

PATHWAYS TO CARBON NEUTRALITY IN CALIFORNIA

What will it take to get to Net-zero Emissions in California?

July 2024



About

About the Stanford Center for Carbon Storage

Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage is a key technology for achieving net-zero greenhouse gas emissions. The Stanford Center for Carbon Storage (SCCS) uses a multidisciplinary approach to address critical questions related to flow physics, monitoring, geochemistry, geomechanics and simulation of the transport and fate of CO₂ stored in partially- to fully depleted oil & gas fields and saline reservoirs. SCCS is an affiliates program associated with the Stanford University Doerr School of Sustainability

About the Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative

The Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative (SCRI) seeks to create science-based opportunities and solutions for gigaton-scale negative emissions and atmospheric carbon removal. The initiative helps to enable removal of atmospheric greenhouse gases at scale by generating and integrating knowledge, creating scalable solutions, informing policies for technology deployment and governance, and demonstrating approaches and solutions with industry collaborators. All of this is done with a focus on social acceptance and equity, as well as environmental, economic, and social costs. SCRI is an affiliates program associated with the Precourt Institute for Energy and the Woods Institute for the Environment.

Suggested Citation: Joshua Neutel*, Andrew Robert Berson*, Ethne Laude, Anela Arifi, Adam Brandt, John Weyant, Sarah D. Saltzer and F.M. Orr, Jr., “Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: What will it take to get to net-zero emissions in California?”, Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, July 2024.

© Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, 2024
Revision 1

Stanford | Doerr
School of Sustainability



Stanford | ENERGY
Precourt Institute for Energy

Acknowledgements

Report Authors

Joshua Neutel
Andrew Robert Berson
Ethne Laude
Anela Arifi
Adam Brandt
John Weyant
Franklin M. Orr Jr (Principal Investigator)
Sarah D. Saltzer

Additional Project Team Members¹

Inês M.L. Azevedo
Bruce Cain
Christopher B. Field
Terry Surles
Consultant

Industry Sponsors

California Business Roundtable
California Cattlemen's Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Manufacturers & Technology
Association
California State Building and Construction
Trades Council
International Brotherhood of Boilermakers
Western States Petroleum Association

¹ Stanford University unless indicated otherwise

Table of Contents

.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Key Findings.....	1
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	3
Chapter 2: LEAP and DECAL	8
Overview	8
Modeling Methodologies Used in DECAL	10
Demand	10
Transformation.....	12
Non-Energy	13
Levers	13
Economics	15
Total Resource Cost Test.....	15
Learning.....	16
Incentives	18
Prices	20
Modeling limitations	21
Chapter 3: Comparison Between DECAL and the CARB Scoping Plan.....	24
Reference Case	24
Proposed Scenario.....	26
Cost Comparison.....	27
Chapter 4: Economy-wide Insights.....	29
Chapter 5: Policies and Programs that are Key to Achieving CARB’s Proposed Scenario	31
Chapter 6: Model Insights for the Electricity Sector and the Grid	34
Importance of NGCCS and Clean Dispatchable Power	38
Impacts of Demand Response.....	41
Chapter 7: Model Insights for the Transportation Sector (and Fuels).....	46
BEVs versus FCEVs	49
Chapter 8: Model Insights for The Industrial Sector.....	51
Chapter 9: F-gas Mitigation.....	53
Chapter 10: Model Insights for The Buildings Sector.....	56
Heat Pumps versus Electric Resistance Appliances	58
Chapter 11: Model Insights for Alternative Fuels	61
Hydrogen.....	61

Renewable Natural Gas	64
Renewable Diesel	66
Chapter 12: Model insights for Carbon Dioxide Removal	69
Chapter 13: Economic Sensitivity Analysis	74
Chapter 14: Action Items	76
Chapter 15: Conclusions.....	77
Chapter 16: Future Work	78
Appendix A: Additional Emissions Comparisons.....	80
Appendix B: Modeling Frameworks in LEAP	81
Demand	82
Transformation.....	82
Non-Energy	85
Disclaimers.....	85
Appendix C: DECAL Raw Data Inputs.....	86
Appendix D: DECAL’s Tree.....	92
Appendix E: Levers.....	108
Appendix F: Learning Rates From Literature	111
Appendix G: Additional Resources	114
References	115

List of Acronyms

AB	Assembly Bill
AC	Air conditioner
AD	Anaerobic digestion
AIM act	American Innovation and Manufacturing act
ATR	Auto thermal reformer
BAU	Business as usual
BEV	Battery electric vehicle
BiCRS	Biomass with Carbon Removal and Storage
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CCS	Carbon capture and storage/sequestration
CDR	Carbon dioxide removal
CEC	California Energy Commission
CGC	Clean generation constraint
CHP	Combined heat and power
CI	Carbon intensity
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
Comm	Commercial
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
DAC	Direct air capture
DECAL	The model used in this study – DEcarbonize CALifornia
D&S	Distribution and storage (hydrogen)
e-	Electricity
E-gen	Electricity generation
EO	Executive Order
EOL	End of life
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ER	Electric Resistance (space or water heater)
EV	Electric vehicle
FCEV	Fuel cell electric vehicle
F-gas	Fluorinated gas (e.g., refrigerant)
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GW	Gigawatts
GWh	Gigawatt-hours
GWP	Global warming potential
H ₂	Hydrogen
HDV	Heavy-duty vehicle
HFC	Hydrofluorocarbon
HP	Heat pump
ICE	Internal combustion engine
ITC	Investment Tax Credit
kWh	Kilowatt-hours
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard
LDV	Light-duty vehicle
Li Ion	Lithium-ion batteries

LEAP	Low Emissions Analysis Platform
LPG	Liquid propane gas
MACC	Marginal Abatement Cost Curve
MMBTU	Million British thermal units
MtCO ₂ e	Million (or Mega) metric tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent
MWh	Megawatt-hours
MW	Megawatt
NG	Natural gas
NGCCS	Natural Gas combined cycle power plant with CCS
NWL	Natural and working lands
O&G	Oil and gas
PEV	Plug-in EV
PHEV	Plug-in hybrid EV
PTC	Production Tax Credit
PV	Photovoltaic
RD	Renewable diesel
Res	Residential
RFS	Renewable Fuel Standard
RNG	Renewable natural gas
RPS	Renewable Portfolio Standard
S&D	Supply and demand
SB	Senate Bill
SG	Steam generator
SH	Space heater / space heating
SMR	Steam methane reformer
T&D	Transmission and distribution (electricity)
VMT	Vehicle miles travelled
WH	Water heater / water heating
ZEV	Zero emissions vehicle

Key Findings

- Greenhouse gas emissions estimated with our system-wide model for California agree well with the estimates of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Reference Case and Proposed Scenario with similar assumptions.
- There is no single technology or resource that would allow California to reach net-zero emissions by 2045. A combination of efficiency improvements, renewable electricity generation, carbon capture & storage (CCS), electrification, biofuels, hydrogen, low global warming potential (GWP) refrigerants and carbon dioxide removal (CDR) is needed.
- About 80% of emissions reductions envisioned in the CARB Proposed Scenario can be realized via eight proposed measures: direct air capture (DAC), decarbonizing light-duty vehicles (LDV), decarbonizing heavy-duty vehicles (HDV), clean electricity generation, industrial fuel switching, F-gas mitigation, decarbonizing residential buildings, and industrial CCS.
- Approximately 130 – 460 GW of capacity additions will be required to power California’s decarbonized future. The scale of this buildout equals roughly 1.5 – 6 times California’s current grid capacity and 4 – 15 times the amount of capacity California has added since 2000.
- Without an expandable, 100% carbon free, dispatchable power source, reaching 100% emission-free electricity generation will be quite difficult, requiring large amounts of solar and battery storage to maintain reliability during periods of limited renewables. Use of a small amount of natural gas power with carbon capture and storage (NGCCS) at a slightly lower emissions constraint would produce emission reductions comparable to a 100% carbon-free grid at lower cost.
- Demand management can reduce battery storage buildout, but even in the most aggressive load shifting scenarios, energy storage is still needed in a significant way.
- Battery electric vehicles (BEVs) are a relatively affordable and effective mitigation option for the transportation sector. Deploying ZEVs as rapidly as possible will be required if 2045 goals are to be met. Gradual deployment towards those goals can reduce transportation emissions substantially even if the timing goals are not met. The speed with which ZEVs are deployed is one of the single largest drivers in cumulative emissions impacts and has a direct influence on the amount of CDR that will be needed in 2045 to meet California’s goal of net-zero emissions.
- CCS is an effective and relatively affordable option for the industrial sector. Incentives like 45Q and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) have a large impact on CCS technoeconomic competitiveness, and a case can be made to extend the expiry date of 45Q, especially for the manufacturing subsector.
- Refrigerant emissions are a significant source of California emissions and are projected to grow due to heat pump installations. Responsible end-of-life management can help, but innovative low GWP refrigerants will be needed for deep reductions.

- The buildings sector is and will remain the largest user of electricity. Encouraging aggressive electric appliance (electric resistance, heat pumps) deployment is an important element to reducing buildings sector carbon emissions.
- Hydrogen is currently a relatively expensive fuel switching option but is presently most cost-effective for HDVs. Hydrogen generation costs are relatively small compared to the cost of distribution and storage (D&S) assuming production of hydrogen at central facilities (distributed hydrogen generation and storage was not considered in this study). Research and development (R&D) will be needed to reduce these costs.
- Renewable natural gas (RNG) and renewable diesel (RD) are like-for-like replacements with their fossil counterparts (natural gas and diesel), making them attractive decarbonization options. However, supply of these fuels is limited, demand for them is global, and thus their uses should be prioritized carefully, perhaps in difficult to decarbonize applications.
- Reaching net-zero will be difficult to impossible without significant engineered DAC or the development of new technologies that can replace the need for DAC. R&D is needed to reduce the cost of Direct air Capture (DAC).
- Meeting California's emission goals will require a massive infrastructure buildout (electricity generators, transmission & distribution [T&D], BEV charging, CDR, CCS, building upgrades, and more) in a short amount of time. Streamlining permitting activities and fostering cooperation between public and private entities will be needed if the 2045 timeline is to be met.

Chapter 1: Introduction

California is the largest state in the United States by population and is poised to become the fourth largest economy in the world, after only the United States, China, and Japan [1]. California has long been a leader in climate policy, which has inspired climate policies globally and across the U.S. The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, also known as Assembly Bill (AB) 32, was the first program in the country to require a reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and take a comprehensive, long-term approach to doing so [2]. Since the passing of AB 32, several other policies have been put in place to support California's ambition for climate action, most notably, Executive Order (EO) B-55-18, which calls for the state to achieve carbon neutrality economy-wide by 2045 [3]. More recent legislative activity is highlighted below. California's historical emissions (by sector) as well as near and long term GHG reduction goals are shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: California's historical emissions and GHG Reduction Goals (Adapted from CARB, 2021) [4].

As seen in Figure 1, in order to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045, the five large emitting sectors will need to drastically reduce their emissions. A more detailed view of sectoral emissions is shown in Figure 2. Some of the recent legislative and regulatory actions that will help to reduce sectoral emissions include:

- Transportation:
 - The Advanced Clean Cars II Regulation requires 100% of new passenger car and light-duty truck sales to be zero-emission by 2035 [4].
 - The Advanced Clean Truck Program requires all new medium- and heavy-duty vehicles sold in California to be zero-emission by 2045 [5].
 - The Advanced Clean Fleets rule requires fleet owners operating vehicles for private services including last-mile delivery, Postal Service, and state and local

government fleets, to begin their transition toward zero-emission vehicles starting in 2024 [6].

- As part of AB 32, Executive Order (EO) B-48-18 creates a goal of 5 million zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) on California roads by 2030 [7].
- More recently, the Biden administration granted California the legal authority to require that half of all garbage trucks, tractor-trailers, cement mixers and other heavy vehicles sold in the state to be all-electric by 2035 [8].
- Buildings
 - In the residential and commercial building sectors, several cities have attempted to ban natural gas connections for new housing builds, fundamentally requiring electrification for those buildings [9] [10] [11].
 - California's 2022 Building Code encourages electric heat pump technology as well as establishes electric-ready requirements for new buildings when natural gas is installed [12].
 - The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is in the process of defining zero-emissions standards for new sales of gas heaters, furnaces, and water heaters, with a likely implementation date of 2030 [13].
- Industry
 - Mandatory reporting of GHG emissions by major reporting sources is required by AB 32 [14].
 - SB 905 establishes a carbon capture, removal, utilization, and storage program for the state [15].
- Agriculture and Forestry
 - EO N-82-20 enlists California's vast network of natural and working lands to store and remove carbon from the atmosphere [16].
- Electricity
 - SB 100 establishes a 60% Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) goal for 2030 and a 100% clean electricity grid goal by 2045 [17].
- Hydrofluorocarbons
 - SB 1013 establishes the Fluorinated Gases Emission Reduction Incentive Program which promotes voluntary adoption of low-GWP refrigerant technologies [18].
 - The AIM Act directs the EPA to phase down the production and consumption of HFCs in the US by 85 percent over the next 15 years [19].




Figure 2: California GHG Emissions by Sector and Subsector, 2019 (Adapted from CARB, 2021) [4]. Note: Sum of percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

A detailed review of the emissions from each of these sectors, as well as options and costs to abate was conducted in year 1 of this study (“deep dives”). The results of these sectoral analyses as well as fuel switching options can be found in the following reports:

- Anna Tarplin, Sarah D. Saltzer, Jacques de Chalendar, and Sally M. Benson, “Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: **Decarbonizing the Commercial Buildings Sector**”, Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, May 2022 [20].
- Joshua Neutel, Adam Brandt, Sally M. Benson and Sarah D. Saltzer, “Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: **Decarbonizing the Residential Sector**”, Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, May 2022 [21].
- In Jae Cho, Michael L. Machala, Alexander Evers, Sarah D. Saltzer and Adam Brandt, “Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: **Decarbonizing the Industrial Sector**”, Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, May 2022 [22].
- Eleanor M. Hennessy, Madalsa Singh, Andrew Robert Berson, Inês L. Azevedo, and Sarah D. Saltzer, “Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: **Decarbonizing the Transportation Sector**”, Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, January 2023 [23].

- Ejeong Baik and Sally M. Benson, “Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: **Decarbonizing the Electricity Sector**”, Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, March 2022 [24].
- Anela Arifi and Christopher B. Field, “Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: **The Bioenergy Opportunity**”, Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, April 2022 [25].
- John Foye and Christopher B. Field, “Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: **The Forest Management Opportunity**”, Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, April 2022 [26].
- Justin Bracci, Adam Brandt, Sally M. Benson, Gireesh Shrimali and Sarah D. Saltzer, “Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: **The Hydrogen Opportunity**”, Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, February 2022 [27].

Additional insights obtained via interviews and a 2-day workshop can be found in the following report:

- Terry Surles, Thomas Grossman, and Sarah D. Saltzer, “Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: **Clean Energy Solutions that Work for Everyone - Summary of Interview and Workshop Findings**”, Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, September 2021 [28].

All of these reports can be downloaded from the following website:

<https://sccs.stanford.edu/california-projects/pathways-carbon-neutrality-california>

Given California’s ambitious climate goals, many energy systems models have been used to assess the impact of California’s decarbonization policies. Scenario-based models assessing pathways for reaching California’s AB 32 goals indicate that widespread electrification would be crucial, and decarbonized electricity would become the primary form of energy supply [29], [30], [31]. Wei et al. (2013) emphasized energy efficiency, electrification, and a shift from fossil fuel resources in meeting future greenhouse gas emissions targets [32]. Yang et al. (2015) found that while all low-carbon resources are important, carbon capture and storage (CCS) would be a key technology for achieving the lowest mitigation costs [33]. Jacobson et al. (2014) considered an energy system for California utilizing only renewable resources [34]. Overall, economy-wide studies of California’s decarbonization options have shown the importance of decarbonizing the grid, as well as the importance of a wide range of technologies, including but not limited to renewable resources, energy efficiency, and CCS. Similarly, more recent U.S.-wide studies that assess pathways for reaching economy-wide net-zero emissions by 2050 also commonly emphasize the need for 1) end-use energy efficiency, 2) electrification, 3) clean electricity, and 4) CCS [35], [36].

Additionally, AB 32 requires CARB to develop a Scoping Plan that describes a pathway to reduce GHGs. The first Scoping Plan was approved by CARB in 2008 and the plan is now updated every five years. The latest update was completed in 2022 [37]. The plan lays out a sector-by-sector roadmap for the state based on a technologically feasible, cost-effective, and equity-focused path.

This study integrates the findings of the year 1 sectoral and decarbonized fuel “deep dives” as well as the year 1 interview and workshop findings into a comprehensive assessment of the energy system. Specifically, data from year 1 ‘deep dives’ was used in tandem with an energy planning and climate change mitigation assessment [38] tool called the Low Emissions Analysis Platform (LEAP) to build an economy-wide energy model for California, which we refer to as DECAL (**DE**carbonize **CAL**ifornia). The goal was to provide an independent assessment of decarbonization options and alternatives, including electrification, CCS, biofuels, hydrogen, CDR, and other technologies.

DECAL is a “what-if” pathways model, which allows for economy-wide decarbonization experiments. After inputting proposed policy or technology changes, the model outputs a number of results including emission savings, cost, and various metrics related to resource constraints/availability (example: grid peak, biofuel imports, etc.). This simple framework can provide answers to a variety of questions such as:

- What are the cost and emissions implications of 100% electric light-duty vehicle (LDV) sales by 2035? What if 100% of natural gas (NG) furnace sales are instead heat pumps by 2035? For these two scenarios, what is the impact on the grid?
- What are the cost implications of extending federal incentive programs from 2032 to 2045?
- Which makes more sense from a cost and emissions point of view, fuel cell electric vehicles (FCEVs) or BEVs? Is the answer different for LDVs vs. HDVs?

The next chapter of this report is an overview of the DECAL model - what it does and how it works. This is followed in Chapter 3 with a comparison of DECAL and the CARB Scoping Plan modeling results using similar assumptions. This step was done as a ‘check’ to ensure broad compatibility of results. Chapters 4-12 contain a series of analyses each aimed at answering the question “What will it take to get to net-zero by 2045?” Finally, Chapter 13 contains a sensitivity analysis. The goal is ultimately to outline the technologies and policies that will be needed for a feasible and cost-effective transition, as well as to illustrate the speed & scale with which California needs to move.

Chapter 2: LEAP and DECAL

Overview

LEAP is a software tool for energy policy analysis and assessment of climate change mitigation options. According to the developers, it has been used by governments, NGOs, consulting companies and energy utilities in more than 190 countries. It can be used at many different scales, from cities or states to regional and global applications. Many countries use LEAP as part of their commitment to report to the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change [38].

LEAP can be used to model energy consumption, production, and resource extraction, as well as account for energy and non-energy sector GHG emission sources and sinks. The structure of LEAP's calculations is shown in Figure 3. In the figure, arrows are shown to represent the *automatic* flow of information within LEAP, however most variables (inputs and output) are available for reference within LEAP when manually writing equations, including in the **Non-Energy** area. Note that the flow of information in LEAP is in the opposite direction from the flow of fuels through the energy system.

Energy demand is first calculated in the **Demand** area. This area includes end-users of energy, such as homes, cement plants, vehicles, and more. Information from the Demand area flows down into the **Transformation** area, where LEAP either generates the requisite fuel or imports it. In addition, any additional fuel demanded by Transformation modules higher in the tree must be generated by Transformation modules lower in the tree. For example, electricity used in refining processes adds further requirements to electricity processes lower in the tree. In this way, information can be thought to flow downward within LEAP (as represented in Figure 3), first from Demand to Transformation, and then from the top Transformation process to the bottom Transformation process. For this reason, the order of Transformation processes is material². Finally, import/export information is summarized in the **Resources** area. Further detail on modeling methodologies and raw data entries used in the Demand and Transformation areas can be found in Appendices C&D.

