

EXHIBIT 13.—SUMMARY OF ELECTRICITY PRICES BY NERC REGION

NERC region	Preferred option				W/C-based option	
	Proposal (\$2001)		NODA (\$2002)		NODA (\$2002)	
	Annualized pre-tax compliance cost (cents/KWh sales)	% change in price	Annualized pre-tax compliance cost (cents/KWh sales)	% change in price	Annualized pre-tax compliance cost (cents/KWh sales)	% change in price
ECAR	0.010	0.15	0.015	0.23	0.015	0.23
ERCOT	0.007	0.11	0.008	0.12	0.013	0.18
FRCC	0.012	0.15	0.015	0.20	0.088	1.16
MAAC	0.012	0.13	0.015	0.17	0.096	1.05
MAIN	0.010	0.14	0.016	0.22	0.016	0.22
MAPP	0.008	0.13	0.010	0.15	0.010	0.16
NPCC	0.017	0.19	0.020	0.22	0.061	0.68
SERC	0.006	0.10	0.008	0.14	0.023	0.38
SPP	0.005	0.09	0.007	0.12	0.007	0.12
WSCC	0.004	0.05	0.010	0.13	0.053	0.70
U.S. Average	0.008	0.11	0.012	0.17	0.037	0.51

VII. Performance Standards

In the proposed rule, EPA set up a framework that would require facilities that did not reduce their intake capacity commensurate with a closed-cycle recirculating cooling system to meet certain other performance standards for reducing impingement mortality and entrainment based on technologies such as fine-mesh screens and fish-return systems. These other performance standards were based on the source water body type where the cooling water intake structure is located, the facility's capacity utilization rate, and the proportion or volume of the water body that is withdrawn by the facility. In general, most facilities would be required to implement control technologies that reduce impingement mortality by 80 to 95 percent and/or entrainment by 60 to 90 percent unless they demonstrate the need for a site-specific determination of best technology available. (See proposed § 125.94 and Chapter VI. Best Technology Available for Minimizing Adverse Environmental Impact at Phase II Existing Facilities (67 FR 17140)).

A. Technology Efficacy Database to Support Performance Standards

In an effort to document and further assess the performance of various technologies and operational measures designed to minimize the impacts of cooling water withdrawals, EPA compiled a database of documents that analyzes the efficacy of a specific technology or suite of technologies. The database contains materials that range from brief journal articles to more intensive analyses found in historical section 316(b) demonstration reports and technology evaluations. At this time, EPA is assembling as much

documentation as possible to support future Agency decisions. Information entered into the database includes some notation of the limitations the individual studies may have for use in further analyses (*e.g.*, no biological data or conclusions).

EPA's intent in assembling this information is four-fold. First, EPA seeks to develop a categorized database containing a comprehensive collection of available literature regarding technology performance that will serve as a more rigorous compilation of data supporting the determination that the proposed performance standards are best technology available. Second, EPA expects to use the data to demonstrate that the technologies chosen as compliance technologies for costing purposes are reasonable and can meet the performance standards. Third, the availability of a user-friendly database would allow EPA, State permit writers, and the public to more easily evaluate potential compliance options, facility compliance with performance standards, and data pertaining to the streamlined option described in this NODA (see section VII.B below). Fourth, EPA has attempted to evaluate the technology efficacy data against objective criteria in order to assess the general quality and thoroughness of each study. This may assist in further analysis of conclusions made using the data.

Basic information from each document is recorded in the database (*e.g.*, type of technology evaluated, facility at which it was tested, etc.) In addition to basic document information, the database contains information in two principal areas: (1) General facility information and (2) detailed study information.

For those documents that refer to a specific facility (or facilities), basic technical information is included to enable EPA to classify facilities according to general categories. EPA collected locational data (*e.g.*, waterbody type, name, state) as well as basic cooling water intake structure configuration information. Each technology evaluated in the study is also recorded, along with specific details regarding its design and operation. Major categories of technology include modified traveling screens, wedge-wire screens, fine-mesh screens, velocity caps, barrier nets, and behavioral barriers. (Data identifying the technologies present at a facility as well as the configuration of the intake structure refer to the configuration at the time the study was conducted and do not necessarily reflect the present facility set-up.)

Information on the type of study and any study results, is recorded in the second portion of the database. EPA identifies whether the study evaluates the technology with respect to impingement mortality reduction (or avoidance), entrainment survival, or entrainment exclusion (or avoidance). Some studies address more than one area of concern and are noted accordingly. If provided, EPA records basic biological data used to evaluate the technology. These include target or commercially/recreationally valuable species, species type, life history stage, size, sample size, and raw numbers of impinged and/or entrained organisms. Finally, EPA records any overall conclusions reached by the study, usually presented as a percentage reduction or increase, depending on the area of focus. Identifying this information for each document allows EPA and others to more readily locate