Technical Support Documentation for Lookup Table Pathways

Proposed Amendments for the Low Carbon Fuel Standard Regulation

December 19, 2023August 12, 2024

California Reformulated Gasoline Blendstock for Oxygenate Blending (CARBOB) • California Ultra-low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) • Conventional Jet Fuel • Compressed Natural Gas • Propane • Electricity

I. Table of Contents

| I. Introduction | 2 |
|---|--------|
| II. Lookup Table Pathways | 3 |
| A. Section A. California Reformulated Gasoline Blendstock for Oxygenate Blending (CARBOB) |) 3 |
| 1. Pathway Summary | 3 |
| 2. Pathway Assumptions, Details, and Calculation | 3 |
| B. Section B. California Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) | 9 |
| 1. Pathway Summary | 9 |
| 2. Pathway Assumptions, Details, and Calculation | 9 |
| C. Section C. Conventional Jet Fuel1 | 5 |
| 1. Pathway Summary1 | 5 |
| 2. Pathway Assumptions, Details, and Calculation1 | 5 |
| D. Section D. Compressed Natural Gas1 | 8 |
| 1. Pathway Summary1 | 8 |
| 2. Pathway Details, Assumptions, and Calculations1 | 9 |
| E. Section E. Propane2 | :3 |
| 1. Pathway Summary2 | :3 |
| 2. Pathway Details, Assumptions, and Calculations2 | :4 |
| F. Section F. Electricity2 | :7 |
| 1. Pathway Summary2 | 27 |
| 2. Pathway Details, Assumptions, and Calculations2 | :9 |

I. Introduction

This document provides details of Lookup Table Pathways for the following fuels:

- California Reformulated Gasoline Blendstock for Oxygenate Blending (CARBOB)
- California Ultra-low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD)
- Compressed Natural Gas
- Propane
- Electricity
- California average grid electricity supplied to electric vehicles (ELCG)

Electricity that is generated from 100 percent zero-CI sources, which include eligible renewable energy resources as defined under California Public Utilities Code section 399.11-399.36, excluding biomass, biomethane, geothermal, and municipal solid waste (ELCR).

Electricity supplied under the smart charging or smart electrolysis provision with a CI based on curtailment probability (ELCT).

This document provides the input values and assumptions related to calculation of carbon intensities determined using a modified version of the Argonne GREET1 2022 model (CA-GREET4.0¹) for each of the pathways included in the Lookup Table.

¹ California Air Resources Board, CA-GREET4.0 (Proposed Rulemaking Version). (Released December 19, 2023 <u>August 12, 2024</u>). https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/lcfs-life-cycle-analysis-public-comment

II. Lookup Table Pathways

A. California Reformulated Gasoline Blendstock for Oxygenate Blending (CARBOB)

1. Pathway Summary

California Reformulated Gasoline Blendstock for Oxygenate Blending (CARBOB) pathway carbon intensity includes greenhouse gas emissions from the following life cycle stages: crude oil recovery from all domestic and oversea sources, crude transport to California for refining, refining of the crude to gasoline blendstock in California refineries, transport to blending racks and distribution of the finished fuel, and tailpipe emissions² from final combustion in a vehicle. Based on emission factors in the CA-GREET4.0 model, the carbon intensity (CI) of CARBOB is calculated to be **100.693** gCO₂e/MJ as shown in Table A.1.

| Component | Total CI* gCO2e/MJ |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Crude Recovery and Crude Transport | 12.61 |
| Refining | 13.4 5 8 |
| CARBOB Transport | 0.72 |
| Tailpipe Emissions | 73.82 |
| Total Cl | 100.6 0 3 |

Table A.1. Summary Table of CARBOB CI

* Individual values may not sum to the total due to rounding

2. Pathway Assumptions, Details, and Calculation

a) Crude Oil Recovery and Transport to California:

Crude oil recovery for the year 2010 is based on the Oil Production Greenhouse Gas Emission Estimator (OPGEE) model, version 3.0b.³ The CI is calculated to be **12.61 gCO**₂**e/MJ**.

² Tailpipe emissions are determined for California reformulated gasoline (90 percent CARBOB and 10 percent ethanol by volume) and allocated to the blendstock on an energy basis.

³ Brandt, A.R., Masnadi, M.S, Rutherford, J.S., El-Houjeiri, Vafi, K., H.M., Langfitt Q., Duffy, J., Sleep, S., Pacheco, D., Dadashi, Z., Orellana, A., MacLean, H., McNally, S., Englander, J., & Bergerson, J., *Oil Production*

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Estimator OPGEE v.3.0b. (Updated on May 14, 2022). https://eao.stanford.edu/research-project/opgee-oil-production-greenhouse-gas-emissions-estimator

b) CARBOB Refining:

To calculate carbon intensity of refinery product streams for the Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy Use in Transportation (GREET®) model⁴, Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) contracted with Jacobs Consultancy Inc. to develop a refinery linear programming (LP) model for evaluation of the petroleum refining process. The LP model represents process-based refinery operations, material flows, prices, and responses to changes in petroleum product specifications. The model maximizes refinery profit by determining the optimal volumetric throughput and utility balance among various processes under given market and technical conditions. The modeling results were validated against propriety data from 43 individual refineries in the U.S. in 2012. The validated models were also compared to the 2010 refinery statistical data available from the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), and little difference was observed at the Petroleum Administration for Defense District (PADD) level.

From the LP modeling results, product-specific efficiency, the efficiency of producing an end product, should be calculated to estimate the emissions associated with each product. The product specific efficiency can be calculated as energy in an end product divided by energy associated with the production of the end product. Usually, the production of an end product takes one or more processes. The energy associated with the production of the end product is estimated from aggregating energy consumed in the processes of the pathways. Because many processes produce multiple output streams, the energy consumed in these processes is allocated to the output streams by the energy values of the output streams. Note that the LP model provides the volumetric and mass flow rates of individual process units in a given refinery. The energy flow rates of gaseous and solid streams are calculated using a heating value regression formula by its API gravity. More detailed information relating to model development, refinery and unit efficiency calculation and allocation methodology used in this study is presented by Elgowainy et al.⁵

For the LCFS, ANL disaggregated PADD 5 data⁶ and provided weighted average data for California refineries from the validated LP model. ANL included energy inputs, refining efficiency and refinery operational details for the production of CARBOB and these are shown in Table A.2.

Major inputs of CARBOB refining include crude oil, heavy unfinished oils, butane, blendstocks, natural gas, hydrogen and electricity. Heavy unfinished oils (e.g., vacuum gas oil) can be purchased from less complex refineries and processed in more complex refineries with deep conversion units (such as coker, hydrocrackers, etc.). Gasoline blendstocks (such as butane, reformates, alkylates, etc.) can also be purchased from other facilities to meet the

⁴ Wang, M. et al., *GREET1 2022*, October release. Center for Transportation Research, Argonne National Laboratory (accessed November 2, 2022). https://greet.anl.gov/greet_excel_model.model

⁵ Elgowainy, A., Han, J., Cai, H., Wang, M., Forman, G.S., & Divita, V.B., Energy Efficiency and Greenhouse Gas Emission Intensity of Petroleum Products at U.S. Refineries. Environmental Science & Technology, 48(13), 7612-7624. May 28, 2014 (accessed October 15, 2023). https://pubs.acs.org/doi/full/10.1021/es5010347 https://greet.es.anl.gov/publication-energy-efficiency-refineries

⁶ PADD 5 includes California, Arizona, Nevada, Hawaii, Oregon, Alaska and Washington.

gasoline specification depending on market conditions, refinery capacities, etc. NG is used to provide heat and electricity via combustion or to generate hydrogen via steam methane reforming. When combusted, NG is mixed with refinery off gases from process units. A portion of the hydrogen used in the refinery is purchased from external sources.

From the LP modeling, the total energy input for CARBOB is calculated to be **1,128,165 Btu** for every 1,000,000 MMBtu of finished product. This translates to a refining efficiency calculated as 1,000,000/1,128,165 and reported as 88.64% in Table A.2.