Emissions associated with fuel combustion are calculated in the Demand and Transformation areas, as well as any costs. The **Non-Energy** area can be used to model emissions that do not result directly from fuel combustion (e.g., fugitive emissions, enteric fermentation) as well as other relevant costs (e.g., incentives).

² Note that it is possible to create an ordering in which LEAP cannot generate the requisite fuel, for example, if the electricity sector was placed above the refining sector. In this case, DECAL would simply import the remaining fuel. DECAL's tree was designed to minimize the occurrence of these issues.




Figure 3: Structure of LEAP's calculations.

LEAP is not an equilibrium model – i.e., it will not endogenously calculate sales based on market conditions. Rather, it is a what-if model, that simply calculates the consequences of projections forced upon it by the user. To this end, LEAP is designed around the concept of scenario analysis or storylines of how an energy system might evolve over time. Using LEAP, policy analysts can create and then evaluate alternative scenarios by comparing their energy requirements, their social costs and benefits and their environmental impacts (GHG emissions) [38].

LEAP is not a plug-and-play model (e.g., En-ROADs [39]). Rather, LEAP provides a flexible framework to build customizable models to the desired level of detail. LEAP's flexibility is in part afforded by its tree structure. For example, DECAL's tree to two levels is shown in Figure 4, along with additional levels in the residential sector. Level one is provided by default in LEAP, and includes the aforementioned Demand, Transformation, and Non-Energy branches. Afterward, users are free to tailor their tree structure; for example, DECAL's residential sector is organized by old and new dwellings, climate zone, and finally end-use. The last branch in the tree is an end technology or process, where raw data are ultimately input. LEAP offers excellent accounting functionality, keeping track of energy, emissions, and cash flows by branch. Refer to Appendix D to see DECAL's full tree.




Figure 4: DECAL's tree to two levels (left); zooming in on the residential sector (right).

Modeling Methodologies Used in DECAL

To build DECAL, detailed sectoral data from Year 1 reports was entered into LEAP. In some cases, especially in data-rich/high-energy use sectors, highly detailed data are entered into LEAP. In data-poor or low-energy use sectors or subsectors, data are less detailed. A high-level summary of the methodology for each sector is discussed below. Refer to Appendix B for more details about the modeling frameworks (e.g. Stock and Flow, Technology with Energy Intensity, Capacity With Costs, Top-down, etc.) that are mentioned below. Appendix C contains a guide to excel sheets that were used to populate DECAL, and also lists major raw data sources. Appendix D contains a comprehensive version of DECAL's tree. Finally, Appendix G lists even more detailed resources that can be used to learn about DECAL.

Demand

- **Transportation:** A stock and flow³ model is used to track the inventory of four sub-types of light-duty and 10 sub-types of heavy-duty vehicles over time. Planes, trains

³ Stock and Flow modeling explicitly captures inventory, sales, retirements, and market flow.

and ships, as well as dispersed transportation emission such as those from airport support vehicles and industrial equipment, are modeled in a top-down⁴ manner.

- **Residential:** Homes are organized by new dwellings versus old dwellings, by climate zone (13 in total), and by load type. Major loads, especially those expected to be electrified, are modeled using stock and flow. For appliances that will be replaced with like-for-like systems (example: pool pumps), Technology With Energy Intensity⁵ (see Appendix B for more information) is used and cost is ignored (marginal cost is zero). Top-down modeling is used for fuels other than NG and electricity, including diesel, RD, biodiesel, kerosene, liquid propane gas (LPG), and wood.
- **Commercial:** Commercial buildings are organized by building type – e.g., schools, offices, etc. (12 in total) – by climate zone (five in total), and by load type. Similar to the Residential sector, major loads are modeled using stock and flow, and some other loads are modeled using Technology With Energy Intensity. Top-down methods are used to model a material amount of electricity and NG usage, due to bottom-up⁶ data sources being limited in scope (specifically, bottom-up sources did not cover all building types and regions). Similar to the residential sector, top-down modeling is applied for fuels other than NG and electricity, including diesel, RD, biodiesel, ethanol, gasoline, kerosene, LPG, and wood.
- **Industry:** Given the number of energy intensive subsectors, several approaches were taken. Industrial activities were organized into the following groups: cement plants, food production, petrochemical plants, and timber drying plants. Cement plants were modeled at the individual plant level (8 in total). Conversely, food and petrochemical plants were grouped by plant size (<25k t CO₂e/yr, 25k-100k t CO₂e/yr, and >100k t CO₂e/yr). DAC is used in decarbonization scenarios; two processes are currently available, one that utilizes aqueous solutions and high temperature processing, and one that uses solid sorbents and low temperature processing [40]. DAC electricity usage is captured as an industrial load, just like any other industrial load. Industrial plants in the Demand area are modeled using the Technology With Energy Intensity framework. Finally, other dispersed industrial sources were grouped and modeled together in a top-down manner. Upstream oil and gas (O&G) production and refineries, although part of the industrial sector, were modeled in the Transformation section discussed below. Landfills were modeled in both the Transformation (to create RNG) and Non-Energy areas.
- **Agriculture:** Emission sources from this sector were modeled in a top-down manner. This is for several reasons: 1) data paucity, 2) the large majority of emissions in this sector come from Non-Energy emissions (mainly enteric fermentation and manure), and 3) decarbonization options in this sector are sparse and therefore are modeled using top-down mitigation costs.
- **Carbon Dioxide Removal:** CDR generally encompasses a suite of technologies including DAC with carbon storage, biomass carbon removal with carbon storage (BiCRS, also known as bioenergy with CCS, or BECCS), contributions from natural and working lands (NWL), and other technologies. DAC is available in DECAL as a decarbonization option. Two processes are available, one that utilizes aqueous solutions and high temperature processing, and one

⁴ Top-down means that energy and emissions are input exogenously.

⁵ Technology with Energy Intensity means that energy is broken down into the number of processes and the energy used per process.

⁶ Bottom-up means that energy and emissions are not exogenously input. They are computed in the model based on stock and flow, Technology with Energy Intensity, etc.

that uses solid sorbents and low temperature processing [40]. DAC electricity usage is captured as an industrial load, just like any other industrial load, and uses the Technology with Energy Intensity framework. BiCRS/BECCS is also available in Electricity and Hydrogen sectors by pairing generators that burn biogenic fuels (RNG, waste) with CCS. Other CDR solutions such as NWL and newer technologies are not currently available in DECAL.

Transformation

Sectoral energy demands (discussed in the previous section) are summed by LEAP and then the Transformation area is run to satisfy demand. Several transformation processes are used to generate the requisite fuels.

- **Electricity:** In-state electricity production is modeled via optimization. Specifically, several generator types are made available to DECAL – including NG with and without CCS, solar and wind (both onshore and offshore) in several different geographic regions, hydro, geothermal, nuclear, hydrogen fuel cell, and battery storage – and then LEAP finds the lowest cost solution subject to a number of constraints, including the clean generation constraint (see Appendix B for more details). Out-of-state generation and distributed generation (residential and commercial photovoltaics (PVs)) are modeled using LEAP's Capacity With Costs⁷ framework (see Appendix B for more information), and are thus out of scope of the optimization decision making framework. The optimization module is responsible for generating all electricity that's not imported or created behind the meter. Note that NGCCS generators can be paired with RNG to create a negative emission source.
- **Refineries:** Refineries take in crude oil (in-state production and imports) and hydrogen and create a slate of products (gasoline, diesel, jet fuel, etc.). 15 refinery plants are individually modeled – specifically, the fluidized catalytic cracker and CHP processes, which account for the majority of energy demand and emissions. These processes create demand for hydrogen, which is satisfied via refinery steam methane reformer (SMR) plants, which are also individually modeled (18 SMRs in total). If demand for refinery products decreases, then refining outputs/inputs also decrease along with associated emissions. DECAL also allows for refinery changes/upgrades to produce renewable diesel. Refineries are modeled with LEAP's Capacity With Costs module.
- **Upstream oil and gas:** Crude oil demand is created by refineries, and then that crude must either be produced or imported. First, DECAL dispatches available crude oil production wells, which creates demand for heat. The heat demand is satisfied by in-state CHPs and steam generators (SGs), which collectively capture the majority of energy use and emissions associated with steam flooding operations. SG units were modeled as a group whereas CHPs were modeled as individual plants (23 in total). Crude production wells, CHPs, and SGs are modeled with LEAP's Capacity With Costs module.
- **Hydrogen:** Hydrogen is initially generated at existing refinery SMR plants. As mentioned above, existing SMRs are modeled at the individual plant level (18 in total). DECAL allows excess hydrogen generated at refinery SMRs to be distributed

⁷ Capacity with Costs means that capacity additions and dispatch are handled exogenously and costs are broken down into capital and operating costs.

and used in other places in the economy, such as HDVs or industrial heating. This is especially relevant in decarbonization scenarios where refinery hydrogen demand decreases and non-refinery hydrogen demand increases. Importantly, it is assumed that existing SMR plants cannot be retired, but CCS can be added, and the feedstock RNG blend percentage can be altered. In scenarios where existing refinery SMR capacity is not sufficient, DECAL can also build new hydrogen plants, including SMR (optionally with CCS and/or RNG feedstock), ATR (auto thermal reforming) (optionally with CCS and/or RNG feedstock), gasification (optionally with CCS), and electrolysis. Hydrogen plants are modeled using LEAP's Capacity With Costs module. Note that SMRs can be paired with RNG and CCS to create a negative emission source, and that Gasification utilizing biogenic waste can be paired with CCS to create a negative emission source as well.

- **Bioenergy:** RNG, ethanol, and biodiesel demand are separately satisfied with RNG production, ethanol production, and biodiesel production modules respectively. RNG is either created from landfill gas capture or anaerobic digestion (AD). Three types of AD plants are available – wastewater, green/food waste, and manure – the lattermost being the largest potential source of RNG. Ethanol and biodiesel are made from corn and oils/fats respectively, though demand for these fuels is predominantly satisfied via imports. Ethanol and biodiesel are each modeled using one lumped generator. Bioenergy facilities are also modeled LEAP's Capacity With Costs module.
- **Transmission/Distribution/Storage:** the distribution of three fuels (NG, hydrogen, and electricity) is modeled in DECAL. It is assumed that all NG is imported, but DECAL does consider the energy needed to compress the NG to flow through pipelines, as well as fugitive emissions from NG pipelines and compressor stations. The cost of hydrogen distribution and storage (D&S) is approximated using a flat \$/MWh charge, with sector specific rates for industry and transportation. Electricity transmission and distribution is considered to be 95% efficient, and cost is also approximated using a flat, sector-specific (residential, commercial, industry) \$/MWh charge. Explicit modeling of pipelines (NG and hydrogen) and poles/wires (electricity) was out of scope for this study but should be considered for future research.

Non-Energy

Most emission sources in this area are input in a top-down manner. Two exceptions are NG pipeline leaks and refrigerant leaks, which are tied respectively to the amount of NG (in energy) and refrigerants (number of devices) used in other places within the model. Negative emission sources – CCS and CDR – are also tabulated here, with equations tied to the Demand and Transformation areas. The Non-Energy area is also organized by sector – residential, commercial, transportation, industry/transformations, and electricity production – as well as by emission source (e.g., NG leaks, enteric fermentation, solvents, etc.). Some costs/benefits that have no energy demand associated with them are also applied in this area, mainly in-state incentives and transportation infrastructure (BEV chargers and hydrogen refueling stations).

Levers

Scenario analysis in DECAL is driven by a series of exogenously defined levers. Levers can be adjusted by the user and typically define the following:

- Rates at which technologies and fuel transformations are deployed (e.g., sales rates of ZEVs)
- Types of technologies that are deployed (e.g., CCS vs fuel switching)
- Biofuel blend percentages
- The Clean Generation Constraint (CGC), a lever that essentially applies an emissions constraint on the modeled electricity system
- Incentive prices
- Costs and learning rates (for sensitivity analysis)

Some of the most important levers in DECAL are shown in Table 1. See Appendix E for a more detailed list of levers.

Sector	Lever
Residential & Commercial Buildings	• Sales rate of space and water heaters • Space and water heater technology choice (e.g., electric resistance vs heat pump)
Industry	• Adoption rate of fuel switching • Fuel switching technology choice (e.g., electric resistance vs heat pump vs hydrogen) • Adoption rate of CCS
Transportation	• Sales rate of ZEVs • ZEV technology choice (e.g., BEV vs FCEV) • Renewable diesel blend %
Electricity Production	• Clean generation constraint
Hydrogen Production	• CCS adoption rate for existing SMRs • Technology choice for new H2 facilities (e.g., SMR CCS vs Electrolysis)
Bioenergy Production	• Adoption rate of anaerobic digesters
Applicable to Multiple Sectors	• Refrigerant GWP • Refrigerant EOL leak rate • RNG blend % • Renewable diesel blend %
Financial Levers	• Technology learning rates – cost of technologies over time • Cost of fuels • Incentive prices and program end-dates

Table 1: Major levers used in DECAL.

Of the 2019 emissions of 412 Mt CO₂e, 346 Mt CO₂e can be “levered” in a “bottom-up” manner, 48 Mt CO₂e can be levered into in a “top-down” manner, and 18 Mt CO₂e were not levered in scenarios shown here (see Figure 5). “Bottom-up” levers are those levers that are active in subsectors that have been modeled in a “Bottom-up” manner, whereas “Top-down” levers are active in subsectors that have been modeled in a “top-down” manner (see Appendix E for more details). Bottom-up modeling typically implies a detailed understanding of cost (e.g., automobiles, residential space heating, electricity generation, etc.), whereas Top-down modeling implies a more superficial understanding of cost (e.g., residential sector “other emissions”, trains/planes/boats, etc.). More concretely, Bottom-up modeling commonly includes prices at the device level (e.g., \$/vehicle, \$/heat pump, \$/plant), whereas Top-down costing is typically done via a Top-down abatement price (\$/t) set to match the bottom-up counterpart where possible (e.g., residential other costing is set to be similar to the \$/t price of bottom-up portions of the residential sector). If a bottom-up

counterpart is unavailable – as is the case, for example, for enteric fermentation and refrigerant emissions – top-down abatement costs were set to \$500/t. Given the net-zero goal, Top-down levers are still used in many scenarios.

Levers were not deployed in portions of the model where solutions are currently non-existent or judged to be commercially infeasible at present. Some emission sources that were not levered include leftover landfill gas⁸ (8.5 Mt), fertilizers (3.6 Mt), and emissions from wastewater and composting (2.4 Mt), as well as highly dispersed sources (each less than 1 Mt) such as aerosols, foams, fire protection, solvents, residue burning, crop residue, liming, histosol cultivation (e.g., peats and bogs), and rice cultivation. The CARB Scoping Plan is silent concerning mitigation of these emissions. Due to unlevered emissions, DECAL requires at least 18 Mt CO₂e of CDR to reach net-zero – an inevitable reality in the absence of innovation in the aforementioned areas.




Figure 5: Bottom-up, top-down, and unlevered emissions in DECAL.

Economics

Total Resource Cost Test

DECAL performs a total resource cost test. In other words, DECAL accounts for all additional spending or savings from the perspective of society. DECAL **does not** perform an economic cost test from the perspective of the user, e.g., a ZEV buyer, a homeowner, a cement plant operator, etc. This distinction is particularly important for fuel prices. In the case of

⁸ Landfill gas capture is already used broadly throughout the state. The remaining emissions are assumed to be at small/dispersed facilities, or from inefficiencies in existing methane capture plants. These remaining emissions cannot be levered.

electricity, from a societal perspective, there is a cost for marginal generators, as well as the transmission and distribution (T&D) required to distribute additional electricity. End-users may pay additional costs, such as from legacy contracts and more. This difference is relevant for fuels that are generated in DECAL rather than imported, most notably electricity, gasoline, and diesel.

Note that the total resource cost test operates on a marginal basis, meaning, it reports the *delta in cost between one scenario and another*. Choosing scenarios to compare, and thus the costs to report, depends on the question being asked. That said, costs are commonly compared to the Reference Case, or some strategic variation of the Reference Case. Appendix G contains a link to the excel data used to generate all graphs in this report, which clarifies precisely how scenarios are compared to generate cost metrics.

Reporting costs on a marginal basis means that cost projections are unnecessary for some technologies. For example, if a technology exists identically in both a scenario and the Reference Case, then the cost of that technology (replacing it upon retirement, operating it, etc.) on a marginal basis is zero. Thus, cost evaluations are not needed for all technologies in DECAL, only those that are subject to change on the margin. A good example is pool pumps – no scenarios reported in this study make changes to pool pumps, or in other words, it is assumed that pool pumps are replaced with like-for-like systems upon retirement. In this case, the cost of pool pumps is irrelevant. For this reason, as will be found in supporting spreadsheets and the DECAL model itself (see Appendices D and E), cost projections are absent for many technologies. That said, the energy usage and emissions of unchanging technologies are still relevant, as energy and emissions are often reported here on an outright (non-marginal) basis. These energy loads and emission sources have been captured in DECAL appropriately.

Learning

Costs are amongst the most uncertain data entries in DECAL, especially projected costs into the future. Learning rates are commonly used to estimate cost reductions over time. However, most literature sources define learning rates as a function of global production, and as DECAL is limited in scope to only California, it is challenging to apply these learning rates. However, cost reductions were available for vehicles, DAC, and electricity generators. Modeled cost reduction fractions for these 3 areas are detailed in Appendix F and Table 12 of Neutel et al. (2024) [40].

For many technologies, it was difficult to find cost projections from literature. In this case, a two-step approach was used to define cost projections 1) technologies were grouped by cost reduction potential (either Low or High), and then 2) cost-reduction rates were defined for each group. Table 2 details cost reduction potential groups, which were decided by polling faculty on the Pathways team. Cost reduction fractions are shown in Table 3– here, cost projections in Table 18: Cost reduction fraction over time for Transportation, DAC, and Electricity Subsectors. served as guidance, in that the learning rate of the Low group was set to be similar to that of mature technologies like PHEVs and Natural Gas generators, whereas the learning rate of the High group was set to be similar to that of developing technologies

like BEVs and NGCCS power plants. While learning is highly uncertain, the process used here is at least consistent and transparent.

Cost Reduction Potential	Sector	Technologies
From Literature	Transportation	• LDV BEV • LDV FCEV • LDV PHEV • HDV BEV • HDV FCEV
	Electricity Production	• Natural Gas • Solar • Wind • Offshore Wind • Geothermal • Hydrogen Fuel Cell • Hydro • Nuclear • Biomass • Natural Gas CCS • Battery Storage • Pumped Hydro
	Direct Air Capture	• High temperature aqueous solution • Low temperature solid sorbent
Low	Residential & Commercial Buildings	• Air conditioners • Natural gas furnaces and boilers • Space heat pumps • Electric resistance furnaces • Natural gas water heaters • Heat pump water heaters • Electric resistance water heaters • Electric panels
	Industry	• Electric resistance heating
	Transportation	• LDV ICE • HDV ICE • LDV BEV chargers (home, commercial)
	Electricity Production	• T&D
	Hydrogen Production	• SMRs • ATRs • Distribution & storage
	Bioenergy Production	• Landfill capture • Anaerobic digestion • Ethanol production • Biodiesel production
High	Industry	• CCS • Heat pump heating • Hydrogen heating
	Transportation	• Buses (BEV, FCEV) • HDV BEV chargers • LDV FCEV refueling stations • HDV FCEV refueling stations

Cost Reduction Potential	Sector	Technologies
	Hydrogen Production	• SMRs with CCS • ATRs with CCS • Gasification • Gasification with CCS • Electrolysis

Table 2: Cost Reduction Potential groupings.

Cost Reduction Potential	Default Cost Reduction Fraction in 2045
Literature	Appendix F
Low	0.10
High	0.30

Table 3: Cost reduction fraction used for many technologies in DECAL. Linear interpolation is used for values between the start year and 2045.

Cost data was largely unavailable for the following technologies or emission sources, and so a top-down abatement cost of \$500/t is applied. Future work will explore the sensitivity of the system to top-down cost assumptions.

