is currently developing its response to this decision. Regulatory decisions that will follow from this response may have implications for both new and existing stationary sources, such as power plants. The ultimate outcome of these rulemaking activities cannot be determined at this time; however, as with the current legislative proposals, mandatory restrictions on the Company's greenhouse gas emissions could result in significant additional compliance costs for electric utilities including Gulf Power.

On June 25, 2008, Florida's Governor signed comprehensive energy-related legislation that includes authorization for the FDEP to adopt rules for a cap-and-trade regulatory program to address greenhouse gas emissions from electric utilities, conditioned upon their ratification by the legislature no sooner than the 2010 legislative session. This legislation also authorizes the Florida PSC to adopt a renewable portfolio standard for public utilities, subject to legislative ratification. The impact of this and any similar legislation on the Company will depend on the future development, adoption, legislative ratification, implementation, and potential legal challenges to rules governing greenhouse gas emissions and mandates regarding the use of renewable energy, and the ultimate outcome cannot be determined at this time.

International climate change negotiations under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change also continue. Current efforts focus on a potential successor to the Kyoto Protocol for the post 2012 timeframe, with a conclusion to this round of negotiations targeted for the end of 2009. The outcome and impact of the international negotiations cannot be determined at this time.

---

## **6.0 SUMMARY OF GULF'S COMPLIANCE PLAN**

Gulf Power's environmental compliance plan reflects a comprehensive assessment of requirements Gulf and its customers face in meeting CAIR, CAVR and potential mercury, SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> regulations. CAIR will require significant reductions in SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>. CAVR may also require the installation of command and control retrofit equipment at certain facilities. In assessing the most cost-effective means of meeting these significant regulatory requirements, Gulf Power considered four primary compliance options: fuel switching, purchase of allowances, retrofit installations, and retirement and replacement of existing units. Fuel switching alone could not meet the requirements of these programs. Given the uncertainty of emerging allowance markets, it was highly questionable whether mature stable allowance markets would emerge in time for an all allowance purchase option to be implemented. There was a fundamental question of whether sufficient allowances would even be available. In addition, given the historic volatility in existing allowance markets, the potential cost of an all-allowance option could be significant. Therefore, risks regarding availability and costs of allowances resulted in an unacceptable level of risk for an all-allowance compliance approach for Gulf and its customers. As a result, Gulf assessed the best means of meeting plant-by-plant emission requirements through retrofit measures supplemented by allowance purchases and compared those options to retiring and replacing existing units. That analysis led to the selection of Gulf Power's environmental compliance plan set forth in Tables 3.1-1 and 3.1-2. Gulf Power's environmental compliance plan, which is based upon analytically sound technical and economic evaluations of alternatives, is the most reasonable, cost effective compliance plan available to Gulf and its customers under current planning assumptions. Gulf Power's environmental compliance plan assures environmental compliance and preserves flexibility for dealing with ever changing requirements and assumptions.