The energy inputs are derived from various inputs based on the LP modeling results and include:

- Crude: This is the quantity of crude-derived feedstock used in the production of CARBOB. From Argonne's modeling, a weighted-average California refinery uses 750,100 Btu of crude to produce 1,000,000 Btu of CARBOB.
- Additional external energy inputs are derived from purchased feedstock/blendstock, which include residual oil (as a surrogate for purchased unfinished oil and heavy products), natural gas, electricity, hydrogen, butane and other blendstock. The subtotal of these inputs makes up the remaining 1,128,165 - 750,100 = 378,065 Btu of input energy.
- During CARBOB refining, intermediate products such as pet coke and refinery still gas are combusted to provide additional energy to the refining process. Since these intermediates are generated from the input crude and other purchased energy, they do not contribute to the total energy input. However, their combustion contributes to the final CI for CARBOB. Table A.3 provides the emission factors (EFs) used in the calculation of GHG emissions from combustion of these intermediate products.
- A portion of purchased NG is used to produce H₂ in an on-site steam methane reforming (SMR) reactor. The CO₂ released in the SMR is considered as non-combustion emissions from NG and is included in the final CI for CARBOB.
- For the LCFS, since Crude Oil Recovery and Transport to California and the CARBOB Refining processes are calculated for the 2010 base year, the NG production and electricity mix data in the calculation have been adjusted to reflect 2010 values which were also applied in previous model version CA-GREET3.0.

| Parameter | Value | Unit | Note | |
|--|---------|------|--|--|
| CARBOB Refining Energy Efficiency | 88.64 | % | This is CA specific CARBOB refining energy efficiency (weighted average). Although the reference reports PADD-level results, same calculation methodology applies to CARBOB produced in California refineries. | |
| CARBOB Refining: External Energy Inputs (Including Feedstocks and Process Fuels) for 1,000,000 Btu of finished product | | | | |
| Crude oil | 750,100 | Btu | Crude input for the production of CARBOB | |
| Residual oil | 138,334 | Btu | As a surrogate for purchased unfinished oil and heavy products. | |

Table A.2. Refining Parameters Used in CARBOB Refining CI Calculations

| Parameter | Value | Unit | Note |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Natural gas | 85,481 | Btu | A portion of purchased natural gas is converted into H2 by on-site SMR (see Intermediate Products Non-combustion Emissions section below) while the rest is mixed with fuel gases and combusted to produce heat and electricity (see Intermediate Products Combustion section below). |
| Electricity | 4,953 | Btu | From grid. |
| Hydrogen | 2,533 | Btu | Purchased from external vendor. |
| Butane | 77,163 | Btu | Purchased butane is used mainly as a blendstock for gasoline. Assumes butane refining requires 1/3 of gasoline refining energy. |
| Blendstock | 69,602 | Btu | Other purchased blendstock (alkylates, reformates and natural gasoline) produced elsewhere. Assumes blendstock refining requires 2/3 gasoline refining energy. |
| Total | 1,128,165 | Btu | Total external energy input of 1,128,165 Btu for 1,000,000 Btu of CARBOB production |
| CARBOB Refining | g: Intermediat | e Products Co | nbustion for 1,000,000 Btu of finished product |
| Pet Coke | 20,975 | Btu | Since the FCC coke is an intermediate product derived from the external inputs (crude oil, unfinished oil, heavy products, etc.), on-site combustion of the FCC coke does not contribute to the total energy inputs. The emission factor of pet coke combustion in an industrial boiler (stationary application) is 101.66 gCO ₂ e/MJ (Table A.3). |
| Refinery Still Gas | 94,100 | Btu | Refinery still gas is a mix of purchased natural gas and internally produced fuel gas. Since refinery still gas is derived from the external inputs, on-site combustion of the refinery still gas does not contribute to the total energy inputs. The emission factor of refinery still gas combustion in an industrial boiler (stationary application) is 54.69 gCO ₂ e/MJ (Table A.3). |
| CARBOB Refining 1,000,000 Btu of | g: Intermediat finished prod | e Products No luct | n-combustion Emissions for |
| On-site Steam Methane Reformer (SMR) | 1,113 | gCO ₂ | CO ₂ emission from the on-site SMR, which converts a portion of purchased NG into H2. |

The CI of refining in CA-GREET4.0 is calculated to be **13.45<u>8</u> gCO₂e/MJ**.

Table A.3. Emission Factors for Petroleum Coke and Refinery Still Gas Combusted in an **Industrial Boiler**

| Emissions Factor | Pet Coke | Refinery Still Gas |
|--|----------|--------------------|
| VOC, g/MMBtu | 0.47 | 2.39 |
| CO, g/MMBtu | 23.95 | 17.23 |
| CH ₄ , g/MMBtu | 1.25 | 3.20 |
| N ₂ O, g/MMBtu | 0.86 | 0.62 |
| CO ₂ , g/MMBtu | 106,933 | 57,398 |
| Emission Factor, gCO2e/MJ intermediate product | 101.66 | 54.69 |

as Refinery Intermediate Products

c) CARBOB Transport and Distribution:

Transportation: CARBOB is transported to the blending terminal and is blended with ethanol. 80% is assumed to be transported by pipeline for 50 miles to a blending terminal and 20% is blended at the refinery and distributed 50 miles by Heavy Duty Diesel (HDD) truck (emissions for HDD distribution is accounted in the distribution step).

Distribution: Finished gasoline is distributed to gas stations and is assumed to be a total of 50 miles by HDD Truck.

d) Tailpipe Emissions:

Since CARBOB is a blendstock and not a final finished fuel, vehicle tailpipe emissions represent the portion of California Reformulated Gasoline (CaRFG) emissions allocated to CARBOB. The tailpipe emissions are based on CARB's EMFAC2021 (v1.0.2) model⁷ for Methane (CH₄) and Nitrous Oxide (N₂O). For CO₂, it is calculated based on Carbon in CARBOB. The results are shown in Table A.4:

| GHG | Tailpipe GHG from gasoline vehicles, g/MMBtu | gCO₂e/MJ |
|------------------|---|----------|
| CH ₄ | 3.89 | 0.09 |
| N ₂ O | 2.89 | 0.82 |
| CO ₂ | 76,925 | 72.91 |
| Total | 77,882 | 73.82 |

Table A.4. Tailpipe Emissions from CARBOB

A comparison of refinery process details and pathway CI for CARBOB between CA-GREET3.0 and CA-GREET4.0 is provided in Table A.5.

⁷ California Air Resources Board, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory. (Accessed October10, 2023).

Table A.5. Comparison of CIs and Refining Details for CARBOB Production between CA-
GREET3.0 and CA-GREET4.0

| CARBOB | | CA-GREET3.0 | CA-GREET4.0 | Difference |
|--|------------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Electricity source | city source 3-CAMX Mix | | AMX Mix | |
| 1) Crude Recovery | | | N/A | |
| Cl, gCO ₂ e/MJ | | 11.78 | 12.61 | 0.83 |
| 2) Crude Refining | to CARBOB | | | |
| Source (fuel produ | ction) | C | A Crude | |
| Efficiency | | 88.64% | 88.64% | |
| Share of other | Residual oil | 36.6% | 36.6% | |
| energy inputs | Diesel fuel | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| (excluding crude) | Gasoline | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| | Natural gas | 22.6% | 22.6% | |
| | LPG | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| | Electricity | 1.3% | 1.3% | |
| | Hydrogen | 0.7% | 0.7% | |
| | Butane | 20.4% | 20.4% | |
| | Blendstock | 18.4% | 18.4% | |
| Feed loss | | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| Cl, gCO ₂ e/MJ | | 14.80 | 13.4 5 8 | -1.3 5 2 |
| 3) CARBOB Transp | oort | L | | |
| 80% pipeline to bl terminal, miles | ending | 50 | 50 | |
| 20% on-site blending and distributed by HDD truck, miles | | 0 | 0 | |
| Distributed by HDD Truck, miles | | 50 | 50 | |
| CI, gCO ₂ e/MJ | | 0.30 | 0.72 | 0.42 |
| 4) Tailpipe Emissions | | 73.94 | 73.82 | -0.12 |
| Methane (CH ₄), g/MJ | | 0.14 | 0.09 | |
| N ₂ O, g/MJ | | 0.91 | 0.82 | |
| CO ₂ , g/MJ | | 72.89 | 72.91 | |
| Total CI, gCO ₂ e/M | IJ | 100.82 | 100.6 0 3 | -0. 22 19 |

B. California Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD)

1. Pathway Summary

The California Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) pathway carbon intensity assessment includes greenhouse gas emissions from the following well-to-wheel life cycle stages: crude oil recovery from all domestic and overseas sources, crude transport to California for refining, refining of the crude to ultra-low sulfur diesel in California refineries, transport to blending racks and distribution of the finished fuel, and tailpipe emissions from final combustion of the fuel in a vehicle. Based on the CA-GREET4.0 model, the life cycle Carbon Intensity (CI) of California ULSD is calculated to be **105.769** gCO₂e/MJ as shown in Table B.1.