- Zero-emission trains, planes, and boats.
- Low GWP refrigerants.
- Seaweed feed augments to reduce enteric fermentation emissions.
- Various other Non-Energy sources: fertilizers, waste, dispersed landfills, and fugitives.

Incentives

Incentives can play a critical role in decarbonization affordability. There are many federal incentives that have been introduced to help encourage carbon mitigation activities, and many of these have been incorporated into DECAL, including the following federal programs:

- **Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS)** which requires refiners and importers of gasoline/diesel to blend in certain volumes of renewable fuels. Those that outperform annual goals can receive credits (RINs) which can be traded (sold) to those entities that are unable to comply.
- **Carbon Capture Tax Credit 45Q** which provides (for 12 years) \$85/t CO₂ for CCS projects and \$180/t CO₂ for DAC projects.
- **Clean Electricity Production Tax Credit (PTC)** will commence in 2024 and provide for 0.3-1.5 cents/kWh of emission-free electricity produced.
- **Clean Energy Investment Tax Credit (ITC)** will commence in 2024 and provides for 30% credit on investment costs with a 10% bonus in certain situations. Note that the ITC and PTC cannot be stacked, and that DECAL by default utilizes the PTC.
- **Zero-Emission Nuclear Power Production Tax Credit** of 0.3 cents per kWh of electricity produced by a nuclear power plant.
- **Clean Hydrogen Production Tax Credit** is a 10-year credit of up to \$3.00 per kg of clean hydrogen produced; the exact dollar per kg rate depends on the life cycle emissions of the hydrogen produced.

- **Alternative Fuel Refueling Property Credit** provides a credit of 30% of the cost (not to exceed \$1,000 for residential EV chargers or \$100,000 for commercial EV chargers) for fueling equipment for NG, propane, hydrogen, electricity, E85 and diesel fuel blends.
- **Clean Vehicle Credit** is worth up to \$7,500 for buyers of EVs and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEVs).
- **Commercial Clean Vehicle Credit** is worth up to \$40,000 and applies to those purchasing vehicles with gross vehicle weight greater than 14,000 pounds.
- **Credit for Residential Clean Energy** allows homeowners to deduct up to 30% of the cost of clean energy systems installed in home from federal taxes. Applicable technologies in LEAP include solar water heaters.
- **Energy Efficiency Home Improvement Credit** is equal to 30% of the sum of amounts paid by the taxpayer for certain qualified expenditures, including (1) qualified energy efficiency improvements installed during the year, (2) residential energy property expenditures during the year, and (3) home energy audits during the year. Applicable technologies in LEAP include space and water heat pumps.

Amongst in-state programs, only cap-based incentives are included. The economic rationale is that cap-based programs attach innate economic value to the regulated externality. While substantially abstracted from how these complex policies work in reality, in DECAL, benefits are obtained anytime the environmental benefit is achieved – for example, increasing the share of renewable electricity (RPS), producing low carbon fuels (LCFS), and reducing emissions (Cap and Trade). The per unit benefit is set equal to the price of each trading commodity (REC credit, LCFS credit, emissions allowance).

- **Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS)** requires utilities to provide a certain amount of renewable electricity or buy credits if unable to do so.
- **Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS)** is a cap-and-trade-program designed to encourage the development of lower carbon intensity transportation fuels that are ultimately sold in California. Credits trade on the open market with market pricing that can range from a floor of \$0 to up to \$200/t CO₂e. DECAL assumes the price remains at \$75/t CO₂e. There are currently three LCFS credit pathways – fuel pathways that incentivize the use of low carbon transportation fuels, project-based crediting which incentivize DAC and CCS projects in the petroleum supply chain, and capacity-based crediting which incentivizes ZEV charging infrastructure; only the prior two pathways are included in DECAL.
- **Cap and Trade** is a program that limits emissions from facilities in California. Those that limit emissions below the current year threshold can receive credits which can be traded (sold) to those entities that are unable to comply or for whom the cost of purchasing credits is lower than the cost of reducing emissions directly.

Further details as to how these incentives were included in DECAL can be found in Table 5 below.

The following incentives were not included in DECAL:

- New Advanced Manufacturing Production Tax Credit

- Clean Fuel Production Tax Credit
- Geothermal Heating Tax Credit
- Revival of Qualifying Advanced Energy Project Credit
- Extension of Second-Generation Biofuel Incentive
- Extension of Biodiesel and Renewable Diesel Credit
- High-Efficiency Electric Home Rebate Program
- Previously Owned Clean Vehicle Credit

Prices

Table 4 lists some of the most significant base case assumptions that were used for this analysis. Note that many of these assumptions are levers that can be easily changed.

Parameter	Value		Unit	Notes
Discount rate	5		%	
Inflation	2		%	
Natural Gas Price	5.11		\$/MMBTU	
Crude Oil Price	83.09		\$/BBL	
Gasoline Price	3.46		\$/Gal	
Diesel Price	3.56		\$/GGE	
LPG Price	4.49		\$/GGE	
Coal Price	223.57		\$/Mt	
RNG Price	18.00		\$/MMBTU	
Renewable Diesel Price	4.83		\$/GGE	
Biodiesel Price	4.17		\$/GGE	
Ethanol Price	3.80		\$/GGE	
RFS Credit Price	37.31 for D3 fuels 18.76 for D4 fuels 15.78 for D6 fuels		\$/MMBTU	D3 – RCNG D4 – Renewable Diesel, Biodiesel D6 – Ethanol
Carbon Capture Credit Price	85 for CCS 180 for DAC		\$/t	Small plants that are below the regulated threshold are ineligible. Both fossil and biogenic CO ₂ apply.
PTC Credit Price	15		\$/MWh	Applicable to biomass/biogas, geothermal, solar, wind, and H2FC
ITC Credit Price	30		%	Additionally applicable to Li Ion A generator can only apply for one of PTC or ITC. By default in DECAL, they apply for the PTC.
Nuclear PTC Credit Price	15		\$/MWh	
Clean Hydrogen Tax Credit Price	H2 CI (kg CO ₂ e / kg H ₂)	Credit Price \$/kg	\$/kg	As this a new program, federal guidance is still being published, and so carbon intensities were estimated using data from DECAL and from [41]
	0.00 – 0.45	3.00		
	0.45 – 1.50	1.00		
	1.50 – 2.50	0.75		
	2.50 – 4.00	0.60		
Alternative Refueling Property Credit Price	30		%	Minimum of 30% and \$1,000
Clean Vehicle Credit Price	3,750		\$/Vehicle	Applicable to passenger cars only

Commercial Clean Vehicle Credit Price	Up to 7,500 for T1–T3 Up to 40,000 for T4 and larger	\$/Vehicle	15%/30%/30% of the cost of PHEVs/BEVs/FCEVs is covered for commercial vehicles, but up to a maximum of 7,500 for grades T1, T2, or T3 vehicles, and up to a maximum of 40k for vehicles sized T4 or larger
Residential Clean Energy Credit Price Energy Efficiency Home Improvement Credit Price	30	%	Applicable to space heat pumps, water heat pumps, and solar water heaters
RPS Credit Price	5.00	\$/MWh	Applicable to biomass/biogas, geothermal, solar, and wind. For computational reasons, RPS is applied after the optimization model makes its decisions, in other words, the model does not make decisions with RPS in mind.
LCFS Credit Price	75.00	\$/t	Clean hydrogen and electricity used for transportation applies for the fuel production pathway. Carbon intensities are estimated using published LCFS pathways (see excel spreadsheet for further details). Sustainable liquid fuels additionally apply – ethanol, biodiesel, renewable diesel, compressed RNG, and CNG. The following generators apply for the carbon removal pathway when adding CCS retrofits: existing SMR plants steam generators, crude oil CHPs, and refineries. In addition, DAC is applicable.
Cap & Trade Credit Price	28.45	\$/t	Cap and trade is implemented in DECAL via a carbon tax, in that each ton produced creates a cost to society. Only 80% of emissions apply (about 80% of emission sources are under the cap), and emissions reductions from carbon removal (CCS, DAC) is not included as a benefit (consistent with the regulation).

Table 4: Key economic assumptions used in DECAL.

Modeling limitations

Every model has its strengths and weaknesses. DECAL is best suited to reveal high-level, cross-sectoral insights about California’s pathways to net-zero. That said, some of DECAL’s limitations are described below. It is important to consider these limitations when considering results shown in later chapters.

- **Exogenous Modeling:** as has been mentioned, DECAL is mostly an exogenous model, in that the user instructs the model which technologies to deploy and at what pace. Technology costs and incentives still affect the overall cost-benefit-analysis, but reducing costs or implementing incentives cannot automatically push the model in a particular direction. This is in contrast to an equilibrium model or an optimization model, which evaluates market conditions (cost, incentives, mandates, global market conditions, and more) and then installs infrastructure in response. Exogenous modeling can be helpful to explore the effect of specific what-if scenarios – for example, “what if FCEVs were used instead of BEVs?” These cases may not be explored in an equilibrium or optimization model because they are not cost optimal. On the other hand, equilibrium and optimization modeling can be helpful to evaluate incentive or cost thresholds in which the model makes particular decisions – for example, “at what cost-point, or with what incentive, do FCEVs become cost-effective?” Overall, exogenous modeling can be both a limitation and a strength depending on the context.
- **Outside Agents:** As DECAL is an exogenous model, it does not consider changes that occur outside of California, for example, the effect of changing global market conditions, fuel prices, policies of neighboring states, etc.
- **Projections vs Forecasts:** DECAL is not a forecasting tool – it does not make predictions about the future. It simply projects the results of a future that the user chooses.
- **Technology Scope:** There are numerous technologies that may be introduced over the next two decades ranging from industrial heating, long duration grid-scale energy storage, modular nuclear reactors, alternative liquid fuels, innovative materials, CDR with lower input energy requirements, and much more. The modeling team did not have the bandwidth to evaluate technoeconomics of all technologies, but tried to include most technologies that are proven at scale.
- **Economic Scope:** DECAL only evaluates cost from the perspective of society. Solutions that look low cost from the perspective of society may be financially unsuitable to particular agents within society. DECAL should be thought of as an initial cost-benefit screening, but policymakers should consider additional perspectives.
- **Emissions Scope:** DECAL’s emission scope aligns with CARB’s annual GHG inventory (Figure 2) [42]. As a result, greenhouse gas emissions created outside California are out of scope (with exception to emissions that are created when producing imported electricity). Likely the most notable emission source not included in DECAL are those caused by land-use changes in other states and countries due to biofuels used in California. In addition, emissions generated to manufacture technologies (for example, batteries) used in California are not considered. Emissions sources and sinks from natural and working lands (NWL) are not yet considered in the GHG inventory, and so they are not included in DECAL. Furthermore, CARB’s 2022 Scoping Plan suggests that NWL are a small source of emissions (7 – 9 Mt CO₂e) [37], and so NWL mitigation options were not considered in this study. DECAL can help policymakers identify high-level tradeoffs of various technologies and pathways, but in practice, policymakers should further evaluate life cycle emissions before implementing programs.

- **Other Impacts:** In any life cycle cost-benefit analysis, it is important to carefully define the impact-metrics of interest. In this study, those are greenhouse gas emissions, societal costs, and resource constraints. There are many other impacts one may consider. A notable example is criteria air pollutants (NO_x, SO_x, and particulate matter) – these pollutants have a major impact on local health outcomes and are critical to consider when evaluating environmental justice. Other environmental impacts of interests may be water-usage, soil quality, and much more. One economic impact noted in an earlier report associated with this project [28] is leakage – the degree to which strict decarbonization policies drive people and/or business to neighboring states or countries. These impacts are out of scope for this project but remain a possibility for future work.
- **Capacity Expansion Model:** DECAL's dispatch model has two major limitations: 1) it uses 288-hour time slices, and 2) it uses a single node. For (1), DECAL assumes that every day in a particular month is the same. This removes temporal variance of loads such as heating, cooling, and BEV charging, and also abstracts out temporal variance of solar and wind availability. Extreme weather events can impact both the demand and supply side of electricity. For example, heat waves can cause spikes in cooling, and the grid must be built to accommodate them. In addition, storms can reduce solar capacity for several days in a row, necessitating solar overbuilding and/or long-duration energy storage. Overall, due to using 288-hour time slices, DECAL's capacity expansion model should be considered optimistic - it may in fact *undershoot* actual required capacity additions. For (2), DECAL does not consider *where* load comes from, or *where* generation is available; in other words, all loads and generators are assumed to be located at the same node. The practical implication of this is that transmission and distribution (T&D) constraints are not considered in DECAL, which could have an impact on capacity expansion and dispatch. In addition, T&D build-out is not explicitly modeled, though the marginal cost of T&D is approximated in a top-down manner using a flat \$/MWh charge,
- **Refinery Model:** In DECAL, refineries are unable to change the proportions of gasoline, diesel, and other refined fuels that they produce. If LDVs electrify far quicker than HDVs, it may be in the best interest for a refinery to increase the proportion of diesel-to-gasoline that they produce, however this is not possible in DECAL. In practice this means that refining emissions reported by DECAL may be overestimated in scenarios where LDVs are decarbonized more quickly than HDVs.

Chapter 3: Comparison Between DECAL and the CARB Scoping Plan

Questions that this section will address:

- *Do DECAL model results match the yearly emissions forecast by the CARB Reference Case and Proposed Scenario when run under the same set of assumptions?*
- *Do DECAL decarbonization costs align with CARB cost estimates?*

The CARB 2022 Scoping Plan published Nov 16, 2022, provides a Reference Case and a Proposed Scenario. The Reference Case reflects current trends and expected performance of policies identified in the 2017 Scoping Plan — some of which are performing better (such as the RPS and LCFS) and others that may not meet expectations (such as vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reductions and methane capture) [37]. The Proposed Scenario achieves carbon neutrality by 2045, deploys a broad portfolio of existing and emerging fossil fuel alternatives and clean technologies, and aligns with statutes, Executive Orders, Board direction, and direction from the Governor [37]. To build our confidence in the output from the DECAL, the results were compared to the CARB Reference Case and Proposed Scenario under similar assumptions. The results are shown in Figure 6.




Figure 6: Emissions over time, CARB Reference Case and Proposed Scenario vs DECAL under a similar set of assumptions.

Reference Case

The CARB Reference Case and DECAL were run under similar assumptions (shared by CARB in Appendix H) in the 2022 Scoping Plan [37] and provide broadly similar results as shown in Figure 6. Emissions in 2045 differ by only 16.5 Mt. Explanations for the differences are

described in Table 5. Given the number of assumptions, data inputs, and variables at play, we consider the agreement to be reasonable. Going forward, the CARB Reference Case will be adopted as the Business as usual (BAU) for this study, and as such, many alternative scenarios will be compared against the DECAL version of the CARB Reference Case.




Figure 7: 2045 Emissions, CARB Reference case compared to DECAL run with a similar set of assumptions.

2045 Annual Emissions (Mt CO ₂ e)	CARB	DECAL	Δ	Explanation of significant differences
Transportation	91.7	91.7	0.0	
Industry	72.0	81.7	9.7	DECAL starts 6 Mt higher than the Scoping Plan to align with the GHG inventory DECAL's refineries are unable to change their diesel:gasoline production ratio. As a result, refineries are unable to reduce their output much in this scenario, which has high diesel demand relative to gasoline demand.
High GWP	10.8	8.7	-2.1	
Electricity Production	30.6	23.1	-7.5	Iteration on DECAL's CGC was done in an attempt to match CARB's results as closely as possible
DAC (and NWL)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Buildings	27.1	39.2	12.1	DECAL starts 7 Mt higher than the Scoping Plan to align with the GHG inventory
Agriculture	27.2	31.4	4.2	DECAL does not assume any changes to livestock populations or manure management practices
Total	259.4	275.9	16.5	

Table 5: Explanation of differences between CARB Reference Case and DECAL run with a similar set of assumptions.

Proposed Scenario

The CARB Proposed Scenario and DECAL were run under similar assumptions (provided by CARB in Table 2-1 in the 2022 Scoping Plan [37]) and provide broadly similar results as shown in Figure 8. Emissions in 2045 differ by only 14.5 Mt. Explanations for the differences are described in Table 6. Again, given the number of assumptions, data inputs, and variables at play, we consider the agreement to be reasonable. Many analyses in this study involve making slight perturbations to the DECAL version of the CARB Proposed Scenario, which proved to be a tractable and valuable learning approach.




Figure 8: 2045 Emissions, CARB Proposed Scenario and DECAL run with a similar set of assumptions.

2045 Annual Emissions (Mt CO ₂ e)	CARB	DECAL	Δ	Explanation of significant differences
Transportation	7.9	11.3	3.4	DECAL likely assumes slower transportation stock and flow transition dynamics than the Scoping Plan
Industry	10.4	22.3	11.9	6 Mt/yr: DECAL starts higher than the Scoping Plan to align with the GHG inventory 3-4 Mt/yr: DECAL assumes that only certain refinery units are eligible for CCS. 3-4 Mt/yr: DECAL's SMRs continue to run to meet new hydrogen demand in Industry and HDV sectors; some emissions thus remain due to inefficiencies in SMR carbon capture
High GWP	9.0	9.8	0.8	
Electricity Production	8.7	8.0	-0.7	
DAC (and NWL)	-65.9	-66.6	-0.7	CARB uses 64.4 Mt CO ₂ of DAC by 2045 and 1.5 Mt CO ₂ of NWL reductions. NWL solutions are not included in DECAL, with

				these 1.5 Mt instead being captured by DAC.
Buildings	4.4	4.0	-0.4	
Agriculture	15.3	15.5	0.2	
Total	-10.2	4.3	14.5	

Table 6: Explanation of differences between CARB Proposed Scenario and DECAL run with a similar set of assumptions.

CARB also provides a breakdown of 2045 annual carbon mitigation contribution by intervention in Table 3-5 of the 2022 Scoping Plan [37]. DECAL results are broadly similar as shown in Figure 9.




Figure 9: 2045 annual carbon mitigation contribution by intervention, CARB Proposed Scenario versus DECAL run with a similar set of assumptions. Categories compared in this plot are consistent with those in Table 3-5 from the 2022 Scoping Plan [37].

Additional emissions comparisons are made in Appendix A, including to the CARB Scoping Plan in the model start year, and to CARB's GHG inventory.

Cost Comparison

A comparison of abatement costs between CARB's Scoping Plan and DECAL was attempted, with results shown in Figure 10. In general, it is difficult to compare costs between models because 1) technology cost projections are highly uncertain, 2) it is unclear in some cases what is and isn't included in a reported cost metric (e.g., federal incentives, in-state incentives, resource savings, learning, etc.), and 3) there is uncertainty in defining the Reference scenario and associated costs. The categories along the vertical axes are consistent with those used by CARB [37]. For four out of the seven categories, costs are similar. There are large differences in cost estimates for clean electricity generation, DAC, and reduction of non-combustion GHGs. We speculate that the difference in electricity costs

per tonne is partially because CARB does not include GHG reductions from electricity imports in their abatement cost calculation, which decreases the denominator (tonnes abated) and thus increases their reported abatement cost [37]. In addition, CARB utilizes quite a bit of hydrogen-fueled power plants (a relatively expensive baseload power source) in its capacity dispatch [37], which could add to their clean electric generation costs. As for DAC, costs in DECAL may be lower due to optimistic DAC learning rates (see Appendix F), or due to using different assumptions regarding incentives (\$269/t includes 45Q and LCFS incentives). The cost of reducing non-combustion emissions is negative in DECAL because anaerobic digesters reduce imports of expensive RNG. Interestingly in both studies, the incremental costs of new vehicles are generally offset by efficiency gains [37].




Figure 10: Abatement costs by intervention, CARB Proposed Scenario versus DECAL run with a similar set of assumptions. Categories compared in this plot are consistent with those in Table 3-11 from the 2022 Scoping Plan [37].

Chapter 4: Economy-wide Insights

Questions that this section will address:

- *Can one resource or technology get us to net-zero by 2045?*

To assess the high-level decarbonization potential of a single technology or resource, four scenarios were run in DECAL – high electrification, high hydrogen, high bioenergy, and high CCS, where each of these resources were respectively and separately deployed throughout the economy (where applicable) and pushed to an aggressive upper bound. Table 7 details how levers were set in these four scenarios. As an example, the high electrification scenario involves aggressive deployment of all electrification technologies in DECAL – including electric home appliances, battery electric vehicles, electric industrial heating, and electrolysis – but importantly does not include additional deployment (i.e., more deployment than the Reference Case) of non-electric technologies such as hydrogen, bioenergy, CCS, or CDR. This exercise was undertaken to assess if there were any single technology options that could be relied upon to achieve carbon neutrality, and the results are shown in Figure 11. Note all scenarios listed in Table 7 were run with a clean generation constraint reaching 97% by 2045 (same as DECAL version of CARB Proposed scenario).

Scenario	Main Levers
High Electrification	• 100% electric sales in buildings by 2045 • 100% electric sales in cars by 2045 • 100% industry electrification where possible (food and petrochemical plants, Industry Other) by 2045 • Partial electrification of trains and planes • Electrolysis for additional hydrogen capacity requirements (likely N/A because hydrogen demand is small)
High Hydrogen	• 60% LDV FCEV sales by 2045 (balance 20% BEV, 20% hybrid) • 70% HDV FCEV sales by 2045 (balance 30% BEV) • 60% H2 fuel switch in industry by 2045 where possible (food and petrochemical plants, Industry Other) • Partial H2 fuel-switch of train, planes, and boats • Gasification used for additional hydrogen capacity requirements
High Bioenergy	• Increase economy wide RNG blend to 30%, including in the hydrogen and electricity production subsectors • Increase ethanol blend to 15% by 2045 • Increase economy-wide RD blend to 100% by 2045, including in automobiles, trains, boats, etc. • Use 100% renewable jet fuel in planes by 2045 • Maximize in-state RNG production by 2045 • Build out in state renewable diesel capacity • SMRs with RNG used for additional hydrogen capacity requirements (likely N/A because hydrogen demand is small)
High CCS	• 100% CCS adoption by 2045 on cement plants, large food plants, large petrochemical and mineral plants, refinery CHPs, and SRMs • 80% CCS adoption by 2045 on medium-sized food plants, medium-sized petrochemicals and mineral plants, timber drying plants, and crude oil CHPs • 60% CCS adoption rate by 2045 on small food plants and small petrochemical and mineral plants • SMRs with CCS used for additional hydrogen capacity requirements (mostly N/A)

Table 7: Main levers used for each single technology scenario.




Figure 11: Emissions over time, CARB Reference Case (orange) and Proposed Scenario (solid blue) as estimated by DECAL (same as in Figure 6). Blue dashed line shows impact of removing CDR from the Proposed Scenario. Additional solid lines illustrate the impact from 4 'single technology' or 'single resource' scenarios (high biofuels, high electrification, high CCS and high hydrogen).

Figure 11 shows that a strategy of focusing on a single decarbonization technology will not bring emissions nearly as low as a strategy that blends different decarbonization technologies, such as the CARB Proposed Scenario. Electricity and CCS are notably complementary, in that many emission sources that cannot utilize CCS can often be electrified (for example, buildings and transportation), while many emission sources that cannot be electrified can often utilize CCS (for example, industrial plants like cement, refining, and upstream O&G). Ultimately reaching net-zero emissions will rely on employing a diversified set of technologies and resources.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?

All decarbonization technologies are needed

Chapter 5: Policies and Programs that are Key to Achieving CARB's Proposed Scenario

Questions that this section will address:

- What policies and technologies have the most impact on emissions reductions?
- Is there any “low hanging fruit”? How far can those approaches take us?

Given the close alignment of the CARB Reference Case and Proposed Scenario with those derived with the DECAL model, the DECAL results can be used to garner further insights about policies and programs that will be key to achieving CARB's Proposed Scenario. To do this, DECAL was run with groups of levers ‘turned off’ one at a time, reverting from the settings in the Proposed Scenario to the settings in the Reference Case. In addition, to explore the degree to which innovation is needed to reach net-zero, technologies are placed into three groups – Available at Scale, Pilot Scale, and Research & Development (R&D). The results of this analysis are shown in Figure 12. Note that in some cases (e.g. Decarbonize LDVs), aggressive mitigation in the Reference Case will reduce the marginal emissions impact of the Proposed Scenario shown in Figure 12.




Figure 12: 2045 abated emissions, each bar represents mitigation contribution from a particular measure.

40% of emissions abated in the DECAL Version CARB Proposed scenario are mitigated with technologies that are already available at scale today. An additional 30% are mitigated with technologies that are currently available at pilot scale, and 30% are mitigated with technologies that are in research stage, including 19% that is mitigated with DAC. Overall, much progress can be made with existing technologies, but reaching net-zero will inevitably require innovation across all sectors. Notably, approximately 80% of 2045 annual emissions can be mitigated with policies and technologies in eight key areas. These eight areas should

be seen as high leverage opportunities for the state where policy action and R&D funding would have the largest effect on emissions.

- **Direct Air Capture:** The Proposed Scenario in the 2022 CARB Scoping Plan relies on 64.4 Mt of DAC in 2045. DAC is discussed in detail in Chapter 12. Additional innovation and research funding will be needed to find ways to reduce the cost and energy requirements of DAC.
- **Decarbonize Light Duty Vehicles:** LDVs (including passenger cars) make up 93% of the vehicle fleet in California and are responsible for 70% of transportation sector emissions and 28% of total emissions. As is shown in Chapter 7, the rate at which buyers convert to BEVs has a major impact on emissions, making it critical to set ambitious BEV sales targets.
- **Decarbonize Heavy-Duty Vehicles:** HDVs make up 7% of the on-road vehicle fleet in California and are responsible for 20% of transportation sector emissions and 7.8% of total emissions. The rate at which buyers convert to ZEVs (BEVs or FCEVs) has a major impact on emissions, making it critical to set ambitious HDV BEV sales targets (see Chapter 7). Further innovation is needed to make HDV BEVs available and affordable at scale. RD can be used in tandem with electrification for near term mitigation as well as for reducing emissions from dispersed sources, however the impact of RD may be limited by feedstock availability (see Chapter 11).
- **Clean Electricity Generation:** As the State decarbonizes, electric load will inevitably grow. The speed and scale of capacity additions required will be unprecedented. Most of the technologies we need are available today, in large part thanks to precipitous cost declines of renewables. However, further cost reductions for Li Ion batteries (or innovation in other battery technologies) and/or innovation in clean dispatchable power (example – NGCCS) would make the transition more feasible and affordable. Electrification and impacts on the grid are discussed in detail in Chapter 6.
- **Industrial Fuel Switching:** Industrial fuel switching is still in its infancy, though this is an active area of R&D. In DECAL, petrochemical & mineral plants and food plants are electrified. In addition, it is assumed that Industry Other cannot be decarbonized with CCS due to the dispersed nature of these plants, and so Industry Other is decarbonized via electrification. In general, electrification may be a necessary but expensive option for plants where CCS is logistically challenging.
- **Reduce F-Gas Emissions:** Fluorinated gases (F-gases) represent a significant portion of present-day emissions, in large part because they have global warming potentials as high as 1000 – 3000 tCO₂e/t. F-gases are emitted from the building, industrial, and transportation sectors, with the majority of emissions coming from the building sector. As buildings electrify and switch to heat pump technology, it will be essential to develop technologies and policies to effectively mitigate these potential emissions. Responsible EOL F-gas management is a solution available today, however deep F-gas emissions mitigation will require low-GWP refrigerants (e.g., CO₂, propane) that are currently unaffordable and unavailable at scale. Note that F-gas mitigation is included in CARB's Reference Case, but was incorporated into this exercise to illustrate the importance of the measure. F-gas emissions are discussed in more detail in Chapter 9.
- **Decarbonize Residential:** Emissions in the Residential sector are primarily due to the use of natural gas for space and water heating as well as cooking. Emissions

abatement in this sector boils down to electrification of natural gas and propane appliances. More aggressive deployment of electric appliances is needed to reach net-zero. Residential emissions are discussed in more detail in Chapter 10.

- **Industrial CCS:** Industry is California’s highest emitting sector by 2045 in CARB’s Scoping Plan. Ensuring that there is a process for streamlining CCS project development in this sector is very important to cost-effective neutrality in 2045. Note that the DECAL version of the CARB Proposed Scenario results in more emissions abated via CCS than the CARB Proposed Scenario. This is largely because in DECAL, refinery hydrogen SMRs do not trend down with the phase-out of oil & gas, whereas in CARB’s Proposed Scenario they do. Industrial CCS is discussed in more detail in Chapter 8.

It is important to note however, that these eight high-impact areas are not necessarily the cheapest, as shown in the marginal abatement cost curve plot in Figure 13 (the eight that are discussed above are noted with a black star). The eight measures identified earlier are spread relatively evenly across the cost spectrum. With some exceptions, measures that are Available at Scale tend to be more affordable (further left), whereas measures that are at Pilot or R&D stage tend to be more expensive (further right). Overall, Figure 13 shows we can get about halfway to California’s emission reduction goals with measures that are relatively cost effective. That said, even these measures will involve implementation challenges such as permitting, consumer preference, and more. In addition, getting to net-zero will inevitably require some more costly investments, such as decarbonizing industry and direct air capture. Note that the costs of the following measures are largely unknown: F-Gases and Trains/Planes/Boats. For these measures, a top-down cost of \$500/t is used, though the final abatement costs as they appear in Figure 13 may differ due to resource savings and discounting.




Figure 13: Marginal abatement cost curve (MACC) using the same 17 measures discussed in Figure 12.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?

Eight key areas can get us ~80% of the way to net zero, but it will be expensive

Chapter 6: Model Insights for the Electricity Sector and the Grid

Questions that this section will address:

- *How much capacity needs to be added to the grid and from what resources?*
- *What is the cost and resource impact of a 100% clean generation constraint in 2045?*
- *How does a 100% renewable grid compare to a grid that maintains firm power resources (e.g., NGCCS)?*
- *What is the impact of shifting loads (e.g., day vs night EV charging)?*

Electrification and grid capacity expansion will be key drivers in meeting California's net-zero goal. To explore the bounds of the electrification space, low, medium, and high electrification scenarios were created. The DECAL version of the CARB Proposed Scenario was used for the medium case. The low electrification scenario was created by choosing non-electric technology options (CCS, biofuels, hydrogen) where possible and appropriate, as well as more efficient electric options (heat pump rather than electric resistance). By comparison, the high electrification scenario was created by choosing electric options where possible and appropriate, as well as less efficient electric options. Further details are shown in Table 8.

Scenario	Main Levers That Changed From CARB Proposed Scenario
Low Electrification	• Diesel used in Commercial Other is substituted with RD • Petrochemical & mineral plants, food plants, and Industry Other are decarbonized with H₂ • 30% LDV FCEV sales by 2045 (balance 40% BEV, 30% hybrid) • 70% HDV FCEV sales by 2045 (balance 30% BEV) • Planes are decarbonized using sustainable aviation fuel and H₂ only; trains are decarbonized using RD • New hydrogen production is satisfied with 50% SMRs with RNG & 50% Gasification with CCS (as opposed to 65% electrolysis and 35% Gasification with CCS)
Medium Electrification	• Same as DECAL version of the CARB Proposed Scenario
High Electrification	• Buildings: use ER heating instead of HPs • Industry: use ER heating instead of HPs • Transport: use BEVs instead of FCEVs, electricity used in trains/planes/boats • New hydrogen production is satisfied with 100% electrolysis

Table 8: Main levers used in each electrification scenario.

Figure 14 shows 2045 electric load by sector in these three scenarios. Between Low and High Electrification cases, there is a large range in total electric usage, demonstrating the sensitivity of the system to levers listed in Table 8. In all three cases, buildings continue to be the largest driver of electric demand, with industrial and transportation load growing from Low to High scenarios. Electricity required for DAC is also a new, material load source in all scenarios.




Figure 14: Electricity demand(TWh) in 2045 today and in the Low, Medium, and High Electricity scenarios

Figure 15 illustrates how this load is used temporally throughout the year. Figure 15 is the average load shape in the three cases, showing an average daily profile for each month of 2045. The figure illustrates that in all scenarios, grid capacity will need to increase significantly. In fact, these results suggest about a 20-70 GW increase in peak load. Additionally, in all cases, a shift from a summer peaking system (current) to a winter peaking system is observed. This is partially due to electrification of space heating which peaks during the winter months.




Figure 15: Electric load shape for an average day each month of the year. Current modeled load (black) is compared to the results for low, medium, and high electrification scenarios.

Capacity expansion requirements are ultimately a function of not only load but also the emissions constraint imposed on the grid. For example, very high emissions constraints may require deeper penetration of intermittent solar and wind resources, with battery storage additionally required as backup, adding to build-out requirements. To assess capacity expansion requirements in the decarbonized future, Low, Medium, and High Electrification scenarios were run with 6 different CGC goals: 80.0%, 90.0%, 95.0%, 97.5%, 99.0%, 100.0%, each goal to be reached by 2045, with the CGC increasing linearly up to the goal value in 2045. Results are shown in Figure 16 which shows cumulative capacity additions and 2045 electricity emissions.




Figure 16: Capacity (top) and emissions (bottom) associated with the three electrification scenarios with a CGC of 80%, 90%, 95%, 97.5%, 99%, and 100% by 2045. Dashed black boxes indicate cases used in Figure 17.

Figure 17 illustrates that in all three scenarios, moving from a CGC of 99.0% to 100.0% requires dramatically more capacity despite having a small impact on electricity emissions. Stepping out of the modeling exercise - whether in reality the value is 99%, 95%, or something else, the main takeaway is that there is likely a point at the extreme in which further emissions reductions are small but may require excess overbuilding.

California's RPS program was established in 2002 by SB 1078 with a requirement that 20% of electricity retail sales be sourced from renewable resources by 2017. The program has been modified over the years and finally in 2018, SB 100 increased the RPS to 60% by 2030 and requires all the state's electricity to come from carbon-free resources by 2045 [43]. Results from Figure 16 suggest that the state should consider relaxing a policy constraint of 100% carbon-free by 2045, with a slightly lower value likely leading to similar emissions reductions at much lower cost.

The following scenarios are highlighted to evaluate the bounds of capacity expansion requirements for the decarbonized future: Low Electricity CGC 95%, Medium Electricity 97.5%, High Electricity 99%. As can be seen from Figure 17, from 130 to 460 GW of capacity additions are needed in these scenarios, mainly in the form of solar, wind, Li Ion batteries, and NGCCS. To put this undertaking into perspective, there are currently 80 GW of generation capacity in the state, and only 30 GW have been added in the last 20 years. In other words, in these scenarios, California increases the size of its grid by about 1.5 – 6 fold and builds approximately 4-15 times more capacity in the next 20 years than it did in the last 20 years. The orders of magnitude of these results are consistent with the Scoping Plan [37], which adds about 179 GW of electricity resources by 2045⁹. The enormity of these additions to generation capacity cannot be overstated – meeting these goals will require infrastructure buildout to be streamlined as well as continued advancements in batteries (Li Ion or other battery chemistries) and NGCCS (or other clean dispatchable power). Impact on land-use will also be significant – these scenarios imply 350,000 to 2.15 million acres of suitable land for commercial solar arrays (assuming 5-10 acres/MW [44]), which equates to 0.33 to 2.1% of the land area in the state.

⁹ CARB is likely at the lower end of the range because 1) it projects 479 TWh/yr by 2045 in their proposed scenario, and 2) CARB utilizes significant hydrogen power, a dispatchable (and expensive) resource.




Figure 17: Cumulative capacity added by 2045 in the three highlighted electrification scenarios, by resource type.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?

A very clean grid, but perhaps not 100% clean

Streamlining electric infrastructure capacity expansion

Importance of NGCCS and Clean Dispatchable Power

In this analysis, the importance of NGCCS – and clean dispatchable power more generally – is analyzed using three scenarios built from the Medium Electricity case: 1) ‘100% Clean NGCCS’, 2) ‘90% Clean NGCCS’, and 3) ‘No NGCCS’. In the ‘100% Clean NGCCS’ scenario, the model has access to NGCCS with a 100% capture rate, a technology which is not yet commercially available. This scenario should be considered a hypothetical thought exercise, demonstrating capacity expansion requirements in the case that a 100% clean, unconstrained¹⁰ dispatchable power source becomes available. The ‘90% Clean NGCCS’ scenario is the same as the Medium Electricity case, where the model has access to NGCCS with a 90% capture rate. Finally, in the ‘No NGCCS’ scenario, NGCCS is removed entirely, representing a “no combustion” scenario. These three scenarios were run with the same set of CGCs described previously (80.0%, 90.0%, 95.0%, 97.5%, 99.0%, and 100.0%, each by 2045). The results are shown in Figure 19 which shows cumulative capacity additions for all 18 scenarios (three scenarios at six CGC constraints).

¹⁰ Hydro, geothermal, and nuclear are considered 100% clean dispatchable sources by DECAL but are constrained by resource availability.

To understand the impact of NGCCS on capacity expansion, it is helpful to compare scenarios in Figure 18 vertically, in which case scenarios only differ in NGCCS availability (with electric load and CGC being equal).




Figure 18: Electric capacity added at several CGCs while iterating on NGCCS availability.

For example, at a CGC of 95%, the model adds a similar amount of capacity regardless of whether NGCCS is 90% clean or 100% clean – this is because NGCCS that is 90% clean can still be used while meeting the 95% emissions constraint. Removing NGCCS entirely has a dramatic impact on capacity expansion, as the model must now rely almost exclusively on solar/wind/battery storage to meet demand. These same insights are true at a CGC of 90% and 80%.

Looking at the 97.5% CGC case, we now see a larger gap between the ‘100% Clean NGCCS’ scenario and the ‘90% Clean NGCCS’ scenario. At a CGC of 97.5%, the model is unable to deploy as much NGCCS with 90% capture while meeting the meeting the emissions constraint, instead building more solar/wind/storage. NGCCS with 90% capture still does have some effect, as the model builds even more capacity (solar/wind/storage) in the ‘No NGCCS’ scenario. These same insights are true at a CGC of 99%.

Figure 19 shows 2045 electricity generation for the 99% CGC cases. The figure helps illustrate the extent to which NGCCS is used in these scenarios. For example, comparing the ‘90% Clean NGCCS’ scenario to the ‘No NGCCS’ scenario, relatively little NGCCS generation is needed to prevent significant overbuilding, with the majority of generation coming from

solar in both cases. In other words, a small amount of NGCCS can make a large difference on capacity expansion requirements.




Figure 19: Electric generation by resource for the scenarios shown in Figure 18, 99% CGC case.

As can be seen in Figure 18, at a CGC of 100%, NGCCS can only be utilized if it is 100% clean. In fact, should a 100% clean, unconstrained generation source become available (in this exercise, modeled as NGCCS with 100% capture rate), dramatic growth seen at CGCs of 95% and greater (including at 100% CGC) would be avoided. The exercise motivates research into technologies like this – for example, modular nuclear reactors, widening geothermal capacity, etc. At a CGC of 100%, the ‘90% Clean NGCCS’ and ‘No NGCCS’ scenarios have similar dispatch requirements, implying that if the grid must be exactly 100% clean, NGCCS with 90% capture has little impact on expansion requirements. This is because the model cannot utilize NGCCS that is only 90% clean while still meeting the absolute emissions constraint.

Overall, the analysis identifies clean dispatchable power, such as from NGCCS, as a key technology to reduce capacity expansion. NGCCS with 90% capture – an existing technology – can reduce overbuilding at very high emissions constraints, but not at an emissions constraint of exactly 100%. The state should consider committing to dispatchable capacity, such as by 1) funding NGCCS research and development, 2) streamlining NGCCS installations, 3) explicitly embracing NGCCS in the RPS regulation, and 4) reducing the 100% emissions constraint to a slightly lower value, so that NGCCS with 90% capture (an existing technology) can play a larger role in reducing expansion requirements and cost.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?