| Aggregated Impact | Cl Impact* gCO ₂ e/MJ |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Crude Recovery and Crude Transport | 12.61 |
| Crude Oil Refining | 13.24 <u>7</u> |
| ULSD Transport | 0.27 |
| Tailpipe Emissions | 79.64 |
| Total Cl | 105.7 6 9 |

| Table B.1. | Summarv | Table of | California | ULSD | CI |
|------------|---------|----------|------------|------|----|
| | Sammary | | Camornia | | |

* Individual values may not sum to the total due to rounding

2. Pathway Assumptions, Details, and Calculation

a) Crude Oil Recovery and Transport to California:

Crude oil recovery for the year 2010 is based on the updated Oil Production Greenhouse Gas Emission Estimator (OPGEE) model, version 3.0b.³ The CI for this phase of the life cycle assessment is calculated to be **12.61 gCO₂e** /**MJ**.

b) ULSD Refining:

To calculate carbon intensity of refinery product streams for the Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy Use in Transportation (GREET) model, Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) contracted with Jacobs Consultancy Inc. to develop a refinery linear programming (LP) model for evaluation of the petroleum refining process. The LP model represents process-based refinery operations, material flows, prices, and responses to changes in petroleum product specifications. The model maximizes refinery profit by determining the optimal volumetric throughput and utility balance among various processes under given market and technical conditions. The modeling results were validated against propriety data from 43 individual refineries in the U.S. in 2012. The validated models were also compared to the 2010 refinery statistical data available from the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), and little difference was observed at the Petroleum Administration for Defense District (PADD) level. From the LP modeling results, product-specific efficiency, the efficiency of producing an end product, should be calculated to estimate the emissions associated with each product. The product specific efficiency can be calculated as energy in an end product divided by energy associated with the production of the end product. Usually, the production of an end product takes one or more processes. The energy associated with the production of the end product is estimated from aggregating energy consumed in the processes of the pathways. Because many processes produce multiple output streams, the energy consumed in these processes is allocated to the output streams by the energy values of the output streams. Note that the LP model provides the volumetric and mass flow rates of individual process units in a given refinery. The energy flow rates of gaseous and solid streams are calculated using a heating value regression formula by its API gravity. More detailed information relating to model development, refinery and unit efficiency calculation and allocation methodology used in this study is presented by Elgowainy et al.⁵

For the LCFS, ANL disaggregated PADD 5 data and provided weighted average data for California refineries from the validated LP model. ANL included energy inputs, refining efficiency and refinery operational details for the production of ULSD and these are shown in Table B.2.

Major inputs of ULSD refining include crude oil, heavy unfinished oils, butane, natural gas, hydrogen and electricity. Heavy unfinished oils (e.g., vacuum gas oil) can be purchased from less complex refineries and processed in more complex refineries with deep conversion units (such as coker, hydrocrackers, etc.). Butane as a blendstock can also be purchased from other facilities to meet the ULSD specification depending on market conditions, refinery capacities, etc. NG is used to provide heat and electricity via combustion or to generate hydrogen via steam methane reforming. When combusted, NG is mixed with refinery off gases from process units. A portion of the hydrogen used in the refinery is purchased from external sources.

From the LP modeling, the total energy input for California ULSD is calculated to be **1,164,530 Btu** for every 1,000,000 MMBtu of finished product. This translates to a refining efficiency calculated as 1,000,000/1,164,530 and reported as 85.87% in Table B.2. The energy inputs are derived from various inputs based on the LP modeling results and include:

- Crude: This is the quantity of crude-derived feedstock used in the production of ULSD. From Argonne's modeling, a weighted-average California refinery uses 978,161 Btu of crude to produce 1,000,000 Btu of ULSD.
- Additional energy inputs are derived from purchased feedstock and include residual oil (as a surrogate for purchased unfinished oil and heavy products), natural gas, electricity, hydrogen, gas-to-liuid (GTL) and butane. The subtotal of these inputs makes up the remaining 1,164,530 978,161 = 186,369 Btu of the input energy.
- During ULSD refining, intermediate products such as pet coke and refinery still gas are combusted to provide additional energy to the refining process. Since these intermediates are generated from the input crude and other purchased energy, they do not contribute to the total energy input. However, their combustion contributes to the final CI for ULSD. Table A.3 provides the emission factors (EFs) used in the calculation of GHG emissions from combustion of these intermediate products.

- A portion of purchased NG is used to produce H_2 in an on-site steam methane reforming (SMR) reactor. The CO₂ released in the SMR is considered as non-combustion emissions from NG and is included in the final CI for ULSD.
- For the LCFS, since Crude Oil Recovery and Transport to California and the ULSD Refining processes are calculated for the 2010 base year, the NG production and electricity mix data in the calculation have been adjusted to reflect 2010 values which were also applied in previous model version CA-GREET3.0.

| Table B.2. | Refining Parameters Used in ULSD Refining CI Calculations |
|------------|---|
| | |

| Parameter | Value | Unit | Note | |
|---|--------------------|------------------|---|--|
| ULSD Refining | 85.87 | % | This is CA specific ULSD refining energy | |
| Energy | | | efficiency (weighted average). Although the | |
| Efficiency | | | reference reports PADD-level results, same | |
| | | | calculation methodology applies to ULSD | |
| | | | produced in California refineries. | |
| ULSD Refining: Ex | xternal Energy Inp | uts (Including F | Feedstocks and Process Fuels) for | |
| 1,000,000 Btu of | finished product | | | |
| Crude oil | 978,161 | Btu | Crude input for the production of ULSD. | |
| Residual oil | 38,709 | Btu | As a surrogate for purchased unfinished oil and heavy products. | |
| Natural gas | 133,563 | Btu | A portion of purchased natural gas is | |
| _ | | | converted into H2 by on-site SMR (see | |
| | | | Intermediate Products Non-combustion | |
| | | | Emissions section below) while the rest is | |
| | | | mixed with fuel gases and combusted to | |
| | | | produce heat and electricity (see Intermediate | |
| | | | Products, Combustion section below). | |
| Electricity | 6,916 | Btu | From grid. | |
| Hydrogen | 6,786 | Btu | Purchased from external vendor. | |
| Butane | 373 | Btu | Purchased. | |
| Gas-to-Liquid (GTL) | 22 | Btu | Purchased. | |
| Total | 1,164,530 | Btu | Total external energy input of 1,164,530 Btu | |
| | | | for 1,000,000 Btu of ULSD production in | |
| | | | California. | |
| ULSD Refining: In | itermediate Produ | cts Combustior | n for 1,000,000 Btu of finished product | |
| Pet Coke | 7,476 | Btu | Since the FCC coke is an intermediate product | |
| | | | derived from the external inputs (crude oil, | |
| | | | unfinished oil, heavy products, etc.), on-site | |
| | | | combustion of the FCC coke does not | |
| | | | contribute to the total energy inputs. The | |
| | | | emission factor of pet coke combustion in an | |
| | | | industrial boiler (stationary application) is | |
| | | | 101.66 gCO₂e/MJ (Table A.3). | |
| Refinery Still | 115,219 | Btu | Refinery still gas is a mix of purchased natural | |
| Gas | | | gas and internally produced fuel gas. Since | |
| | | | refinery still gas is derived from the external | |
| | | | inputs, on-site combustion of the refinery still | |
| | | | gas does not contribute to the total energy | |
| | | | inputs. The emission factor of refinery still gas | |
| | | | combustion in an industrial boiler (stationary | |
| | | | application) is 54.69 gCO ₂ e/MJ (Table A.3). | |
| ULSD Refining: Intermediate Products Non-combustion Emissions for | | | | |
| 1,000,000 Btu of | tinished product | | | |
| On-site Steam | 2,856 | gCO ₂ | CO_2 emission from the on-site SMR, which | |
| Methane | | | converts a portion of purchased NG into H2. | |
| Retormer (SMR) | | | | |
| | | | | |

The CI for ULSD refining is calculated from CA-GREET4.0 to be **13.24**<u>7</u> **gCO₂e/MJ**.

c) ULSD Transport and Distribution:

Transportation: After refining, ULSD is transported to the distribution terminal. The assumed transport route is 80% by pipeline for 50 miles, and 20% is directly transported by truck to a filling station (50 miles considered in distribution leg).