*A very clean grid, but perhaps not 100% clean
Clean dispatchable power*

Impacts of Demand Response

Demand response is a broad area that includes the ability to shift load, oftentimes to the middle of the day to maximally utilize cheap solar resources (without need for storage). As loads are electrified and more stress is put on the grid, research interest in demand response has continued to grow. Many of the benefits of demand response comes from general flexibility, helpful in case of abnormalities or extreme weather events. DECAL is not well set up to test the costs and benefits of demand response, as DECAL models every day of each month identically. That said, DECAL can offer some insight as to the value of demand response from a broad resource management perspective.

Limited demand response capabilities were implemented in DECAL to test the effect of load shifting, specifically for the following technologies: light duty BEV charging, residential electric water heaters, heavy duty BEV charging, and DAC. Shifting load poses a unique set of challenges for each of these technologies, and some would be more challenging (and costly) than others to implement. Below we describe how load shifting is modeled in DECAL for each of these technologies:

- **LDV BEVs:** Shifting light duty vehicle charging would likely imply BEV owners charging their cars during the day while at work, rather during the night while at home. The CEC published some scenarios for residential vs commercial charging as a function of plug-in electric vehicle (PEV) fleet share, as shown in Figure 20. Figure 20 was used in tandem with a stochastic load shape study [45] to inform LDV shifting in DECAL. Specifically, as BEVs are sold into the stock, the fraction of vehicles that charge residentially or commercially changes, as instructed by the curves in Figure 20. A low LDV shifting scenario, for example, would follow curve A, whereas a high LDV shifting scenario would follow curve B. As the fraction of home charging changes over time, the load shape used for BEV charging changes correspondingly, as described in Figure 21.
- **Residential electric water heating:** Shifting water heater load would imply concentrating water heating during the day, despite much of the water being used in the evening. The schema would likely necessitate a larger, more thermally resistant storage tank, and/or some amount of overheating (to be cooled later with a mixing point). Demand response water heaters are not yet commercially available, but they are an active area of research. In DECAL, a new technology was introduced called a demand response water heater (both electric resistance and heat pump), which can be sold into the stock over time just like any other water heater option. The demand response water heater has the same properties (annual energy usage, cost, etc.) as a standard water heater, except the demand response water heater follows a new load shape, demonstrated in Figure 22. Said load shape concentrates heating during the day while simultaneously accounting for the fact that standard water heaters within DECAL require less heat during the summer. These are optimistic assumptions, in that the demand response water heater would likely be more expensive, and it would almost certainly require some backup nighttime load. However, DECAL can still offer some intuition as to the optimistic impact of demand response water heating.
- **HDV BEVs:** As heavy duty BEVs are not yet commercially available, there is much less data and research on BEV load shapes. A lever was created to control the extent to

which HDV BEV charging follows a flat versus solar load shape. DECAL proportionally overbuilds chargers in high solar scenarios to ensure peak charging demand can still be met.

- **Direct air capture:** It is theoretically possible to operate DAC plants during the day only, however, doing so while capturing the same amount of carbon would require overbuilding DAC plants. In DECAL, a lever was created to control the extent to which DAC plants follow a flat versus solar load shape. As the shape becomes more solar focused, DECAL overbuilds DAC to ensure the desired rate of capture can still be achieved.
- **Rest of Industry:** A lever was implemented to control the extent to which industrial loads (cement plants, manufacturing plants, etc.) follow a flat versus solar load shape. Unlike other technologies listed above, it was not possible to account for the impacts of overbuilding industrial plants. As such, this option should be strictly treated as a thought exercise, showing the benefits to the grid in an extreme demand response scenario, without showing overbuild costs.




Figure 20: Two scenarios describing the relationship between PEV fleet share and access to home charging. Modified after CEC [46].




Figure 21: LDV charging load shapes as a function of home charging, made in collaboration with Powell et al [45].




Figure 22: Standard water heater load shape compared to demand response water heater load shape, demonstrated for CZ7 (Los Angeles area).




Figure 23: Solar load shape, constructed from the solar availability shape [24].

To test the impacts of demand response, six scenarios were implemented in DECAL, as described in Table 9. The scenarios build off of the DECAL Version of CARB Proposed Scenario with a 99% CGC. Demand response technologies are introduced sequentially; the most “shiftable” loads are added first, as in, the loads in which there is greater certainty that shifting would even be possible.

Scenario	Main Levers That Changed From CARB Proposed Scenario
No Shift	- Clean generation constraint set to 99% - LDV charging set to follow Curve A (Figure 20)
Shift LDVs	In addition to the prior changes, LDV charging set to follow Curve B (Figure 20)
Shift WHs	In addition to the prior changes, demand response heat pump water heaters are utilized instead of standard heat pump water heaters
Shift HDVs	In addition to the prior changes, HDV charging reaches 100% solar load shape by 2045, with interpolation used in-between.

Shift CDR	In addition to the prior changes, CDR reaches 100% solar load shape by 2045, with interpolation used in-between.
Shift Industry	In addition to the prior changes, industry reaches a 100% solar load shape by 2045, with interpolation used in-between.

Table 9: Main levers used in each demand response scenario.

Figure 24 shows the impact to system-wide load shape and demonstrates that aggressive demand response measures are needed to substantially reduce nighttime usage. Figure 25 shows the impact on electric capacity additions. As expected, DECAL installs less Li Ion storage in high demand response scenarios, but even in the most aggressive demand response scenarios, Li Ion storage is still needed in a significant way. Finally, Figure 26 shows the impact to abatement cost – by in large, cost savings from lower storage are small, because Li Ion storage is a small driver of overall system-wide costs. By comparison, overbuilding CDR (DAC in this case) is exorbitantly expensive.




Figure 24: Load shapes, demand response analysis.




Figure 25: Cumulative electric capacity added, demand response analysis.




Figure 26: Abatement cost, demand response analysis.

There is much uncertainty related to the feasibility and cost of demand response. However, from the simple analysis here, we can conclude that demand response can be helpful to reduce storage capacity additions, but that expensive overbuilding of infrastructure (e.g., CDR) is likely not worthwhile. Furthermore, significant storage will inevitably be needed even in the most aggressive demand response scenarios. It is worth emphasizing, however, that much of the value of demand response is in grid flexibility (the ability to manage the volatility in the supply and demand of power at multiple timescales), and those effects are not captured here.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?

Energy storage

Chapter 7: Model Insights for the Transportation Sector (and Fuels)

Questions that this section will address:

- *What is the impact of overshooting goals outlined in the Clean Cars II regulation and the Advanced Clean Truck program?*
- *How do costs and emissions of different vehicle fuel types (BEV, FCEV) compare?*

The Advanced Clean Cars II Regulation requires 100% of new passenger car and light-duty truck sales to be zero-emission by 2035 [4], with a ramp of increasing ZEV penetration before then as shown in Figure 27.




Figure 27: Percent of ZEV sales required by Advance Clean Cars II by model year [4].

Similarly, the Advanced Clean Truck Program requires all new medium- and heavy-duty vehicles sold in California to be zero-emission by 2045 [5]. While the majority of vehicles in California still run on internal combustion engines, recent LDV adoption rates have increased, with BEVs making up 25% of new car sales in the state through the end of Q2, 2023 [47].

To assess the impact of a faster (earlier) and slower (later) 100% ZEV adoption rates of new LDVs and HDVs, four scenarios were set up in DECAL, reaching the 100% ZEV sales goal in 2025, 2035, 2045, and 2055 respectively (with linear interpolation between). Electricity and hydrogen production were also simultaneously cleaned¹¹. Note that this analysis does not take into account whether infrastructure will be ready for a transition to ZEVs, a concern raised in a recent report by the Energy Institute at UC Berkeley [48].

¹¹ CGC of 97% by 2045, existing SMRs receive CCS retrofits, new hydrogen plants consist of a mixture of Gasification with CCS (35%) and electrolysis (65%) (same assumptions used in Decal version of the CARB Proposed Scenario).

The results are shown in Figure 28 and Figure 29, which show emissions over time and an annual emissions snapshot by subsector.




Figure 28: Emissions over time, varying the date in which 100% ZEV sales is reached.




Figure 29: Annual emissions, varying the date in which 100% ZEV sales is reached.

The 2055 scenario should be seen as an overshoot, projecting emissions if we are late to reach ZEV sales goals by 10-20 years. Interestingly, even in this case, LDV and HDV emissions are both reduced by more than half by 2045. That being said, if the state is steadfast about the net-zero by 2045 goal, any LDV and HDV emissions left over by 2045 would need to be handled via CDR. At the other end of the spectrum, the 2025 scenario should be seen as a thought exercise, projecting emissions if the state could move faster than realistically possible. In this case, LDV and HDV emissions reach near zero, but not quite zero. In a sense, the question is not *whether* CDR will be needed to bring transport emissions to zero, rather the question is *how much* CDR will be needed. Overall, the analysis simultaneously says the following: 1) gradual progress towards ambitious ZEV sales targets is an effective way to reduce economy-wide emissions, even if target dates are not met, 2) due to stock and flow dynamics, every year we overshoot said targets will inevitably lead to greater CDR requirements, assuming net-zero by 2045 is a binding constraint.

It is important to mention that adoption rate also has an impact on cumulative emissions, which in the end determines California's contribution to warming. As can be seen in Figure 30, the 2055 overshoot scenario results in an additional 509 Mt of cumulative emissions compared to the 2035 scenario (which is similar to the Proposed Scenario), whereas the 2025 scenario results in 381 Mt less. For reference, the DECAL Version of the CARB Proposed Scenario mitigates 3135 Mt cumulatively, and thus the 2055 scenario reduces cumulative emission savings by about 16%, whereas the 2025 scenario increases cumulative emission savings by about 12%. This represents one of the larger swings in abatement seen throughout the analyses.




Figure 30: Marginal cumulative emissions, varying the date in which 100% ZEV sales is reached.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?
Steady progress towards ambitious ZEV deployment

BEVs versus FCEVs

While BEVs are currently the dominant ZEV type for LDVs, FCEVs are slowly gaining market share. As of mid-2023, there are 63 light-duty retail hydrogen refueling stations in California with another 30 planned. Additionally, there are 6 heavy-duty refueling stations with another 4 planned [49]. These plans demonstrate California’s commitment to FCEVs. Using DECAL, it is possible to test out scenarios to compare abatement costs associated with BEVs and FCEVs for both light and heavy-duty vehicles.

For both LDVs and HDVs, a 100% BEV scenario was compared to a 100% FCEV scenario. The scenarios assume that 100% of clean vehicles sold into the stock are either electric or hydrogen powered. Results are shown in Figure 31 and Figure 32, which respectively show the cost of abatement of each scenario, and the cost breakdown by subsector.

Figure 31 demonstrates that for both LDVs and HDVs, BEVs are more cost-effective option than FCEVs. Interestingly, Figure 31 also shows that HDVs are a “cheaper” problem than LDVs, even on a \$/t basis. This is likely because heavy duty vehicles produce more emissions than light duty vehicles on a per vehicle basis; or in other words, fewer heavy duty ZEVs are needed to mitigate the same amount of CO₂.

Figure 32 shows that the biggest drivers of cost/benefits are 1) the vehicles themselves, 2) hydrogen distribution & storage (D&S) including refueling stations, 3) electricity T&D, and 4) resource savings from oil products. Notably, electricity and hydrogen production are not significant drivers of cost, nor are BEV chargers. Overall, the analysis tells us that as of today, BEVs are economically favorable, and that for hydrogen to become competitive, further cost reductions to FCEV vehicles, hydrogen D&S, and refueling stations will be needed.




Figure 31: Abatement cost, BEV versus FCEV for both HDVs and LDVs.




Figure 32: Cost by subsector, BEV versus FCEV for both HDVs and LDVs. Note that the net cost (blue dot) is the right side minus the left side.

It should be noted that Figure 31 and Figure 32 only capture cost-differences from the point of view of the state. As such, some externalities, including payload, reliability and refueling time are not captured in this analysis. These externalities are particularly important for HDVs and could impact consumer preferences. Ultimately, businesses will need to weigh differences in reliability, payload, fuel-time, and cost. In addition, note that in Figure 31 and Figure 32, federal incentives are included in the capital costs; for example, the Clean Vehicle Credit is incorporated into LDV 'Transportation' bars, Commercial Clean Vehicle Credit is incorporated into the HDV 'Transportation' bars, and the Alternative Fuel Refueling Property Credit is incorporated into the 'Chargers/Refueling' bars.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?

BEVs

Chapter 8: Model Insights for The Industrial Sector

Questions that this section will address:

- Which decarbonization technology is preferable for the industrial sector?
- What is the impact of incentives on CCS technoeconomics?

Industry is California's highest remaining emitting sector by 2045 in CARB's Scoping Plan, in large part because the industrial sector contains some of the hardest to abate emissions [50]. In DECAL, industrial decarbonization options vary by subsector, but typically include either CCS, electrification (via electric resistance and/or heat pumps), or fuel switching to hydrogen. To test the efficacy of these options, one technology was deployed at a time in each industrial subsector (as applicable). The results are shown in Figure 33 which shows 2045 mitigated emissions and the cost of abatement.




Figure 33: 2045 abated emissions and abatement costs for technologies in the industrial sector.

As can be seen in Figure 33 (left), CCS is the only modeled decarbonization option for the cement and upstream O&G subsectors. Due to high-temperature heating requirements, these subsectors are especially difficult to electrify, though this is an ongoing area of research with promising progress being made [22]. In the manufacturing subsector, abatement potential is a function of penetration potential. Specifically, it is assumed that 1) all manufacturing (petrochemical, mineral, food) plants can switch to ER and hydrogen, 2) fast and deep deployment of CCS is unlikely because manufacturing plants are dispersed, and 3) food plants can switch to heat pumps, but petrochemical and mineral plants cannot (due to temperature constraints). Figure 33 (right) shows that CCS is a cost-effective option for all subsectors, and that hydrogen is much more expensive. Overall, Figure 33 shows that CCS has reasonable abatement potential while being more affordable, making it a less costly choice for the industrial sector under the assumptions made here.

Incentives, particularly 45Q and LCFS, play a key role in the cost effectiveness of CCS. The impact of these incentives is shown in Figure 34, which compares the cost of abatement under three scenarios: 1) standard incentive assumptions (used to produce Figure 27), 2) extending 45Q applicability from 2032 to 2045, and 3) turning off 45Q and LCFS entirely. In Figure 33, CCS penetration rates were set equal to those in the DECAL Version CARB Proposed Scenario, as those rates are reasonable guideposts as to how fast a particular

subsector could move under aggressive decarbonization assumptions¹². In some cases, such as refineries/SMRs, all CCS plants are installed prior to 2032, obviating the extension scenario. In other cases, such as upstream O&G, some CCS plants are installed after 2032, making the impact of a 45Q extension more material. In reality, penetration rates are highly uncertain, and the 45Q extension scenario is presented as a way to handle that uncertainty.

‘Standard’ and/or ‘extended’ scenarios can be compared to the ‘off’ scenarios to demonstrate the impact of 45Q and LCFS. It should be noted that LCFS only applies to subsectors that develop transportation fuels (refining/H2 SMRs and upstream O&G). In these subsectors, 45Q and LCFS can reduce the cost of abatement by over \$100/t, shifting CCS from a net-cost to a net-benefit. Cement and large manufacturing plants only apply for 45Q, but still the incentive makes CCS much more attractive. Small manufacturing plants are assumed not to qualify for 45Q’s emission thresholds, making this the most expensive subsector to implement CCS.

Overall, incentives such as 45Q and LCFS play a key role in enabling CCS, which is a promising option in a difficult-to-abate sector. In addition, there may be some rationale for extending the 45Q incentive to give more time to subsectors that may not be able to move as quickly.




Figure 34: Abatement cost of CCS with and without incentives.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?
CCS (and related incentives) while research continues in this sector

¹² Note that the DECAL Version CARB Proposed Scenario does not use CCS in all industrial subsectors. However, for this analysis, CCS is deployed at the same rate and penetration as the alternative technology (e.g., electric resistance heating) is deployed in DECAL Version CARB Proposed Scenario.

Chapter 9: F-gas Mitigation

Questions that this section will address:

- *What is the impact of F-gases?*
 - *What is the effect of EOL versus annual F-gas policies?*
-

F-gas emissions predominantly come from refrigerants. Refrigerants are some of the most potent global warmers, with GWPs often as high as 2000 tCO₂e/t. Today, refrigerants are mainly used in air conditioners and refrigerators. However, heat pumps – which are likely to be an important electrification option in the buildings sector – also use refrigerants. As the economy turns to heat pumps to satisfy space and water heating needs, it will be essential to develop technologies and policies to effectively mitigate F-gas emissions.

Refrigerants can leak during unit operation and when the unit is retired. In fact, CARB's High GWP Emissions Inventory study [51] suggests that EOL emissions can be quite high for residential technologies, implying that technicians often vent refrigerants during the retirement process. The assumed annual and EOL leak rates for California's 5 largest F-Gas emitters are shown in Table 10. Collectively the 5 technologies shown in Table 10 produced ~80% of the California economy's F-gas emissions in 2015 [51].

Technology	Contribution	Annual Leak Rate	EOL Leak Rate
Residential Central AC	32%	10%	80%
Commercial Central AC (small sized)	22%	10%	56%
Commercial Refrigeration (central, medium sized)	14%	18%	20%
Commercial Refrigeration (unitary, small sized)	7%	15%	34%
Commercial Refrigeration (unitary, medium sized)	7%	15%	20%

Table 10: Annual and EOL leak rates from CARB [51].

Efforts to produce air conditioners, refrigerators, and heat pumps that use low GWP refrigerants at scale are currently ongoing. Suitable gases may include CO₂ and propane, though the physical properties of these gases make the refrigeration process somewhat more difficult and expensive. SB 1013 established the Fluorinated Gases Emission Reduction Incentive Program which promotes *voluntary* adoption of low-GWP refrigerant technologies [18]. In addition, the AIM Act directs the EPA to phase down the production and consumption of HFCs in the US by 85 percent over the next 15 years [19]. For these reasons, low GWP refrigerants are assumed to be available in CARB's Reference Case, and thus by default in many of the scenarios used in the Scoping Plan. Given the current availability of low GWP refrigerants, it is important to examine CARB's assumptions surrounding F-gases and assess risk.

To do so, the DECAL version of the CARB Proposed scenario was run with four modifications: 1) no F-Gas measures are implemented, 2) EOL venting rates are linearly reduced to zero by 2045, 3) low GWP refrigerants are implemented in the same manner as in the CARB Reference Case and Proposed Scenario, and 4) both measures (reduce EOL venting rate

and adopt low GWP refrigerant) are implemented. Results are shown in Figure 35, which shows F-gas emissions over time for the four scenarios.




Figure 35: Emissions over time in several F-gas mitigation scenarios.




Figure 36: Marginal cumulative emissions in several F-gas mitigation scenarios.

The midnight blue (almost black) line illustrates the potential F-gas emissions if no mitigation actions are taken and shows a potential net increase in F-gas emissions over time due to heat pump installations. The green line shows that just by reducing EOL leak rates – a lever that is readily available in the near term – the state can keep F-Gas emissions relatively constant despite installing millions of heat pumps. However, deep reductions will ultimately require low GWP refrigerants, as shown in the blue lines. On a cumulative emissions basis, the black line results in an additional 300 Mt of CO₂e compared to the ‘Reduce GWP scenario’ (same as DECAL Version of the CARB Proposed Scenario), whereas the light blue line results in 50 Mt lower CO₂e, as illustrated in Figure 36. Given that the DECAL Version of the CARB Proposed Scenario mitigates 3,135 Mt of emissions over the whole modeling period, F-Gas measures can swing cumulative emission savings by -10% to +2%.

Overall, F-Gas emissions are a significant portion of present-day emissions and are particularly important to address given anticipated heat pump installations. Responsible EOL management is an available strategy for managing F-Gas emissions, but continued development of low GWP refrigerants will be needed to drive this sector to near net-zero.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?