Distribution: Finished diesel is distributed from a diesel terminal to filling stations and this distance is assumed to be 50 miles by HDDT.

d) Tailpipe Emissions:

The tailpipe emissions are based on CARB's EMFAC2021 (v1.0.2) model⁷ for Methane (CH₄) and Nitrous Oxide (N₂O). For CO₂, it is calculated based on Carbon in Diesel. The results are shown in Table B.3:

| GHG | Tailpipe GHG Emissions from Diesel-fueled Vehicles (g/MMBtu) | gCO₂e/MJ |
|------------------|--|----------|
| CH ₄ | 0.27 | 0.006 |
| N ₂ O | 12.36 | 3.49 |
| CO ₂ | 80,333.94 | 76.14 |
| Total | 80,346.57 | 79.64 |

Table B.3. ULSD Tailpipe Emissions

A comparison of refinery process details and pathway CI for ULSD between CA-GREET3.0 and CA-GREET4.0 is provided in Table B.4.

Table B.4. Comparison of CIs and Refining Details for ULSD Production between CA-
GREET3.0 and CA-GREET4.0

| ULSD | | CA-GREET3.0 | CA-GREET4.0 | Difference |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Electricity source | | 3-CAMX Mix | | |
| 1) Crude Recovery | | | | |
| Source (feedstock | production) | OPGEE | default | |
| CI, gCO ₂ e/MJ | | 11.78 | 12.61 | 0.82 |
| 2) Crude Refining | to ULSD | | I | |
| Source (fuel produ | ction) | CA C | rude | |
| Efficiency | | 85.87% | 85.87% | |
| Share of other | Residual oil | 20.8% | 20.8% | |
| energy inputs | Diesel fuel | 0.0% | 0.00% | |
| (excluding crude) | Gasoline | 0.0% | 0.00% | |
| | Natural gas | 71.7% | 71.7% | |
| | LPG | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| | Electricity | 3.7% | 3.7% | |
| | Hydrogen | 3.6% | 3.6% | |
| | Butane | 0.2% | 0.2% | |
| Gas-to-Liquid (GTL) | | | 0.01% | |
| Feed loss | • | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| CI, gCO ₂ e/MJ | | 13.57 | 13.24 <u>7</u> | -0.3 3 0 |
| 3) ULSD Transport | | | | |
| 80% pipeline to bl miles | ending terminal, | 50 | 50 | |
| 20% on-site blending and distributed by HDD truck miles | | 0 | 0 | |
| Distributed by HDD Truck, miles | | 50 | 50 | |
| Cl, gCO ₂ e/MJ | | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.03 |
| 4) Tailpipe Emissions | | 74.86 | 79.64 | 4.78 |
| Methane (CH4), g/MJ | | 0.03 | 0.006 | |
| N ₂ O, g/MJ | | 0.724 | 3.49 | |
| CO ₂ , g/MJ | | 74.1 | 76.14 | |
| Total CI, gCO ₂ e/M | Total CI, gCO ₂ e/MJ | | 105.76 <u>9</u> | 5.3 <u>14</u> |

C. Conventional Jet Fuel

1. Pathway Summary

The Conventional Jet Fuel pathway carbon intensity assessment includes greenhouse gas emissions from the following well-to-wheel life cycle stages: crude oil recovery from all domestic and overseas sources, crude transport to California for refining, refining of the crude to conventional jet fuel in California refineries, transport and distribution of finished fuel, and tailpipe emissions from final combustion of the fuel. Based on the CA-GREET4.0 model, the life cycle Carbon Intensity (CI) of Conventional Jet Fuel is calculated to be 89.434 gCO₂e/MJ as shown in Table C.1.

| Aggregated Impact | Cl Impact* gCO ₂ e/MJ |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Crude Recovery and Crude Transport | 12.61 |
| Crude Oil Refining | 3.3 2 3 |
| Transport | 0.2 8 9 |
| Tailpipe Emissions | 73.21 |
| Total CI | 89.4 <u>34</u> |

Table C.1. Summary Table of Conventional Jet Fuel CI

* Individual values may not sum to the total due to rounding

2. Pathway Assumptions, Details, and Calculation

a) Crude Oil Recovery and Transport to California:

Crude oil recovery for the year 2010 is based on the updated Oil Production Greenhouse Gas Emission Estimator (OPGEE) model, version 3.0b³. The CI for this phase of the life cycle assessment is calculated to be **12.61 gCO**₂**e** /**MJ**.

- 1. The CI for refining is calculated from CA-GREET4.0 to be 3.323 gCO₂e/MJ.
- 2. Transport and Distribution:
 - a. Transportation: After refining, the assumed transport route is 100% by pipeline for 110 miles to large airports/fuel terminals, and 20% is directly transported by truck to small airports (200 miles considered in distribution leg).⁸
 - b. Distribution: Finished diesel is distributed from a fuel terminal to small airports and this distance is assumed to be 200 miles by HDDT.⁸

⁸ California Air Resources Board, CA-GREET3.0 Supplemental Document and Tables of Changes. August 13, 2018 (accessed October 15, 2023). https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/fuels/lcfs/ca-greet/cagreet_supp_doc_clean.pdf?_ga=2.249502272.611476356.1694443979-877253845.1694124606

b) Tailpipe Emissions:

The tailpipe emissions are taken from CA-GREET4.0 for Methane (CH₄) and Nitrous Oxide (N₂O). For CO₂, it is calculated based on Carbon in Conventional Jet Fuel. The results are shown in Table C.2:

| GHG | Tailpipe GHG Emissions (g/MMBtu) | gCO ₂ e/MJ |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| CH ₄ | 0.09 | 0.002 |
| N ₂ O | 0.17 | 0.049 |
| CO ₂ | 77,191.42 | 73.16 |
| Total | 77,191.68 | 73.21 |

Table CF.2. Tailpipe Emissions

The refinery process details and pathway CI for conventional jet fuel using CA-GREET4.0 is provided in Table C.3.

Table C.3. Cls and Refining Details for Conventional Jet Fuel Production using CA-
GREET4.0

| Conventional Jet Fuel | | CA-GREET4.0 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Electricity source | | CAMX Mix |
| 1) Crude Recovery | , | |
| CI, gCO ₂ e/MJ | | 12.61 |
| 2) Crude Refining | | I |
| Source (fuel produ | ction) | CA Crude |
| Efficiency | | 94.9% |
| Share of other | Residual oil | 25.1% |
| energy inputs | Diesel fuel | 0.0% |
| (excluding crude) | Gasoline | 0.0% |
| | Natural gas | 60.1% |
| | LPG | 0.0% |
| | Electricity | 4.0% |
| | Hydrogen | 10.7% |
| | Butane | 0.1% |
| Blendstock | | 0.0% |
| Feed loss | | 0.0% |
| CI, gCO ₂ e/MJ | | 3.3 2 3 |
| 3) CARBOB Transp | oort | · |
| 100% pipeline to la | arge airports/ | 110 |
| terminal, miles | | 200 |
| small airports, mile | | 200 |
| Cl, gCO ₂ e/MJ | | 0.28 <u>9</u> |
| 4) Tailpipe Emissions | | 73.21 |
| Methane (CH ₄), g/ | MJ | 0.002 |
| N ₂ O, g/MJ | | 0.049 |
| CO ₂ , g/MJ | | 73.16 |
| Total CI, gCO ₂ e/M | IJ | 89.4 <u>34</u> |

D. Compressed Natural Gas

1. Pathway Summary

The North American fossil natural gas (NG) to compressed natural gas (CNG) pathway includes the life cycle stages depicted in Figure <u>C.D.</u>1. The fossil NG used as feedstock is modeled as an average unit of gas withdrawn from commercial pipelines and reflects the shares of North American NG supply obtained from shale formations (25%) and from conventional fossil natural gas wells (75%).⁹



Figure C.<u>D.</u>1. Life Cycle Compressed Natural Gas Production and Use (Courtesy of Argonne National Lab)

Based on the CA-GREET4.0 model, the carbon intensity (CI) of Compressed Natural Gas is calculated to be **81.1832</u> gCO₂e/MJ** and is detailed in Table D.1.

⁹ California Air Resources Board, *CA-GREET4.0 - Inputs Tab (Proposed Rulemaking Version).* (Released December 19, 2023August 12, 2024). https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/lcfs-life-cycle-analysispublic-comment

| Pathway Stage | Total CI* gCO₂e/MJ |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Natural Gas (NG) Recovery | 7.64 |
| NG Processing | 3.12 |
| NG Transport | 5.90 |
| NG Compression | 2.97<u>3.09</u> |
| Tailpipe Emissions | 61.56 |
| Total Cl | 81. 18<u>32</u> |

Table D.1. Summary Table of Compressed Natural Gas CI

* Individual values may not sum to the total due to rounding

2. Pathway Details, Assumptions, and Calculations

Extracted NG is processed to meet pipeline specifications e.g., for methane content, heating value, and contaminant concentration. About 90% of fossil natural gas used in California is imported from natural gas basins stretching from western Canada to Texas, and 10% is produced in-state.¹⁰ Figure D.2 shows sources of NG imported into California and their pipeline transmission linkages. For processed NG imported via pipeline to California, staff estimated a weighted average distance of approximately 1,200 miles however, due to lack of detailed data for intra-state supplied NG, an overall weighted transport distance of 1,000 miles was assumed for NG from all sources of NG used in California for the production of Compressed Natural Gas.

¹⁰ California Energy Commission, Supply and Demand of Natural Gas in California.

https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/californias-natural-gas-market/supply-and-demand-natural-gas-california



Figure D.2. Sources of Natural Gas Imported to California (from California Energy Commission¹¹)

Methane Leakage assumptions from extraction to final distribution are detailed in Table D.2.

| CH4 leakage rate for each stag conventional NG and shale gas | CH₄ lea | kage ¹³ | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| Stage | Conventional Shale gas NG | | Conventional NG | Shale gas |
| | (g CH₄/MI | MBtu NG) | Vol | . % |
| Recovery - Completion CH₄ Venting | 0.5 | 11.8 | 0.00% | 0.06% |

Table D.2. Methane Leakage Assumptions

¹¹ California Energy Commission, Natural Gas Resource Areas and Interstate Pipelines into California. (Accessed February 7, 2018).

¹² California Air Resources Board, CA-GREET4.0 - Inputs Tab (Proposed Rulemaking Version). (Released December 19, 2023August 12, 2024). https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/lcfs-life-cycle-analysispublic-comment

¹³ Ibid.

| CH4 leakage rate for each stag conventional NG and shale gas | CH₄ leakage ¹³ | | | |
|--|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Recovery - Workover CH ₄ Venting | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.00% | 0.01% |
| Recovery - Liquid Unloading CH4 Venting | 9.0 | 9.0 | | 0.04% |
| Well Equipment - CH ₄ Venting and Leakage | 134.9 | 134.9 | 0.65% | 0.65% |
| Gathering and Boosting – CH4 Venting and Leakage | 31.2 | 31.2 | 0.15% | 0.15% |
| Processing - CH₄ Venting and Leakage | 26.2 | 26.2 | 0.13% | 0.13% |
| Transmission and Storage - CH4 Venting and Leakage (g CH4/MMBtu NG/1000 miles) | 46.7 | 46.7 | 0.23% | 0.23% |
| Distribution - CH₄ Venting and Leakage | 17.7 | 17.7 | 0.09% | 0.09% |
| Total | | | 1.29% | 1.36% |

Table C.D.3 provides detailed CI calculations for the fossil NG pathway¹⁴ using CA-GREET4.0. For NG recovery and processing, efficiency (expressed in percentage) represents the ratio of energy content in the output product over total energy input (including feedstock and process fuels). The table also lists fuels used in NG recovery and processing and provides a breakdown of the individual shares (expressed in percentage) used in these operations. Feed loss and flared gas during processing are also listed in the table. The table includes GHG emissions (expressed as CI in g/MJ) for each step from recovery to final use in transportation. Table D.3 also includes details of CI calculations for this pathway using factors and inputs in CA-GREET3.0 to provide a comparison of changes and related impacts relative to CA-GREET4.0.

¹⁴ Clark, C., Han, J., Burnham, A., Dunn, J.B., & Wang, M.Q., *Life-Cycle analysis of Shale Gas and Natural Gas*. Energy Systems Division, Argonne National Laboratory. December 2011 (accessed October 15, 2023). *https://greet.es.anl.gov/publication-shale_gas*

| Table D.3. | Compressed Natural Gas Pathway Cls |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| (comparison | of CI CA-GREET3.0 and CA-GREET4.0) |

| Fossil NG | | CA-GR | EET3.0 | ET3.0 CA-GREET4.0 | | Difference |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | Conventional NG | Shale NG | Conventional NG | Shale NG | |
| Electricity | source | | 3-CAMX Mix | | | |
| Share of I | NG supply | 49.78% | 50.22% | 49.78% | 50.22% | |
| 1) NG Re | covery | | | | | I |
| Efficiency | , | 97.50% | 97.62% | 96.40% | 96.80% | |
| | Residual oil | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | |
| | Diesel | 11.00% | 11.00% | 11.00% | 11.00% | |
| Share of | Gasoline | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | |
| process fuels | NG | 86.00% | 86.00% | 86.00% | 86.00% | |
| 14010 | Electricity | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | |
| | Feed loss | Included in NG | as process fuel | Included in NG | as process fuel | |
| Natural F Btu/MMB | lared, Btu | 10,486 | 10,327 | 10,486 | 10,327 | |
| Cl, gCO ₂ | e/MJ | 6.07 | | 7.64 | | 1.57 ¹⁵ |
| 2) NG Processing | | | | | | |
| Efficiency | | 97.3 | 35% | 97. | 4% | |
| | Residual oil | 0.0 | 0% | 0.0 | 0% | |
| | Diesel | 1.0 | 0% | 1.0 | 0% | |
| Share of | Gasoline | 0.0 | 0% | 0.0 | 0% | |
| process fuels | NG | 96.0 | 00% | 96.0 | 0% | |
| | Electricity | 3.0 | 0% | 3.00% | | |
| | Feed loss | 0.0 | 0% | 0.00% | | |
| Cl, gCO ₂ | e/MJ | 3.31 | | 3.12 | | -0.19 |
| 3) NG Tra | ansport | | | | | |
| Pipeline Miles 1,000 | | 000 | 1,0 | 00 | | |
| Cl, gCO ₂ e/MJ 5.92 | | 92 | 5.9 | 90 | -0.0216 | |
| 4) Compression | | | | | | |
| Efficiency 97% | | 97% | | | | |
| Cl, gCO ₂ | e/MJ | 3.18 | | 2.97 <u>3.09</u> | | -0. 21<u>09</u> |
| 5) Tailpipe Emissions, 60.73 g/MJ | | 61.56 | | 0.83 | | |
| Total CI, gCO ₂ e/MJ 79. | | .21 | 81. 1 | 8<u>32</u> | 1.97<u>2.11</u> | |

The tailpipe emissions are based on CARB's EMFAC2021 (v1.0.2) model for Methane (CH₄) and Nitrous Oxide (N₂O). For CO₂, it is calculated based on Carbon in NG. Results of the tailpipe emissions are shown in Table D.4:

¹⁵ Mainly due to the increased natural gas flaring during recovery.

¹⁶ Due to lower updated natural gas transmission leakage rate.

Table C.D.4.Summary of Tailpipe GHG Emissions from Compressed Natural GasVehicles17

| GHG | Tailpipe GHG from Compressed Natural Gas, g/MMBtu | Tailpipe Cl, gCO₂e/MJ |
|------------------|---|-----------------------|
| CH ₄ | 85.10 | 2.02 |
| N ₂ O | 12.36 | 3.49 |
| CO ₂ | 59,139.17 | 56.05 |
| Total | 59,236.62 | 61.56 |

E. Propane

1. Pathway Summary

Propane (also termed Liquefied Petroleum Gas or LPG) is a co-product from the refining of crude oil and is also extracted during natural gas and crude oil recovery. It is a flammable mixture of hydrocarbon gases predominantly propane and butane. At atmospheric pressures and temperatures, propane will evaporate and is therefore stored in pressurized steel tanks. As a motor vehicle fuel, LPG is composed primarily of propane with varying butane percentages to adjust for vaporization pressure. Less than 3% of propane produced in the U.S. is currently used as a transportation fuel.¹⁸

Data from the Energy Information Administration¹⁹ indicates that in PADD 5, approximately 25% of propane is produced from natural gas sources and 75% from refineries. Also, propane produced in the PADD 5 region exceeds propane used in California for all uses.¹⁹ The propane pathway therefore assumes propane used in transportation is produced in-state and delivered 200 miles by heavy-duty truck to end-users or retail stations within California⁸.