Low GWP refrigerants and refrigerant emissions management

Chapter 10: Model Insights for The Buildings Sector

Questions that this section will address:

- *What is the effect of changing the rate of electrification in the buildings sector?*
 - *What are the costs, emissions, and resource implications of using heat pump versus electric resistance heating?*
-

The primary method for decarbonizing the buildings sector (residential and commercial) is electrification of gas appliances, mainly space and water heating and to a lesser extent stoves, ovens, and clothes dryers. Current building electrification policies are generally aimed at new homes and large retrofits only. CARB is in the process of defining zero-emissions standards for new sales of gas heaters, furnaces, and water heaters, with a likely implementation date of 2030. In addition, there is growing momentum at the local level to decarbonize buildings, though in some cases this has been met with resistance¹³ suggesting legislation may be required.

To assess the impact of a faster (earlier) and slower (later) 100% electric appliance adoption, four scenarios were set up in DECAL, reaching a 100% electric appliance sales goal by 2025, 2035, 2045, and 2055 (with linear interpolation between). A fifth scenario was added to reflect current policies aimed at new homes only. Electricity and hydrogen production were also simultaneously cleaned¹⁴. The results are shown in Figure 37 and Figure 38, which respectively show emissions over time and an annual emissions snapshot by subsector.

Figure 37 and Figure 38 demonstrate that existing policies aimed at new homes only will not have much impact on building emissions; this is because most California homes that will exist by 2045 already exist today [21]. The 2055 overshoot scenario still results in significant progress, but any leftover 2045 building emissions would need to be handled via CDR. At the other end of the spectrum, 100% clean sales by 2025 brings the sector to near zero, but not quite zero. The conclusions here are the same as in Chapter 7 (Transportation): 1) it is important to make steady progress towards aggressive sales goals, and 2) due to stock-and-flow lagging effects, how fast California moves has a direct impact on the amount of CDR needed by 2045 (assuming that net-zero by 2045 is binding).

¹³ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2024/apr/09/berkeley-natural-gas-ban-lawsuit-repeal?>

¹⁴ CGC of 97% by 2045, existing SMRs receive CCS retrofits, new hydrogen plants consist of a mixture of Gasification with CCS (35%) and electrolysis (65%) (same assumptions used in CARB Proposed Scenario).




Figure 37: Emissions over time, varying the date in which 100% heat pump sales is reached.




Figure 38: Annual emissions, varying the date in which 100% heat pump sales is reached.

Additionally, much like the transportation sector, the rate at which NG appliances are electrified has a significant impact on cumulative emissions, as shown in Figure 39.




Figure 39: Marginal cumulative emissions, varying the date in which 100% heat pump sales is reached.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?

Ambitious electric appliance sales targets and deployment

Heat Pumps versus Electric Resistance Appliances

Electrification of space heating can be done with either electric resistance appliances (including centralized forced-air electric furnaces as well as electric wall and baseboard heaters) or heat pumps. Electric resistance heaters are inexpensive to purchase and install. Heat pumps can achieve up to 200%-350% coefficient of performance¹⁵ (by transferring heat between the building and the outside air or ground), significantly reducing electric load compared to resistance heating. Heat pumps can also dehumidify better than typical central air conditioners and replace the need for a separate air conditioning unit. Heat pump water heaters are also an alternative to electric water heaters in much the same way.

Using DECAL, it is possible to compare a scenario in which building electrification occurs via space and water heat pumps to a scenario in which electrification occurs via electric resistance appliances. Results can be seen below in Figure 40 and Figure 41.

As can be seen in Figure 40, heat pumps have higher upfront cost and significantly lower electricity costs, whereas electric resistance heaters have lower upfront cost yet much higher electricity costs, resulting in a more expensive choice over time. On a capacity basis

¹⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coefficient_of_performance

(as opposed to a cost-basis), the electric resistance scenario requires about 40 additional GW of electric capacity added compared to the heat pump scenario. Overall, these results suggest that heat pumps are a more effective option for the state, with electric resistance heaters playing a smaller role wherever the upfront cost of heat pumps is prohibitive.




Figure 40: Cost by subsector for heat pumps and electric resistance heaters. Blue dot is the net of the spending and cost savings

The same two scenarios were also run while iterating on two background assumptions: 1) a ‘clean grid’ vs ‘dirty grid’, and 2) ‘clean F-Gases’ vs ‘dirty F-Gases’. In this analysis, a ‘clean grid’ assumes the same CGC as in the DECAL Version of the CARB Proposed scenario (97% by 2045), while a ‘dirty grid’ assumes the same CGC as in the DECAL Version of the CARB Reference scenario (82.5% by 2045). Similarly, ‘clean F-Gases’ assumes the same refrigerant assumptions as in the DECAL Version of the CARB Proposed scenario (roughly 85% reduction), whereas ‘dirty F-Gases’ assumes refrigerant GWPs remain unchanged from the start year. Results are shown in Figure 41, which shows 2045 abated emissions in the four cases. For example, the left side of the first blue bar shows abated emissions assuming heat pumps are used with a ‘dirty grid’ (and ‘clean F-Gases’), and the right side of the first blue bar shows abated emissions assuming heat pumps are used with a ‘clean grid’ (and ‘clean F-Gases’); the width of the first blue bar thus shows the synergy of heat pumps with the cleanliness of the grid.




Figure 41: Mitigated emissions by scenario for heat pumps and electric resistance heaters.

Figure 41 shows that electric resistance heaters pose greater risk in case of a dirtier grid; this is because electric resistance heaters are far less efficient than heat pumps. Figure 41 also shows that heat pumps pose greater risk in case of dirtier F-Gases; this is because heat pumps use F-Gases whereas electric resistance heaters do not.

The synergy of heat pumps with F-Gases is particularly interesting. As previously mentioned, heat pumps serve both heating and cooling needs, and thus for every heat pump that is installed to replace a NG Furnace, a central air conditioning unit is additionally scrapped (if available). DECAL begins with roughly 10 million residential NG furnaces and 8 million residential central air conditioners. Thus, at the start of the modeling period, there are roughly 8 million residential devices that use F-gases (all air conditioners), and by the end, there are roughly 10 million residential devices that use F-gases (all heat pumps). If it were not for scrapping, there would instead be roughly 18 million residential devices that use F-gases, which would have a substantial impact on F-gas emissions. In this way, the dual-purpose nature of heat pumps significantly reduces the risk they pose to *adding* F-gases into circulation. This does not mean F-gases are unimportant. As discussed in Chapter 9, F-gases already account for roughly 27 Mt CO₂e; it just means that in the absence of F-gas measures, heat pumps stand to increase F-gas emissions by roughly 3 Mt CO₂e rather than 10+ Mt.

Overall, heat pumps and electric resistance heaters pose different pros and cons to the state and to end users.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?

Both heat pumps and electric resistance heaters, though heat pumps are overall more effective

Chapter 11: Model Insights for Alternative Fuels

Questions that this section will address:

- *What role can hydrogen play to decarbonize California and what is the impact of different generation methods on cost?*
 - *What role can renewable diesel play to decarbonize California?*
 - *What role can renewable natural gas play to decarbonize California?*
-

This chapter discusses the potential role of alternative fuels such as hydrogen, renewable diesel, and renewable natural gas. These fuel switch options are discussed in much more detail in [25] and [27]. In all cases, the volumes of these fossil fuel alternatives are currently limited, and careful planning will be needed to determine how and where to best utilize them most cost effectively.

Hydrogen

As of mid-2023, California produces around 1.83 Mt/yr of hydrogen. All of this capacity comes from SMR plants. Roughly 99% of this capacity is used for crude oil refining at the 14 refineries in-state, which are concentrated in the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles [27]. SMRs can be retrofit with carbon capture equipment which, with current incentives, appears to be a cost-effective emissions mitigation solution [52].

A number of scenarios were run in DECAL to assess potential volumes of hydrogen that could be utilized by each sector as well as the associated costs. The results are shown in Figure 42. Each bar on the chart (except for the top 3 bars) represents a single scenario in which hydrogen was used as an alternative fuel in the sector (wherever applicable) at the indicated percentage, the balance set to electricity. For example:

- LDVs: 80% means that 80% of LDV ZEV sales are FCEV and 20% are BEV
- HDVs: 20% means that 20% of HDV ZEV sales are FCEV and 80% are BEV
- Industry: 60% implies 60% fuel switching to H₂, 40% to electricity

In each scenario the sales/adoption rate is the same as the CARB Proposed Scenario, the only change is to technology choice. Hydrogen usage increases and electricity usage decreases moving up the chart, whereas hydrogen usage decreases and electricity usage increases moving down the chart. Results are shown in Figure 42 and Figure 43, which show 2045 hydrogen usage and the cost of abatement of each scenario, respectively.

Figure 42 is essentially a lookup table that can provide helpful ‘guideposts’ for planning. For example, if hydrogen were to be used exclusively in the HDV subsector, a H₂ sales fraction of about 40% would result in roughly the same amount of hydrogen demand as can be generated with existing hydrogen generation capacity. As another example, if hydrogen were to be used exclusively in Industry, fuel switching 60%-80% of plants to hydrogen heating would result in roughly the same amount of hydrogen usage as suggested by the DECAL Version of the CARB Proposed Scenario. As hydrogen is a limited resource, these sorts of exercises could be used to help guide planning.




Figure 42: 2045 hydrogen usage for 18 scenarios.

Figure 43 demonstrates that abatement costs increase as hydrogen usage increases (going up the plot), or equivalently, abatement costs decrease as electricity usage increases (going down the plot)¹⁶. As has been cited multiple times throughout this report, hydrogen is relatively expensive, largely due to assumed D&S costs¹⁷. For this reason, energy usage alone (Figure 42) should not be used alone for planning – policymakers should additionally take cost into account when planning. Figure 43 also suggests that HDVs may be the most cost-effective sub-sector to use hydrogen.

DECAL was also used to assess the cost effectiveness of new hydrogen plants (new meaning, in addition to existing SMRs). To do so, a high hydrogen scenario was created, in which technology fractions were set to 60%, 40%, and 20% respectively for HDVs, Industry, and LDVs. This scenario was run while iterating on 11 hydrogen generation options. For both SMRs and ATR, four arrangements were tested: the base technology on its own, with CCS, with RNG, and with both CCS and RNG. Gasification with and without CCS was additionally tested, along with Electrolysis. Results are shown in Figure 44, which shows marginal spending compared to the DECAL Version of the CARB Reference Case. The figure illustrates that hydrogen generation (dark purple bar) is not the driving cost in high hydrogen pathways. Rather, the cost of FCEVs (brown) and hydrogen distribution and storage (D&S, cherry color) are much more significant. The Electrolysis scenario is the most expensive, largely due to higher electricity T&D costs in that scenario. Overall, the marginal costs associated with

¹⁶ Figures 13, 43, and 55 are relatively consistent, if the technology fractions of LDVs and HDVs are considered. Interestingly, both Figures 43 and 55 show that HDV BEVs have a negative cost of abatement – this is because in this case, incentives and resource/refinery savings outweigh the costs of HDV BEVs and electricity generation.

¹⁷ With the exception of refineries, DECAL assumes that hydrogen is created centrally and distributed, rather than created onsite.

these different hydrogen generation pathways are quite similar, illustrating that how the hydrogen is made is less important than the decision of whether or not to use hydrogen in the first place.




Figure 43: Cost of abatement for 18 scenarios.




Figure 44: Costs by sector for several hydrogen generators in a high hydrogen scenario. Using electrolysis as an example, there are 7 items that have a positive impact on marginal cost compared to the DECAL version of the Reference Case: refueling stations, electricity generation, electricity T&D, hydrogen D&S, hydrogen generation, the cost of hydrogen heaters (industry), and the cost of hydrogen vehicles (transportation). There are 3 items that bring down the marginal costs: incentives, reduced oil and gas operations, and reduced imports of fossil fuels (resources). The blue dot is the total cost, the sum of the subcategories.

Renewable Natural Gas

RNG is chemically equivalent to fossil-sourced natural gas and can be mixed into any natural gas stream. Decarbonizing the natural gas supply with RNG is therefore an effective way to accommodate for stock and flow lag effects (e.g., reduce emissions in buildings that have not yet converted to electric appliances), and can be helpful in subsectors that are hard to electrify (e.g., cement).

Similar to prior analyses done for hydrogen, DECAL can be used to create helpful guideposts for feasibility of RNG substitution. To do so, economy-wide blend percentages were set to 5%, 10%, 20%, 40%, 60%, 80, and 100% in both the DECAL version of the CARB Reference Case and the DECAL version of the CARB Proposed Scenario. Note that in these scenarios, RNG is used mainly in Demand sectors, and is explicitly not used in the electricity and hydrogen sectors. Results are shown in Figure 45, which shows RNG usage over time in the two cases. Figure 45 additionally includes two resource proxies: the in-state capacity of RNG [25]¹⁸, and NREL's projected US capacity for RNG [53]. Capacity projections like these are highly uncertain but can be useful guideposts to aid feasibility assessment. Grey contour lines show RNG demand over time using different blends of RNG in the NG system.

The plots show that both the Reference Case and Proposed Scenario stay within in-state capacity. In the Reference Case, RNG blends should not exceed ~10% to stay within in-state production capacity, and should not exceed roughly 30% to stay within the US potential for RNG. Due to aggressive electrification in the DECAL Version of the CARB Proposed Scenario, higher RNG blend fractions can be reached in the Proposed Scenario while using less RNG. In particular, a blend of 60% can be achieved by 2045 while staying within in-state production, and even a blend of 100% would not exceed the US potential for RNG. It is worth mentioning, however, that these results change substantially if RNG is used in the electricity sector and to make hydrogen (see Figure 46). Overall, RNG can be a useful plug-and-play resource to mitigate leftover or hard to decarbonize emissions in 2045. However, policymakers will need to carefully consider resource constraints, rising global demand, and ongoing decarbonization efforts when making plans for RNG.

¹⁸ Note that [25] assumes that food waste is diverted to compost as part of SB 1383 (reducing RNG capacity), whereas DECAL assumes that food waste can instead be diverted to anaerobic digesters.




Figure 45: RNG demand over time. DECAL version of CARB Reference Case (top) and Proposed Scenario (bottom) compared to estimated in-state production [25] and US potential for RNG [53]. Grey contour lines show RNG demand over time using different blends of RNG in the NG system.




Figure 46: RNG demand over time. DECAL version of CARB Reference Case (top) and Proposed Scenario (bottom), adjusted to allow RNG in electricity and hydrogen sectors. The scenarios are again compared to estimated in-state production [25] and US potential for RNG [53]. Grey contour lines show RNG demand over time using different blends of RNG in the NG system, with RNG allowed in the electricity sector and to make hydrogen.

Renewable Diesel

Renewable diesel (RD) is a fuel made from fats and oils (e.g., soybean oil, cottonseed oil, canola oil, corn oil); recycled cooking greases or oils; animal fats (beef tallow, pork lard); or various combinations of these feedstock types and is processed to be chemically the same as petroleum diesel. Decarbonizing the diesel supply with RD is therefore an effective way to reduce emissions in cases where diesel vehicles are still on the road by 2045.

Since a limited volume of these materials is available locally, much of the feedstock volume necessary to satisfy the demand is sourced elsewhere in the world and transported to California.

A very similar set of analyses done for RNG was also done for RD. Economy-wide blend percentages were set to 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100% from both the DECAL version of the CARB Reference Case and the DECAL version of the CARB Proposed Scenario. Results are shown in Figure 47, which shows RD usage over time in the two cases. Figure 47 additionally includes a resource proxy - the current global demand for RD [54]. RD capacity projections (in-state, nationwide, etc.) are sparse in literature, but the current state of global demand still provides a helpful order-of-magnitude comparison. Interestingly, California already accounts for a large fraction of global demand, in large part due to the LCFS program.




Figure 47: RD demand over time. DECAL version of CARB Reference Case (top) and Proposed Scenario (bottom) compared to estimated present-day global demand for RD [55]. Grey contour lines show RD demand over time using different blends of RD in the diesel system.

Due to aggressive electrification in the DECAL Version of the CARB Proposed Scenario, higher RD blend fractions can be reached in the Proposed Scenario compared to the Reference Case while using less RD than is being used now. In fact, given deep electrification, RD could eventually replace fossil diesel entirely (near 100% blend) while about doubling current California demand for renewable diesel. As electrification and decarbonization proceed, policymakers should consider analyses like these to estimate the extent to which RD substitution could be used in California given potential limits on global feedstocks.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?
Careful planning of hydrogen, RNG, and RD

Chapter 12: Model insights for Carbon Dioxide Removal

Question that this section will address:

- *What is the minimum amount of CDR/DAC required while still meeting a net-zero goal?*
 - *How much electric load will CDR/DAC add to the grid?*
-

The Proposed Scenario in the 2022 CARB Scoping Plan relies on 75 Mt of CDR to reach net-zero by 2045. CDR encompasses a suite of technologies including DAC with carbon storage, biomass carbon removal with carbon storage (BiCRS, also known as bioenergy with CCS, or BECCS), contributions from natural and working lands (NWL), and other technologies. The contributions assumed by CARB from DAC, BiCRS, and NWLs are listed in Table 11.

CDR technology	CO ₂ emissions mitigated in 2045 (Mt)
DAC	64.4
BiCRS	9.1
NWL	1.5
Total	75

Table 11: 2045 mitigated emissions by CDR technology in CARB's Scoping Plan.

There are currently 18 DAC plants operating globally (mainly serving the carbonated beverages industry) capturing 0.01 Mt of CO₂ per year. A 1 Mt/yr plant is in advanced development in TX, and 11 more large scale plants are in early development. The International Energy Agency [56] forecasts that there will be 5.5 Mt/yr of DAC onstream globally by 2030. The 2022 Scoping Plan requires 2.3 Mt of DAC in 2030. Clearly, DAC development and deployment will need to scale significantly if California is to achieve its carbon neutrality goals. Additional research funding to find ways to reduce the cost and energy requirements of DAC will be essential. DAC requires significant energy inputs to power the system, and those energy requirements (and associated emissions) are also captured by DECAL.

The future development and deployment of BiCRS technology is also quite uncertain. The BiCRS term was introduced in 2021 and refers to technologies that use plants and algae to remove CO₂ from the atmosphere and store it geologically or in long-lived products [57]. It is estimated that there is 2.5 Mt/yr carbon removal via BiCRS today (globally), with perhaps up to 25 Mt/yr associated with projects in planning and development [57]. A recent Lawrence Livermore National Lab report suggests that there is more than enough waste biomass in the State and by 2045 it would be possible to remove significantly more than the Scoping Plan requires [58].

Finally, emissions from NWL are not included in CARB's annual GHG inventory [36]. The CARB 2022 SP assumes a net 1.5 Mt contribution from NWL in 2045. For simplification purposes, we have lumped NWL and DAC contributions in DECAL.

To assess the minimum DAC needed while reaching net-zero by 2045, a minimal DAC scenario was developed. The main levers that were adjusted for this scenario are listed in

Table 12 and the results are shown in Figure 48, which shows emissions by subsector over time for both scenarios.