Based on the CA-GREET4.0 model, the carbon intensity (CI) of propane is calculated to be **81.4<u>38</u> gCO₂e/MJ** and is detailed in Table E.1.

¹⁷ California Air Resources Board, CA-GREET4.0 - Natural Gas Tab (Proposed Rulemaking Version). (Released December 19, 2023August 12, 2024). https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/lcfs-life-cycle-analysispublic-comment

¹⁸ California Energy Commission, *Propane Vehicles*. (Accessed on February 9, 2018).

¹⁹ United States Energy Information Administration, *Petroleum & Other Liquids, Supply and Disposition, West Coast (PADD 5), Annual 2014.* (Accessed on February 7, 2018).

| Pathway Stage | Cl, gCO₂e/MJ from 100% NG source | Cl, gCO₂e/MJ from 100% crude source | Total CI* gCO2e/MJ (weighted based 25/75 ratio of the sources) |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
| Feeds Inputs from NG | | | |
| NG Recovery | 7.61 | | 1.90 |
| NG Processing | 3.11 | | 0.78 |
| NG Transmission | 0.27 | | 0.07 |
| Feeds Inputs from Crude | | | |
| Crude Recovery | | 4. 88<u>90</u> | 3.6 6 7 |
| Crude Transport | | 0.8 5 7 | 0.6 3 5 |
| Propane Refining from NG | 3.10 | | 0.7 7 <u>8</u> |
| Propane Refining from Crude | | 9.77 <u>9</u> | 7.3 <u>34</u> |
| Non-Combustion Emissions | 0.44 | 0.43 | 0.43 |
| Propane Transport | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.02 |
| Propane Storage | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Tailpipe Emissions | 64.83 | 64.83 | 64.83 |
| Total CI | 80.3 8 9 | 81. 78<u>84</u> | 81.4 3 8** |

 Table E.1. Summary Table of Propane CI CA-GREET4.0

* Values may not sum to total due to rounding

** CA-GREET3.0 CI for propane was 83.19 gCO₂e/MJ.

2. Pathway Details, Assumptions, and Calculations

Since propane is recovered from both natural gas and crude sources, the production step includes contributions from both sources and is detailed below. Since 25% is produced from natural gas sources and 75% from crude sources, the CIs are proportionally weighted for the total propane produced.

a) Propane (from Natural Gas) Recovery, Processing, and Transport:

The propane recovery process from NG sources is assumed to be the same as the NG recovery process detailed in the fossil NG pathway in Section C. The clean, processed gas is pipelined 50 miles (assumed) to a LPG plant.²⁰

Total CI of all three steps for propane production from NG sources: NG recovery (1.90 gCO₂e/MJ), NG processing (0.78 gCO₂e/MJ), and NG transport by pipeline (0.07 gCO₂e/MJ) is calculated to be **2.75 gCO₂e/MJ** (all with 25% allocation).

²⁰ The loss factors during the NG transportation are different between a CNG plant (1000 mi pipeline) and a LPG plant (50 mi pipeline).

b) Propane (from Crude) Recovery, Processing and Transport:

U.S. crude source is used where CI from crude extraction is 3.667 gCO₂e/MJ and CI from crude transportation is 0.635 gCO₂e/MJ. These reflect 75% allocation for propane produced from crude sources. The total carbon intensity for propane production from crude sources is calculated to be 4.392 gCO₂e/MJ.

c) Propane Refining (from NG and Crude):

The energy efficiency and fuel used (with corresponding shares) of propane refining from NG and crude sources is detailed in Table ED.2. After allocation, the carbon intensity of propane refining (from NG sources) is calculated to be 0.778 gCO₂e/MJ and propane refining (from crude sources) at 7.334 gCO₂e/MJ as shown in Table E.2.

| | NG sources | Crude sources |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Energy Efficiency | 96.50% | 91.00% |
| Energy Use | Btu/N | IMBtu |
| Residual Oil | | 104,592 |
| Diesel | 363 | |
| Natural Gas | 34,819 | 43,957 |
| Electricity | 1,088 | 2,929 |
| Hydrogen | | 7,017 |
| Butane | | 60,088 |
| CI results after 25/75 allocation | 0.7 7 8 | 7.3 3 4 |

Table E.2. Propane Refining Parameters *

* Values may not sum to total due to rounding

d) Propane Refining Non-combustion Emissions

CI from non-combustion emissions is calculated to be 0.11 g/MJ for propane derived from NG sources. The non-combustion emissions for propane produced from crude sources is calculated to be 0.32 g/MJ. Both these values reflect a 25/75 percent allocation for propane sourced from these two sources. Total emissions from non-combustion emissions is calculated to be 0.43 gCO₂e /MJ.

e) Propane transport:

Propane transport distance is assumed to be 200 miles by HDD truck to LPG stations and shown in Table E.3. The GHG emissions from transport is calculated to be **1.02 gCO₂e** /**MJ**.

Table E.3. Propane Transport and Distribution

| Transport and distribution mode | Mileage | Cl (gCO₂e /MJ)* |
|--|-----------|-----------------|
| Distribution by Heavy Duty Diesel Truck | 200 miles | 1.02 |

* Values may not sum to total due to rounding

f) Tailpipe Emissions:

Tailpipe emissions from the use of propane in light duty propane vehicles are calculated using values from the CA-GREET4.0 model for Methane (CH₄) and Nitrous Oxide (N₂O). For CO₂, it is calculated based on Carbon in propane and shown in Table E.4. Total tailpipe emissions calculations are shown in Table E.5.

Table E.4. Summary of Tailpipe CO₂ Emissions from Propane Vehicles

| Parameter | Value |
|--|----------|
| MPGGE (Miles per Gasoline Equivalent Gallon) | 23.4 |
| Total Propane Use, Btu/mile | 4,289 |
| CO_2 in Propane, grams CO_2 /mile | 291.9 |
| CO ₂ in Propane, convert to gCO ₂ /MMBtu | 68,040.4 |

Table E.5. Summary of Tailpipe GHG Emissions from Propane Vehicles²¹

| GHG | Tailpipe Emissions for Propane vehicles g/MMBtu | CI (gCO2e/MJ)* |
|------------------|---|-------------------|
| CH ₄ | 3.41 | 0.081 |
| N ₂ O | 0.911 | 0.26 |
| CO ₂ | 68,042.67 | 64.49 |
| Total | 68,056.38 | 64.83 |

* Values may not sum to total due to rounding

²¹ California Air Resources Board, CA-GREET4.0 - Results Tab, LPGV Section (Proposed Rulemaking Version). (Released December 19, 2023August 12, 2024). https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/lcfs-life-cycle-analysis-public-comment

F. Electricity

1. Pathway Summary

There are three pathways for electricity used as a transportation fuel in California in the Lookup Table and they are summarized in Table F.1 and F.1.a with calculated pathway Cls.

| Fuel Pathway Code | Fuel Pathway Description | Total Cl gCO₂e/MJ (August 2018) | Total Cl gCO₂e/MJ CA-GREET3.0 |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ELCG | California average grid electricity used as a transportation fuel in California (subject to annual updates) | 93.75 | 81.00 |
| ELCR | Electricity that is generated from 100 percent zero-Cl sources used as a transportation fuel in California | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| ELCT | Electricity supplied under the smart charging or smart electrolysis provision (subject to annual updates) | | See Table E.1.a below |

| Table F.1. | Electricity | Lookup | Table | Pathways |
|------------|-------------|--------|-------|----------|
|------------|-------------|--------|-------|----------|

The smart charging (or smart electrolysis, when electricity is supplied to a hydrogen electrolyzer) carbon intensity values are calculated based on the marginal emission rates determined using the Avoided Cost Calculator, which is incorporated herein by reference. A set of algorithmically neutral carbon intensity values are determined for each hour of the day, for the four quarters of the year, to represent the average marginal emission rates for EV charging or electrolytic hydrogen production that takes place during these times. Using electricity for EV charging or electrolysis could result in additional emission reductions relative to Average Grid Electricity during the periods when the marginal emissions are low.