	DECAL version of CARB Proposed Scenario	Minimum DAC Scenario
Electricity	• 97% clean generation by 2045 • NGCCS is 90% clean • RNG is not used in the electricity sector	• 99% clean generation by 2045 • NGCCS is 98% clean • The electricity sector reaches the same RNG blend as the rest of the economy, 30% by 2045
Transportation	• 100% LDV sales ZEV by 2035 • 100% HDV sales ZEV between 2035-2040 • 100%/50%/25% reduction in emissions from planes/trains/boats	• 100% LDV sales ZEV by 2030 • 100% HDV sales ZEV by 2030-2035 • 100%/80%/55% reduction in emissions from planes/trains/boats
Buildings	• 100% clean sales by 2035/2045 Residential/Commercial	• 100% clean sales by 2030
Industry	• 90% CCS capture rate • 65% deployment of CCS in refining subsector • 50% electrification of “Industry Other” • 0% deployment in remaining landfill capture, fugitive sealants, and waste mitigation strategies •	• 98% CCS capture rate • 100% deployment of CCS in refining subsector • 100% electrification of “Industry Other” • 30% deployment in remaining landfill capture, fugitive sealants, and waste mitigation strategies
Hydrogen Production	• RNG is not used to make hydrogen • New hydrogen production consists of 35% Gasification with CCS and 65% Electrolysis.	• Hydrogen SMRs reach the same RNG blend as the rest of the economy, 30% by 2045 • New hydrogen production consists of 65% Gasification with CCS and 35% Electrolysis
Agriculture	• Seaweed: 50% eligibility, 30% reduction in emissions • 0% deployment of low emitting fertilizers •	• Seaweed: 85% eligibility, 60% reduction in emissions • 30% deployment of low emitting fertilizers
Refrigerants	• Approximately 85% reduction in refrigerant GWP by 2050	• Approximately 85% reduction in refrigerant GWP by 2045
CDR	• 67 Mt DAC in 2045 / 8 Mt BECCS in 2045	• 15 Mt of DAC in 2045 / 31 Mt BECCS in 2045

Table 12: Changes made to CARB Proposed Scenario to develop a 'minimal DAC' scenario.




Figure 48: Emissions by sector in the DECAL version of the CARB Proposed Scenario (top) and the minimum DAC scenario (bottom).

Overall, DAC capture rates are reduced by about 50 Mt/yr in the Minimal DAC scenario. While the difference between 67 Mt/yr and 15 Mt/yr of DAC is significant, in either case, DAC will be needed at scale. Furthermore, reducing reliance on DAC required pushing other decarbonization options beyond what were already aggressive assumptions in the DECAL Version CARB Proposed scenario. A large portion of the difference comes from using BECCS in leu of DAC, with BECCS capture increasing from 8 Mt/yr to 31 Mt/yr. For this reason, total CDR capture (combination of DAC and BECCS) is only reduced from 75 Mt/yr to 46 Mt/yr (equivalently stated, direct emissions are reduced by 29 Mt/yr CO2e). While BECCS could be an important strategy for the state, it may be limited by resource constraints. For example, the Minimal DAC scenario utilizes 332 PJ/yr of RNG, 4.4 fold more than the DECAL Version CARB Proposed scenario. For reference, NREL estimates that the entire annual US potential for RNG is only ~455 PJ/yr [53], thus under this scenario California would consume a large

portion of RNG that could potentially be produced in the U.S. The scenarios demonstrate just how difficult reaching net-zero will be without large-scale DAC.

Figure 49 shows where these leftover emissions come from. Some emission sources are left unchanged in the DECAL Version CARB Proposed scenario but are gradually reduced in the Minimal DAC scenario, including leftover landfill gas, fertilizers, and emissions from wastewater and composting. A large portion of remaining emissions comes from LDVs, HDVs, and Buildings, ultimately due to stock-and-flow lag effects. Industrial emissions derive from various dispersed plants and fugitive emissions (from leaking natural gas compressors and tanks), whereas Refining emissions are a result of CCS only being applied at certain refinery units (fluidized catalytic cracker, SMRs, CHPs). Enteric fermentation emissions remain due to only a portion of cattle operations adopting seaweed feed augments, and because seaweed emission reduction factors are assumed to be less than one. Similarly, refrigerant emissions remain because it is assumed refrigerants see an 85% (not a 100%) reduction in GWP by ~2045. Some highly dispersed (each less than 1 Mt/yr CO₂e) Non-Energy sources are left untouched in both scenarios, mostly in the Agricultural sector (sources include residue burning, crop residue, liming, histosol cultivation, and rice cultivation), and in other sectors as well (sources include aerosols, foams, fire protection, and solvents). Overall, despite highly aggressive assumptions, small emission sources remain throughout the economy, demonstrating the unforgiving nature of reaching net-zero emissions. It is fair to say that either the state will need even more aggressive technology adoption in these hard-to-abate subsectors, or otherwise it will need large-scale CDR to compensate.




Figure 49: 2045 Annual emissions in the DECAL version of the CARB Proposed Scenario compared to the minimal CDR scenario. Blue dot is the net of the positive and negative emissions.

Indeed, it is difficult to imagine a net-zero world in the mid-to-near term without CDR playing a major role. Realistically, less CDR could be more readily achieved by extending the net-zero timeline, or by utilizing offsets in other states and countries.

It is worth noting that DAC requires electricity to operate, and the amount of DAC required will have a large impact on the future electric load. Figure 50 shows 2045 electric load by sector in DECAL’s start year, by 2045 in DECAL’s version of the CARB Reference Case, and by 2045 in DECAL’s version of the CARB Proposed scenario. While buildings are and will remain the largest sectoral electric load, DAC will have a growing impact as well.




Figure 50: Load by sector today and in the Reference Case and Proposed Scenario.

Conclusion: What is it going to take to reach net-zero by 2045?
Significant volumes of CDR

Chapter 13: Economic Sensitivity Analysis

As mentioned in Chapter 2, cost estimates are among the most uncertain data entries in DECAL, especially cost projections into the future. It is difficult to predict the dollar per tonne abatement cost of particular technologies, especially those currently at pilot or research phase. That said, DECAL can be used more conservatively to show which technologies are cost drivers – i.e, technologies that would have a significant impact on system-wide costs, should their costs change. To do so, an economic sensitivity analysis was run from the DECAL Version CARB Proposed scenario, in which the cost of each technology (one at a time) is reduced by 1% in the start year (and remains that way over the entire modeling period), with the overall impact on economy-wide costs being measured. The experiment is also repeated with the cost of fuels and incentives, to show how the degree to which these macroeconomic factors drive overall costs.

The sensitivity analysis shown here is analogous to taking several partial derivatives of cost. The analysis does not consider how likely it is for the cost of a particular technology, fuel, or incentive to actually change by a given percentage (here, 1%). This could be done, for example, by defining a reasonable range for low and high cost for each technology, fuel, and incentive and then iterating between these states. However, it is difficult and fraught to define ranges like these, and so we rather leave the task to the reader to mentally interpolate how likely any given 1% change might be.

Results are shown in Figure 51 below. In the figure, a negative value means overall costs decline due to the 1% decrease in cost, whereas a positive value indicates overall costs increase due to the 1% decrease in cost¹⁹. The figure is color coded to distinguish between technologies whose costs were estimated in a bottom-up fashion versus via a top-down abatement cost (\$500/t), as well as separate colors for incentives and fuels.

From Figure 51, we learn that cost changes to electricity T&D, crude oil, and LDV BEVs have by the largest impact on overall system-wide costs. Other technologies that drive cost include DAC, HDV BEVs, solar power plants, and heat pumps. One takeaway from the plot is that innovation and cost declines are most fruitful for these technologies. The price of natural gas, renewable diesel, diesel, and gasoline are also important drivers of cost – another view of the plot is that overall system-wide costs are driven in large part due to fuel prices, which can fluctuate greatly. Cap & trade and LCFS are the most impactful incentives amongst those considered here. The figure also demonstrates that top-down abatement costs (assumed \$500/t) have a small role in defining overall system-wide costs.

¹⁹ For example, overall costs increase when the price of incentives decline. Diesel and Gasoline become major exports in the decarbonization scenario, hence a cost decline in these fuels increases cost (the state sells at a lower price).




Figure 51: Economic sensitivity analysis for many technologies, fuels, and incentives in DECAL. The plot shows the impact of a 1% cost decline (for a single line item only) on overall system-wide costs (in units of NPV Billion USD). Marginal costs go up for diesel and gasoline because at the end of the modeling period excess product is created. Thus, if we reduce the costs, less money is received for the exports

Chapter 14: Action Items

The findings of this study have been consolidated into a tangible list of action items, both in terms of research and development and policy opportunities.

Areas that would benefit from additional research and development include:

- **CDR:** R&D is needed to reduce the cost and parasitic load for DAC technologies. CDR is the largest single contributor to 2045 abated emissions in the CARB Proposed Scenario despite being amongst the highest cost. DAC also becomes a very large user of electricity by 2045 in the DECAL Version of the CARB Proposed Scenario.
- **F-Gas emissions management:** Low GWP refrigerants will be needed at scale to achieve deep reductions in this sector.
- **Biofuel feedstocks:** Identifying new RNG and RD feedstocks could help these fuels play a larger role, easing the burden on electrification.
- **Hydrogen Costs:** Hydrogen is expensive, driven by high end-use (e.g., fuel cell vehicles), and D&S costs. R&D to reduce these costs could allow hydrogen to play a larger role in decarbonization. Additionally, distributed H₂ generation using electricity should be investigated as a possible way to reduce H₂ D&S costs.
- **Battery costs:** In this study, LDV decarbonization is one of the largest contributors to emissions reductions. Although costs of BEVs are already coming down, additional reductions would have a substantial impact on statewide costs. In addition, all electrification scenarios explored here necessitated a significant amount of grid-scale Li ion storage. Overall, reducing the cost of batteries and identification of other low-cost battery chemistries will be crucial for a cost-effective transition.

Areas that could be explored for policy interventions include:

- **Electric home appliances:** Most homes that will exist by 2045 already exist today; as such, existing policies aimed at new homes are not sufficient – more rapid deployment of electric appliances are needed for existing homes as well.
- **Grid emissions requirements:** Current regulations require a 100% carbon-free grid by 2045. This study shows that a CGC of 99% reduces overbuilding while having a negligible impact on emissions. Clean baseload power sources such as NGCCS (90% capture) also reduce cost. An evaluation of this regulation is suggested.
- **45Q incentive:** While some subsectors may be able to install CCS retrofits in the nearer term (e.g., power plants, SMRs) other manufacturing subsectors (e.g., petrochemicals, food) may only be able to after 2032, when 45Q expires. This expiry date has been extended twice so far, and a case can be made that it should be extended even longer.
- **Permitting:** Climate change is an infrastructure problem. Given the speed and scale with which new infrastructure (electric generators, T&D, BEV charging, CDR, CCS, building appliances, and more) will be required, it is critical that the state find ways to eliminate red tape and streamline permitting activities.

Chapter 15: Conclusions

This chapter summarizes sector-by-sector conclusions that are made at the end of each subchapter, all aimed to answering the question “What is it going to take to get to net-zero emissions by 2045?”

Economy Wide

- A diversified portfolio of resources and technologies will be needed
- A few policies/technologies are key, though some have high costs

Electricity Sector

- The state must become proficient, timely, and responsive at permitting and building electric infrastructure
- A clean grid is key, but 100% clean may not be needed
- Clean dispatchable power reduces capacity requirements
- Demand response can be helpful but will not replace energy storage

Transportation Sector

- It is important to make steady progress towards ambitious ZEV sales goals
- BEVs are more cost effective than FCEVs

Industrial Sector

- CCS is an effective and relatively affordable option
- Incentives have a large impact on CCS technoeconomics

F-Gases

- EOL programs are helpful but not enough on their own to limit significant emissions of high GWP gases
- Innovative low-GWP refrigerants are needed at scale for deep reductions in refrigerant emissions

Buildings

- It is important to make steady progress towards ambitious electric appliance sales goals
- ER and HP have different tradeoffs, though HPs are overall more effective.
- California should consider new programs to accelerate retrofitting of existing residences.

Alternative fuels (Hydrogen, RNG, RD)

- Careful resource planning will be required, for instance, prioritizing hydrogen in more cost-effective areas (HDVs), or prioritizing RNG and RD in hard-to-decarbonize subsectors.
- Hydrogen is relatively expensive, with cost driven by end-use technologies (e.g. FCEV costs and hydrogen delivery and storage costs).
- RNG and RD will likely have limited feedstocks.

CDR

- Net-zero will be difficult to impossible without significant CDR and DAC.

Chapter 16: Future Work

There are many additional questions that can be addressed using DECAL directly (or with minor modifications) that were outside the scope of this study but would make for interesting and valuable future analysis. Some specific questions that could be considered in future studies include:

- What is the cost impact of delaying the net-zero target past 2045 or accelerating it to earlier than 2045?
- What is the impact of peaker and NGCC plant retirements?
- How much cheaper do FCEV's, hydrogen distribution and storage, and/or refueling stations need to be to achieve cost parity with BEVs, especially for HDVs?
- How would a state limit on CCS impact industrial emissions and statewide costs?
- Where should we act first – i.e., which geographic zone (buildings)?
- What are the emissions/cost implications of using excess solar capacity to make H₂, store it geologically, and then convert back to e- to meet later demand?
- Where (which subsectors) should alternative fuels be prioritized?
- What are the emissions associated with other pollutants (SO_x, NO_x, particulate matter) which can have a major impact on local health outcomes?

Additionally, the work done in this study helped identify additional opportunities that could and should be addressed in future modeling studies. Some of these ideas are listed below:

- **Equilibrium modeling:** DECAL is an entirely exogenous model, in that the user controls both cost and buildout. In a more sophisticated and realistic model, the user could specify costs and allow the model to respond to economic conditions.
- **Optimization modeling:** The work done here explores part of the vast problem space using storylines and logic, leading to helpful insights. Instead, nonlinear optimization could potentially be used to find “optimal” pathways.
- **Multiagent modeling (multiple perspectives):** DECAL only considers cost from the perspective of the state via the Total Resource Cost test. A more sophisticated model could simultaneously consider the cost to the state as well as to other agents, such as business owners and residents.
- **Risk-based modeling:** Systematically defining technology risks, and exploring scenarios according to said risks.
- **Higher model resolution:** The electricity sector currently uses one geographic node and assumes each day of the month is the same. Greater fidelity could allow better characterization of grid service issues that are not explored in this study.
- **Model Scope:** It may be useful to expand the model scope and consider impacts to neighboring states and countries, especially those that trade with California directly.
- **More Impacts:** This study only focuses on impacts to emissions, cost, and resources. More sophisticated models could examine other impacts, such as to criteria air pollution, soil pollution, water pollution, equity, and more.

- **Energy distribution infrastructure:** Energy distribution infrastructure – i.e., poles and wires for electricity and pipelines for gaseous products (NG, hydrogen, CO₂) – was handled in DECAL using top-down costs. These costs are significant, thus analysis that explicitly models these entities could be warranted.
- **More technologies:** DECAL considers a wide range of technologies, but further work could be done to explore up-and-coming technologies, for example, proposed high-grade industrial heating options, new electric storage technologies and battery chemistries, modular nuclear reactors and more. In addition, the impacts of energy efficiency measures, such as retrofits to buildings and industrial processes, are difficult to capture in DECAL, but are thought to be some of the most economically compelling.

Appendix A: Additional Emissions Comparisons

Additional emissions comparisons were made in the model start year, specifically between DECAL and the CARB Scoping Plan, as well as between DECAL and CARB's GHG Inventory. Agreement is reasonable in both cases (see Figure 52 and Figure 53).




Figure 52: 2018 emissions comparison between DECAL and the CARB Scoping Plan.




Figure 53: 2019 emissions comparison between DECAL and CARB's GHG Inventory [42].

Appendix B: Modeling Frameworks in LEAP

When selecting the last branch of a tree, LEAP offers several modeling framework options. Each of these frameworks varies in complexity, requires a different set of data inputs, and is governed by a different set of equations. That said, each framework follows the same basic calculation structure, shown below:

$$\text{Result}(t) = \text{Volume}(t) * \text{Rate}(t) \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

In equation 1, the *Result* is the variable of interest - typically, energy, emissions, or cost – at a particular end branch. The *Volume* is the number of relevant processes at the end branch, and the *Rate* is the degree to which said process produces/creates/accounts for the *Result*. Each of these variables may change as a function of time as the model progresses, in response to user-defined levers (see Chapter 2).

A basic example of Eq. 1 is as follows:

Energy Consumed By Residential Furnaces in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2025 =
*Number of Residential Furnaces in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2025 **
Energy Consumed Per Furnace in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2025 (Eq. 2).

To calculate emissions, an additional emission factor is added on:

Emission Produced By Residential Furnaces in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2025 =
*Number of Residential Furnaces in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2025 **
*Energy Consumed Per Furnace in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2025 **
NG Emissions Per Unit Energy (Eq. 3).

However, Eq. 3 is essentially another form of Eq. 1, if written as follows:

Emissions Produced By Residential Furnaces in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2025 =
*Number of Residential Furnaces in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2025 **
Emissions Produced Per Furnace in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2025 (Eq. 4)

Where,

Emissions Produced Per Furnace in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2025 =
*Energy Consumed Per Furnace in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2025 **
NG Emissions Per Unit Energy (Eq. 5).

As another example, for the cost of heat pumps, the equation essentially looks as follows:

Cost of Heat Pumps in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2032 =
*Number of Heat Pumps Sold in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2032 **
Cost Per Heat Pump in Old Dwellings in CZ1 in 2032 (Eq. 6)

In this way, Eq. 1 provides the basic rationale of LEAP calculations, which is that a variable of interest can be calculated using a volume and a rate. LEAP's modeling frameworks allow users to either add or subtract variables – and correspondingly add or subtract detail/complexity –into Eq. 1. This is a basic and powerful paradigm used by many models, bearing strong resemblance, for example, to the Kaya Identity [59].

Demand

Modeling frameworks used in DECAL's Demand Area are listed in Table 13.

Modeling Framework	Description
Top-down	This is the most basic modeling method, in which the <i>Volume</i> is the Number of California's – equal to 1 – and the <i>Rate</i> is the amount of energy/emissions produced per California's. In this way, the relevant amount of energy/emissions is essentially specified in a top-down fashion. This method is relevant for areas where bottom-up modeling could not be done, either due to data sparsity or bandwidth issues, but it is well-known that energy consumption/emissions production exists. Good examples are trains, planes, and boats, where energy consumption and emissions are tracked by CARB, but the team did not do a deep dive in these areas.
Technology With Energy Intensity	This is LEAP's standard modeling method. The <i>Volume</i> is entered in directly, or in some cases, it is helpful to break down <i>Volume</i> into an <i>Activity Level</i> and a <i>Percent Share</i> or <i>Saturation</i> . For example, to define the number of residential pool pumps in CZ1, we first define the number of homes in CZ1, and then the percentage of those homes that have pool pumps.
Stock and Flow	In this modeling method, LEAP asks users for the number of processes/devices in the start year, projected sales, the age distribution of the current fleet, and the statistical likelihood of retirement in each year, and then LEAP calculates the <i>Volume</i> over time endogenously. A major benefit of stock and flow is users can specify the sales variable, rather than the <i>Volume</i> directly, which is more reflective of real-life policy. Stock and flow also helps capture the effect of market resistance/lag time.
Transportation Stock and Flow	In addition to breaking down <i>Volume</i> as described in Stock and Flow, LEAP also breaks down <i>Rate</i> into <i>Vehicle Miles Traveled</i> and <i>Fuel Economy</i> .

Table 13: DECAL Modeling Frameworks, Demand Area.

Transformation

LEAP's Transformation area operates on the same basic principle described in Eq. 1, but with the added complexity that the Demand Area drives the Transformation Area. To reconcile this complexity, LEAP calculates the *Output Required* for a given process, and then calculates the amount of energy needed to meet that output. The *Output Required* for a given process is calculated based on fuel demand, imports/export adjustments, the stock of capacity, and the dispatch rule.

For example, say that 100 GJ/yr of gasoline are demanded in the Demand Area, there are 20 GJ/yr of export requirements, and there are two available processes, each capable of producing 70 GJ/yr of gasoline. Utilizing a user-selected dispatch rule, LEAP determines how to dispatch the 140 GJ/yr of capacity. For example, the user can tell LEAP to deploy all capacity, which would result in 100% capacity factors for both processes, but 20 GJ/yr of

excess exports (40 GJ/yr of exports in total). Or the user can tell LEAP to utilize process 1 completely, and then utilize process 2, resulting in 100% capacity factor of process 1, a ~70% capacity factor for process 2, and 0 excess exports (20 GJ/yr of exports total). Or the user can tell LEAP to dispatch both processes equally, resulting in ~85% capacity factors for both processes, and 0 excess exports (20 GJ/yr of exports total). Of course, many other configurations are possible. In the end, however, calculating the *Output Required* for each process allows us to think about Transformation processes in a similar manner to Eq. 1.