| Hourly Window | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
|---------------------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| 12:01 AM – 1:00 AM | 87.10 | 87.91 | 90.85 | 96.66 |
| 1:01 AM – 2:00 AM | 87.07 | 86.06 | 87.80 | 92.47 |
| 2:01 AM – 3:00 AM | 87.07 | 86.01 | 87.22 | 90.37 |
| 3:01 AM – 4:00 AM | 87.07 | 85.97 | 87.00 | 89.92 |
| 4:01 AM – 5:00 AM | 87.07 | 87.23 | 86.89 | 91.86 |
| 5:01 AM – 6:00 AM | 92.55 | 95.80 | 88.86 | 103.53 |
| 6:01 AM – 7:00 AM | 115.61 | 94.41 | 100.56 | 126.80 |
| 7:01 AM – 8:00 AM | 114.77 | 30.13 | 96.61 | 125.28 |
| 8:01 AM – 9:00 AM | 67.61 | 2.44 | 61.03 | 103.11 |
| 9:01 AM – 10:00 AM | 2.20 | 1.79 | 7.52 | 40.37 |
| 10:01 AM – 11:00 AM | 0.44 | 3.20 | 13.08 | 4.00 |
| 11:01 AM – 12:00 PM | 0.00 | 50.34 | 21.99 | 8.07 |
| 12:01 PM – 1:00 PM | 0.00 | 53.57 | 32.43 | 9.63 |
| 1:01 PM – 2:00 PM | 0.00 | 55.54 | 45.52 | 12.02 |
| 2:01 PM – 3:00 PM | 0.00 | 59.30 | 55.97 | 42.69 |
| 3:01 PM – 4:00 PM | 30.37 | 64.33 | 105.71 | 80.03 |

 Table F.1.a.
 Calculated Smart Charging or Smart Electrolysis Carbon Intensity Values

| Hourly Window | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 4:01 PM – 5:00 PM | 67.27 | 27.72 | 111.19 | 131.76 |
| 5:01 PM – 6:00 PM | 110.22 | 32.27 | 137.65 | 153.57 |
| 6:01 PM – 7:00 PM | 145.35 | 80.02 | 151.04 | 156.76 |
| 7:01 PM – 8:00 PM | 140.29 | 155.69 | 158.23 | 152.26 |
| 8:01 PM – 9:00 PM | 129.66 | 156.76 | 149.31 | 144.86 |
| 9:01 PM – 10:00 PM | 108.04 | 132.49 | 127.34 | 130.02 |
| 10:01 PM – 11:00 PM | 93.39 | 100.05 | 108.58 | 115.45 |
| 11:01 PM – 12:00 AM | 87.53 | 89.87 | 96.60 | 100.98 |

2. Pathway Details, Assumptions, and Calculations

a) California average grid electricity used as a transportation fuel in California (ELCG)

The California electricity generation mixes in GREET are based on the Total System Electric Generation published by the California Energy Commission (CEC) for the 2020 data year.²² This California electricity resource mix was used for the power generation and the U.S. average electricity resource mix was used for the feedstock production phase (NG, coal, etc.): the weighted carbon intensity (CI) of the feedstock production is calculated to be 14.16 gCO_2e/MJ , and the CI of the power generation is calculated to be 66.83 gCO_2e/MJ .²³ Based on the CA-GREET4.0 model, the CI of average California Electricity is calculated to be **81.00** gCO_2e/MJ and is detailed in Table F.2.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, of the 262 plants²⁴ in the U.S. that generated electricity using fuel resources categorized as "unspecified," 135 reported using natural gas, biogas, and/or land fill gas. Additionally, of the 21 plants in California that generated electricity using fuel sources categorized as "unspecified," 13 reported using natural gas and/or biogas. Therefore, natural gas was used as a surrogate for "Unspecified" fuel category in the CA-GREET4.0. Additionally, "Other Petroleum" in the CEC 2022 was treated as "Residual Oil" in the calculation.

The calculation of emission factors was based on different combustion technologies and their energy conversion efficiencies of each fuel type (Table F.3). For example, residual oil-fired power plants use three combustion technologies: boiler, internal combustion engine, and gas turbine. In California, the shares of these three technologies are 72.4%, 15.5%, and 12.1%, respectively. Furthermore, the energy conversion efficiencies of these three technologies are 33.9%, 39.0%, and 27.6%, respectively. The combustion technology shares and their energy conversion efficiencies were calculated using aggregated data from EIA.²⁵ Complete details are available in Argonne's 2013 report.²⁶

²² California Energy Commission, 2020 Total System Electric Generation. (Accessed on October 27, 2023). https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/california-electricity-data/2021-total-system-electric-generation/2020

²³ Assumes an average transmission loss from power lines is 6.5% for the U. S. from GREET 1 2016.

²⁴ United States Energy Information Administration, *Number of plants for other, United States, all sectors.* (Accessed on October 27, 2023).

https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data/browser/#/topic/1?agg=2,0,1&fuel=00g&geo=g&sec=g&freq=A&datecod e=2014&rtype=s&pin=&rse=0&maptype=0<ype=pin&ctype=linechart&end=2016&start=2014

²⁵ United States Energy Information Administration, Form EIA-923 detailed data with previous form data. (Accessed on October 15, 2023). https://www.eia.gov/electricity/data/eia923/

²⁶ Cai, H., Wang, M., Elgowainy, A., & Han, J., Updated Greenhouse Gas and Criteria Air Pollutant Emission Factors of the U.S. Electric Generating Units in 2010. September 2013. https://greet.es.anl.gov/publication-electricity-13

Table F.2. Summary of CI for California Average Grid Electricity Used as a TransportationFuel in California*

| | Electricity Energy | | Feedstock Production | Power Generation | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| | Mix | Btu/MMBtu | Contribution to Cl, gCO ₂ e/MMBtu | Emission Factor, gCO2e/MMBtu | Contribution to Cl, gCO ₂ e/MMBtu |
| Residual Oil | 0.20% | 6,356 | 94 | 253,578 | 542 |
| Natural Gas | 44.70%** | 993,527 | 13,734 | 123,600 | 59,090 |
| Coal | 3.00% | 92,466 | 510 | 289,776 | 9,298 |
| Biomass | 9.30% | 99,465 | 360 | 0 | 0 |
| Nuclear | 2.30% | 108,845 | 244 | 8,713 | 214 |
| Hydro | 10.20% | 109,091 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Geothermal | 4.80% | 51,337 | 0 | 26,669 | 1,369 |
| Wind | 11.40% | 121,925 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Solar PV | 14.20% | 151,872 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 100% | | 14,943 | | 70,514 |
| Tailpipe Emissions | | | 0 | | 0 |
| Total CI, gCC | ₂ e/MMBtu | | 85,457 | | • |
| Total CI, gCO | ₀₂e/MJ | | 81.00 | | |

* Values may not round to sum due to rounding.

** In the CA-GREET4.0 model, all undefined energy resources are assumed to be from natural gas. This value represents the sum of the reported natural gas used in the electricity mix (37.9%) and the undefined energy categories (6.8%), as the total share of natural gas (44.7%) in the CA Electricity Resources Mix. Similarly, other petroleum sources in the CEC power mix are assumed as Residual Oil in CA-GREET4.0.

Examples of calculation in Table F.2:

For Natural Gas (NG) Feedstock Production, the NG energy input is

$$\frac{44.70\%}{48.12\% \times (1 - 6.5\%)} \times 10^{6} \text{Btu/MMBtu} = 993,527 \text{ Btu/MMBtu};$$

where:

Power generation share of NG = 44.70%;

Loss in electricity transmission = 6.5%; and

Power Plant Energy Conversion Efficiency (see Table F.3)

$$\frac{1}{(6.4\% \div 32.0\%) + (3.3\% \div 32.8\%) + (89.2\% \div 51.1\%) + (1.1\% \div 34.4\%)} = 48.12\%$$

The contribution of NG to the feedstock production CI is:

$$\frac{993,527 \text{ Btu/MMBtu}}{10^{6} \text{Btu/MMBtu}} \times 13,824 \text{ gCO}_2\text{e}/\text{MMBtu} = 13,734 \text{ gCO}_2\text{e}/\text{MMBtu}$$

where:

EF of NG use in power plant = 13,824 gCO₂e/MMBtu

(CI value of the "Natural Gas for Electricity Generation" pathway in the NG tab).

For Natural Gas in Electricity Production, the contribution of NG to the power generation CI is:

$$\frac{123,600 \text{ gCO}_2\text{e}/\text{MMBtu} \times 44.7\%}{(1-6.5\%)} = 59,090 \text{ gCO}_2\text{e}/\text{MMBtu}$$

where:

Power generation share of NG = 50.87%;

Loss in electricity transmission = 6.5%; and

EF of Electricity generation from NG (see Table F.3) =

 $\label{eq:constraint} \begin{array}{l} [(634.08~gCO_2/kWh \times 6.4\%) + (618.58~gCO_2/kWh \times 3.3\%) + (397.17~gCO_2/kWh \times 89.2\%) + (588.66~gCO_2/kWh \times 1.1\%)] \times 293.07~kWh/MMBtu = 123,600~gCO_2/MMBtu \end{array}$

Table F.3. Summary of Combustion Technology Shares and Energy ConversionEfficiencies for California Average Grid Electricity Used as a Transportation Fuel in
California

| | Emission Factors of Combustion Technologies in CA, gCO2e/kWh | Combustion Technology Shares for a Given Plant Fuel Type in CA | Power Plant Energy Conversion Efficiency in CA |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Residual Oil | | | |
| Boiler | 858.87 | 72.40% | 33.90% |
| Internal Combustion Engine | 746.79 | 15.50% | 39.00% |
| Gas Turbine | 1,055.11 | 12.10% | 27.60% |
| Weighted Average | | | 33.65% |
| Natural Gas | | | |
| Boiler | 634.08 | 6.40% | 32.00% |
| Simple-cycle Gas Turbine | 618.58 | 3.30% | 32.80% |
| Combined-cycle Gas Turbine | 397.17 | 89.20% | 51.10% |
| Internal Combustion Engine | 588.66 | 1.10% | 34.40% |
| Weighted Average | | | 48.12% |
| Coal | | | |
| Boiler | 988.76 | 100.00% | 34.70% |
| IGCC | 985.78 | 0.00% | 34.80% |
| Weighted Average | | | 34.70% |
| Biomass | | | |
| Boiler | 29.73 | 100.00% | 22.60% |
| IGCC | 28.69 | 0.00% | 34.80% |
| Weighted Average | | | 22.60% |
| Nuclear | 1.21 | 100% | 100% |
| Hydro | 0 | 38% | 100% |
| Geothermal | 0 | 10.90% | 100% |
| Wind | 0 | 23.20% | 100% |
| Solar PV | 0 | 28% | 100% |

b) Electricity that is generated from 100 percent zero-Cl sources used as a transportation fuel in California (ELCR)

For electricity that is generated from 100 percent zero-CI sources, which include eligible renewable energy resources as defined under California Public Utilities Code section 399.11-399.36, excluding biomass, biomethane, geothermal, and municipal solid waste, and used as a transportation fuel in California, the pathway CI is **0.0 g/MJ**.

c) California Average Grid Electricity supplied under the smart charging or smart electrolysis provision (ELCT)

1) Description of smart charging or smart electrolysis CI values:

The carbon intensity values for smart charging or smart electrolysis are calculated based on the marginal emission rates determined using the Avoided Cost Calculator (May 2018), which is incorporated herein by reference. A set of algorithmically neutral carbon intensity values are determined for each hour of the day, for the four quarters of the year, to represent the average marginal emission rates for EV charging or electrolytic hydrogen production that takes place during these times. Using electricity for EV charging or electrolysis could result in additional emission reductions relative to Average Grid Electricity during the periods when the marginal emissions are low.

2) Calculation of normalized average marginal emission rates for California Average Grid Electricity:

For calculation of marginal emission rates in the Avoided Cost Calculator, natural gas is assumed to be the marginal fuel for electricity generation in California in all hours and the hourly emissions rate of the marginal generator is calculated based on the day-ahead market price curve. The relationship between market prices and higher emissions rates is intuitive: higher market prices enable lower-efficiency generators to operate, resulting in increased rates of emissions at the margin. This relationship holds for a reasonable range of prices but breaks down when prices are extremely high or low. For this reason, the avoided cost methodology bounds the maximum and minimum emissions rates based on the range of heat rates of gas turbine technologies. Additionally, if the implied heat rate is calculated to be at or below zero, it is then assumed that the system is in a period of over-generation and therefore the marginal emission rate is correspondingly zero.

The Avoided Cost Calculator estimates marginal emission rates for Northern and Southern California which are based on the normalized hourly day-ahead heat rate profiles for CAISO NP-15 and SP-15 regions. Statewide average marginal emission rates for 2019, weighted by load, are calculated based on the load profile of large load serving entities (LSE) in the two geographical areas: Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) in Northern California, and Southern California Edison (SCE) and San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) in Southern California. The CAISO demand profile for these three utilities for 2021 is shown in Table F.4.²⁷

| LSE | Demand (MWh) | % of Total Demand |
|-------|--------------|-------------------|
| PG&E | 11,411 | 46% |
| SCE | 11,337 | 45% |
| SDG&E | 2,145 | 9% |
| Total | 24,893 | 100% |

 Table FE.4.
 2021 Demand Profile for California Investor-owned Utilities

²⁷ The CAISO demand reported for PGE-TAC, SCE-TAC, and SDGE-TAC regions are used.

Source: California ISO, CAISO Peak Demand Forecast - OASIS Prod - PUBLIC - 1. (Accessed on October 31, 2023). http://oasis.caiso.com/mrioasis/default.do?tiny=SIddoA

The resulting statewide average marginal emission rates for California Grid Average Electricity are normalized to the California Average Grid Electricity CI value over the year for each hourly window for the four quarters of the year, as shown in Table FE.5.

| Hourly Window | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 12:01 AM – 1:00 AM | 1.0751 | 1.0851 | 1.1213 | 1.1931 |
| 1:01 AM – 2:00 AM | 1.0747 | 1.0622 | 1.0837 | 1.1413 |
| 2:01 AM – 3:00 AM | 1.0747 | 1.0616 | 1.0766 | 1.1154 |
| 3:01 AM – 4:00 AM | 1.0747 | 1.0611 | 1.0738 | 1.1099 |
| 4:01 AM – 5:00 AM | 1.0747 | 1.0766 | 1.0724 | 1.1338 |
| 5:01 AM – 6:00 AM | 1.1423 | 1.1824 | 1.0968 | 1.2778 |
| 6:01 AM – 7:00 AM | 1.4270 | 1.1652 | 1.2412 | 1.5650 |
| 7:01 AM – 8:00 AM | 1.4166 | 0.3718 | 1.1924 | 1.5463 |
| 8:01 AM – 9:00 AM | 0.8345 | 0.0301 | 0.7533 | 1.2726 |
| 9:01 AM – 10:00 AM | 0.0272 | 0.0221 | 0.0928 | 0.4983 |
| 10:01 AM – 11:00 AM | 0.0054 | 0.0396 | 0.1614 | 0.0494 |
| 11:01 AM – 12:00 PM | 0.0000 | 0.6214 | 0.2714 | 0.0996 |
| 12:01 PM – 1:00 PM | 0.0000 | 0.6612 | 0.4003 | 0.1188 |
| 1:01 PM – 2:00 PM | 0.0000 | 0.6855 | 0.5618 | 0.1484 |
| 2:01 PM – 3:00 PM | 0.0000 | 0.7319 | 0.6908 | 0.5270 |
| 3:01 PM – 4:00 PM | 0.3749 | 0.7940 | 1.3048 | 0.9877 |
| 4:01 PM – 5:00 PM | 0.8303 | 0.3421 | 1.3724 | 1.6263 |
| 5:01 PM – 6:00 PM | 1.3605 | 0.3983 | 1.6990 | 1.8955 |
| 6:01 PM – 7:00 PM | 1.7940 | 0.9877 | 1.8642 | 1.9348 |
| 7:01 PM – 8:00 PM | 1.7315 | 1.9216 | 1.9530 | 1.8792 |
| 8:01 PM – 9:00 PM | 1.6004 | 1.9348 | 1.8429 | 1.7879 |
| 9:01 PM – 10:00 PM | 1.3335 | 1.6352 | 1.5717 | 1.6048 |
| 10:01 PM – 11:00 PM | 1.1527 | 1.2348 | 1.3401 | 1.4250 |
| 11:01 PM – 12:00 AM | 1.0804 | 1.1093 | 1.1923 | 1.2464 |

Table FE.5. Normalized Marginal Emission Rates for California Grid Average Electricityfor 2019

3) Calculation of smart charging or smart electrolysis CI values:

The carbon intensity values for smart charging or smart electrolysis for a given time period is determined by multiplying the CI of California Average Grid Electricity by the normalized marginal emission rates for each hourly window. This calculation gives the estimated average carbon intensity for electricity as a result of using electricity for EV charging or electrolysis during a specific hourly window in a given quarter. The carbon intensity values calculated for smart charging or smart electrolysis pathways in 2023 are shown in Table FE.1.a.