Once the *Output Required* for each process is known, LEAP can calculate feedstock requirements and auxiliary energy demand. Feedstock is the raw material needed in units of energy, for example, the amount of crude oil needed to produce a given amount of gasoline. Auxiliary fuel is the energy used in the process itself, for example, the amount of electricity used in the process of turning crude oil into gasoline. LEAP roughly calculates process-based and auxiliary energy demand as follows:

$$Feedstock(t) = \frac{Output\ Required(t)}{Process\ Efficiency(t)} \quad (Eq. 7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Auxiliary\ Fuel\ Demand(t) \\ = Output\ Required(t) * Auxiliary\ Energy\ Required\ Per\ Unit\ Output(t) \end{aligned} \quad (Eq. 8)$$

As previously mentioned, feedstock and auxiliary fuel demand create additional demand for Transformation processes lower in the tree. Emissions can be calculated by adding emission factors onto Auxiliary Fuel Demand, in a similar manner to Eq. 3 – 6 above. Cost is calculated by charging capital costs upon installing new capacity, as well as variable and fixed O&M costs for ongoing operations.

$$\begin{aligned} Cost(t) = Capacity\ Added(t) * Capital\ Price(t) + \\ Capacity(t) * Fixed\ OM\ Price(t) + \\ Output\ Required(t) * Variable\ OM\ Price(t) \end{aligned} \quad (Eq. 9)$$

Transformation calculations follow the same basic pattern shown in Eq. 1. In the case of Transformation calculations, the *Volume* is simply the *Output Required*, and the *Rate* is entered via $\frac{1}{Process\ Efficiency}$ as well as via *Auxiliary Energy Required Per Unit Output*. In the case of emissions, an emissions factor is added, which can easily be fit to the form of Eq. 1, as done in Eq. 3 – 6. In the case of cost, the *Volume* is the *Capacity Added*, *Capacity*, and *Output Required*, and the *Rate* is capital, fixed, and variable OM prices. One major difference between the Demand and Transformation areas is that in the Demand Area, *Volume's* are exogenous to the system (they are essentially entered by the user), whereas in the Transformation Area, *Volumes* are endogenous to the system (they are calculated internally). This is another way of saying that in LEAP, the Demand Area drives the Transformation Area.

As in the Demand area, LEAP has different modeling frameworks available in the Transformation area, which allow users to add or subtract complexity to the basic structure described above. In addition, the modeling frameworks differ in how they add new capacity into the system, and how they dispatch generators. Modeling frameworks used in DECAL's Transformation Area are listed in Table 14.

Modeling Framework	Description
Transmission & Distribution	This modeling framework only allows for one process, which must exactly meet demand without any export/import adjustments (<i>Output Required</i> comes directly from the Demand Area). The only relevant data-entry is the process efficiency, which is effectively used to increase the amount of energy required by later Transformation modules. For example, if 100 GJ/yr of electricity is demanded in the Demand Area, and T&D is 98% efficient, then the electricity sector will be required to produce ~102 GJ/yr of electricity. This framework has no concept of capacity, cost, or auxiliary fuel use (only Eq. 7 is relevant).
Cost Without Capacity	In this modeling framework, LEAP will always exactly meet demand plus exogenous import/export adjustments (0 excess imports/exports). There is no concept of capacity, and instead, users must tell LEAP the proportion of output that comes from each process (on a fractional basis) as a function of time. In DECAL, if there is more than one process, the process share is controlled with a lever. As there is no concept of capacity, all costing is baked into the Variable O&M price (Eq. 7 – 9 all apply, but Eq. 9 is abstracted).
Cost and Capacity	This is LEAP's standard modeling framework, unchanged from Eq. 7 – 9 above. With this framework, users instruct LEAP exactly how to add or subtract capacity, and how to dispatch. In DECAL, capacity additions and subtractions are mostly handled via user-defined levers, whereas the dispatch rule is hard coded. Note that controlling capacity in this way can lead to a mismatch in supply and demand, which will result in imports/exports.
Optimization	Optimization is fundamentally different than other modeling techniques in that the model is given information about generators and constraints, and then it decides how to build out capacity and dispatch plants. With other transformation modules, the user tells LEAP how to build out capacity and dispatch. The optimization model has perfect foresight (it can see all information for the whole modeling period in the start year), and then adds and deploys capacity so as to minimize cost subject to the following constraints: 1) the clean generation constraint ²⁰, 2) load shape constraints ²¹, 3) availability constraints ²², 4) maximum capacity constraints ²³, and 5) a planning reserve margin ²⁴. Once the optimization model has made its decisions, Eq. 7 – 9 still apply.

Table 14: DECAL Modeling Frameworks, Transformation Area.

²⁰ The Clean Generation Constraint defines the portion of electricity generation that must be created from “clean” sources; each resource is assigned a “clean qualified” fraction (e.g., 100% for renewables, 90% for NGCCS by default to match its carbon capture rate, etc.).

²¹ The timing of electricity demand is calculated in the demand area, which forms a constraint on electricity supply; fundamentally this is because electricity supply must always equal electricity demand.

²² This constraint accounts for the fact that renewables (solar, wind, hydro) are not always available on a diurnal and/or seasonal basis.

²³ This constraint accounts for the idea that some generators are limited by resource availability or political constraints, such as hydro, nuclear, and geothermal.

²⁴ The 17.5% planning reserve margin attempts to capture resilience and reliability constraints.

Non-Energy

The Non-Energy area has only one modeling framework, that is to enter top-down emissions and costs. The top-down emissions and costs can be made a function of other variables within DECAL, and thus are not necessarily hard-coded. We call the prior methodology Non-Energy Top-down – data that is truly hard coded – and the latter methodology Non-Energy Bottom-up – results that are a function of other variables within DECAL.

Disclaimers

Please note that the information provided here was intended only as an introduction to LEAP's internal mechanisms to provide a feel for how LEAP works, and overall aid understanding. While some detail/complexity was left out, LEAP's internal calculations do follow the basic principles outlined above. In the end, LEAP's internal calculations are not actually too complex – they stem from Eq. 1 and differ in how the *Volumes* and *Rates* are calculated. Additionally, please note that this discussion/explanation was somewhat catered to DECAL, in that some modeling configurations that are available in LEAP but not used in DECAL are not discussed. Finally, please note that some internal vocabulary was used to aid dialogue (for example, terms like *Volume*, *Rate*, *Output Required* would not be found in LEAP's documentation). For further details on how each modeling framework works, refer to LEAP's website (<https://leap.sei.org/>), help page (https://leap.sei.org/help/leap.htm#t=Demand%2FDemand_Properties_Wizard.htm), and online tutorials.

Appendix C: DECAL Raw Data Inputs

The table below is a guide for data sources which were used to populate DECAL. The excel workbooks loaded into LEAP can be found at this link: <https://sccc.stanford.edu/california-projects/pathways-carbon-neutrality-california>. These excel workbooks contain the raw data as well the data manipulations that were needed to prepare for entry into DECAL. Raw data sources are linked throughout the excel sheets and are also summarized in the table below.

Top Folder	Workbook	Data Contained in the Workbook	Major Raw Data Sources
Buildings	Residential.xlsx	- Number of existing homes - Projections for new homes - Percent saturation - Energy intensity - Electric load profiles - Vintage profiles - Survival profiles - Cost - Efficiency conversions - F Gases: Annual charge size, annual leak rate, EOL charge size, EOL leak rate, GWP	- US Census Bureau [60] [link] - California Department of Finance Population Projections [61] [link] 2019 Residential Appliance Saturation Study [62] [link] - California Energy Commission Energy Consumption Database [63] [link] - EIA Updated Buildings Sector Appliance and Equipment Cost and Efficiency [64] [link] - CARB's California's High Global Warming Potential Gases Emission Inventory, Technical Support Document, "HFC Emission Factors.xlsx" (made privately available) [65]
	8760 Load Shape Calc.xlsx 8760 normalized.xlsx 8760 to 288 Load.xlsx - Demand Response Water Heater.xlsx	Residential load profiles	NREL Commercial and Residential Hourly Load Profiles for all TMY3 Locations in the United States [66] [link]
	1 – Commercial Summary.xlsx	- Summary of workbooks in row below - Square footage - Commercial Other electricity & NG - Vintage profiles - Survival profiles - Cost - Efficiency conversions - F Gases: Annual charge size, annual leak rate, EOL charge size, EOL leak rate, GWP	- California Energy Commission Energy Consumption Database [63] [link] - EIA Updated Buildings Sector Appliance and Equipment Cost and Efficiency [64] [link] - CARB's California's High Global Warming Potential Gases Emission Inventory, Technical Support Document, "HFC Emission Factors.xlsx" (made privately available) [65]
	- College.xlsx - Food Store.xlsx - Health.xlsx - Large Office.xlsx	- Number of devices - Energy per device - Percent saturation (sf basis) - Energy per square-foot	2006 CEC Commercial End Use Survey (CEUS) [67] [link] - Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS) [68] [link]

	• Lodging.xlsx • Mix.xlsx • Refrigerated Warehouse.xlsx • Restaurants.xlsx • Retail.xlsx • School.xlsx • Small Office.xlsx • Unrefrigerated Warehouse.xlsx		• EIA Updated Buildings Sector Appliance and Equipment Cost and Efficiency [64] [link] • NREL Commercial and Residential Hourly Load Profiles for all TMY3 Locations in the United States [66] [link]
	• LADWP.xlsx • PGE.xlsx • SCE.xlsx • SDGE.xlsx • SMUD.xlsx	• Commercial load profiles	• NREL Commercial and Residential Hourly Load Profiles for all TMY3 Locations in the United States [66] [link]
	ResComm Panel and AdjFactors.xlsx	• Residential and commercial panel upgrade costs	• Various online sources (provided)
Electricity Generation	Electricity Generation.xlsx	• Installed capacities, minimum capacities, maximum capacities • Generator efficiencies • Costs (CAPEX, VOM, FOM, fuels) • Electricity imports • Availability shape • Top-down remaining electricity • Natural gas emission factor • Availability shapes	• Decarbonizing the Electricity Sector [24] [link] • California GHG Inventory [42] [link] • CEC 2019 Total System Electric Generation [69] [link] • CEC Electric Generation Capacity and Energy [70] [link]
	TD Electricity Costs.xlsx	• \$/MWh cost for T&D by economic sector	• Annual Electric Power Industry Report, Form EIA-861 detailed data files [71] [link]
	• 2019 Renewable Profiles CAISO.xlsx • 2020 Renewable Profiles CAISO.xlsx • 2021 Renewable Profiles CAISO.xlsx	• Availability shapes for current solar, wind, and hydro	• CAISO Supply [72] [link]
	Distributed PV and Storage.xlsx	• Behind-the-meter solar PV and Li-ion battery capacity	• Distributed Generation Interconnection Program Data [73] [link]
Transportation	• automobiles.xlsx • emfacCalcs.xlsx • hybridVMT.xlsx	• Vehicle stocks • Vehicle sales volumes • Vehicle fuel efficiencies • Vehicle miles travelled • Vintage profiles • Survival profiles • VMT degradation profiles • Total cost of ownership • Fraction of miles driven by electric motor vs combustion engine • Cost of hydrogen refueling stations	• Decarbonizing the Transportation Sector [23] [link] • NREL Annual Technology Baseline: Transportation [74] [link] • CARB – EMFAC [75] [link] • Argonne National Laboratory - Comprehensive Total Cost of Ownership Quantification for Vehicles with Different Size Classes and Powertrains [76] [link]

	• LDV_load_shapes.xlsx • EVSE Rates.docx • bevChargingCostTemplate.xlsx	• Electric vehicle charging load shape • Cost of electric vehicle chargers	• CEC - Home Charging Access in California [46] [link] • Scalable probabilistic estimates of electric vehicle charging given observed driver behavior [77] [link 1], [link 2] • Home Advisor – How much does an electric car charging station cost [78] [link] • US DOE – Costs Associated With Non-Residential Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment [79] [link] • Alternative Fuels Data Center [80] [link]
Industry	Electricity usage 2019 Industrial Sector.xlsx	• Electricity usage in industrial subsectors	• California Industrial Energy Efficiency Market Characterization Study [81] [link] • LLNL Sankey Diagrams [82] [link]
	refiningAndSMR.xlsx	• FCCU and CHP CCS technoeconomics • Refinery inputs, outputs, and auxiliary fuels • SMR CCS technoeconomics • SMR input and output fuels' Refineries and Steam Methane Reformers	• CEC Petroleum Watch, March 2020 [83] [link] • CARB fuel inventory [42] [Link] • CARB GHG inventory [42] [link] • Argonne National Laboratory – Assessment of Potential Future Demands for Hydrogen in the United States [84] [link] • Decarbonizing the Industrial Sector [22] [link] • The Hydrogen Opportunity [27] [link] • EPA FLIGHT [85] [link] • Hydrogen Tools [86] [link]
	renewableDiesel.xlsx	• Renewable Diesel refining input fuels, output fuels, auxiliary fuels, and costs	• Diamond Green Diesel presentation [87] [link] • Oil and Gas Journal – Diamond Green Diesel to build new Port Arther Plant [88].[link] • Darling Ingredients 2021 Annual Report [link] • Darling Ingredients Sept. 2021 ESG Report [89] [link] • Phillips66 News Releases [90] [link] • CARB LCFS Renewable Diesel Fuel Pathway Reports [91] [link 1], [92] [link 2]

			REG Carbon Intensity Report: Renewable Diesel [93] [link]
	chpsAndSgs.xlsx	- Crude oil production – CHP energy use and technoeconomics - Crude oil production – steam generator energy use and technoeconomics	- Decarbonizing the Industrial Sector [22] [link] - Boiler Efficiency, Chapter 3 [94] [link] - CARB fuel inventory [42] [link] - CARB GHG inventory [42] [link] - US EPA – eGRID [95] [link] - EIA – Today in Energy [96] [Link]
	mfg_td.xlsx	Technoeconomics and energy use for food production, petrochemical and mineral production, timber drying, natural gas transmission and distribution, and other manufacturing	- Decarbonizing the Industrial Sector [22] [link] - California Industrial Energy Efficiency Market Characterization Study [81] [link] - NREL - Potential Cost-Effective Opportunities for Methane Emission Abatement [97] [link] - CARB fuel inventory [42] [link] - CARB GHG inventory [42] [link]
	New Hydrogen.xlsx	- Plant costs - Plant efficiency - Plant auxiliary fuel use - Emission factors	- The Hydrogen Opportunity [27] - Comparison of Commercial, State-of-the-Art, Fossil-Based Hydrogen Production Technologies [98] [Link] - Electrofuel Synthesis from Variable Renewable Electricity: An Optimization-Based Techno-Economic Analysis [99] [link] - Techno-economic analysis and life cycle assessment of hydrogen production from different biomass gasification processes [100] [link]
	- Pipelines.xlsx - HDVs_High.xlsm - HDVs_Low.xlsm - Industry_High.xlsm - Industry_low.xlsm - LDVs_LA_High.xlsm - LDVs_LA_Low.xlsm - LDVs_SF_High.xlsm - LDVs_SF_Low.xlsm	Files used to calculate distribution & storage costs for hydrogen	- Hydrogen Delivery Scenario Analysis Model (HDSAM) [101] [link] - State Gas Pipelines [102] [link] - EIA Natural Gas [103] [link]

	- Cement.xlsx - Cement Technoeconomics (Original).xlsx	- Plant activity level - Plant energy intensity - Process emissions per unit energy - Cost of CCS retrofits. The original technoeconomics includes fuel prices and incentives. The abatement costs inputted into DECAL do not include fuel prices and incentives, as they are endogenously included in other places in the model.	Decarbonizing the Industrial Sector [22]
DAC	DAC1.xlsx	- Capital and operating costs (\$/t) - Learning rates - Electricity usage (kWh/t)	Techno-economic assessment of CO2 direct air capture plants [104] [link]
Bioenergy	Bioenergy.xlsx	- Existing capacity (biogas, ethanol production, biodiesel production) - Biogas potential - Process efficiency - Cost - Auxiliary fuel use	The Bioenergy Opportunity [25] [link]
Prices	Fuels.xlsx	Fuel prices	- Index Mundi [105] [link] - World Bank [106] [link] - Alternative Fuels Data Center [107] [link] - IEA Bio-jet Fuel costs [108] [link] - American Gas Foundation [109] [link]
	Incentives.xlsx	Incentive prices	- Cap and Trade Dashboard [110] [link] - LCFS Monthly Activity Reports [111] [link] - EPA RIN Trades and Price Information [112] [link] - Internal Revenue Code [113] [link] - Alternative Fuels Data Center [114] [link]
	LCFS.xlsx	LCFS carbon intensity by fuel	- LCFS Pathway Certified Carbon Intensities [115] [link] - LCFS Data Dashboard [116] [link]
Other	2022-sp-PATHWAYS-data-E3.xlsx	Data outputs from E3's/CARB's scoping plan report. Used to help set some levers and miscellaneous variables.	Draft 22 Scoping Plan Documents [37] [link]
	Calibrate Other.xlsx	Used to calculate abatement price of Residential, Commercial, Transportation, and Industry "Other"	N/A
	Carbon Removal.xlsx	Helper spreadsheet for setting DAC capture rates	N/A

	Leftover Emissions.xlsx	Helper spreadsheet to summarize leftover emissions	N/A
	DR Overbuilding.xlsx	Used to calculate the amount of overbuilding necessary in demand response scenarios	N/A
	Efs.xlsx	Emission factors in cases where LEAP defaults are not used	EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories [117] [link]
	RNG Blend.xlsx	Setting the current blend fraction of RNG	LCFS Data Dashboard [116] [link]
	Technology Maturity Survey.xlsx	Results from the technology maturity survey. Poll was sent to expert staff on the Pathways team. Results helped define maturity buckets described in Chapter 2.	N/A
	Transport_Industrial_BottomUp_FGasses.xlsx	F Gases: Annual charge size, annual leak rate, EOL charge size, EOL leak rate, GWP (for Industrial and Transport sectors)	CARB's California's High Global Warming Potential Gases Emission Inventory, Technical Support Document, "HFC Emission Factors.xlsx" (made privately available) [65]
	HFC Emission Factors 2021 May 10.xlsx	Raw bottom-up F-gas data provided by CARB staff (Glenn Gallagher). Used in other spreadsheets in this database.	CARB's California's High Global Warming Potential Gases Emission Inventory, Technical Support Document, "HFC Emission Factors.xlsx" (made privately available) [65]
	TopDown_Compare.xlsx	Used to set top down energy usage and non-energy emissions. Done by comparing to GHG inventory.	California GHG Emission Inventory Data, Fuel Combustion and Heat Data [42] [link]

Table 15: DECAL Data Sources.

Appendix D: DECAL's Tree

DECAL's full tree structure is shown in Table 16. Branches are shown exactly as they appear in DECAL up to the terminal branch, where raw data is ultimately inputted. Detail is only redacted when repetitive – for example, all climate zones in the residential sector have the same sub-tree structure. Recall that LEAP performs calculations at the end branch, and then has the ability to sum up to higher levels for summary purposes.

- Demand
 - Residential
 - Old Dwellings
 - CZ1
 - Lighting
 - Indoor Lighting
 - Outdoor Lighting
 - Misc Equipment
 - Pool Pump
 - Spa
 - Electric Spa Heat
 - Well Pump
 - Electric Misc
 - Gas Pool Heat
 - Gas Spa Heat
 - Gas Misc
 - Gas Pool Heat RNG
 - Gas Spa Heat RNG
 - Gas Misc RNG
 - Appliances
 - Microwave
 - TV
 - PC
 - Home Office
 - SF Appliances
 - Electric Clothes Dryer
 - First Refrigerator
 - Second Refrigerator
 - Freezer
 - Electric Range Oven
 - NG Clothes Dryer
 - NG Range Oven
 - Clothes Washer
 - Dishwasher
 - Electric Range Oven Replacement
 - Electric Clothes Dryer Replacement
 - New Electric Panels
 - Space Heating
 - SH ER
 - SH HP
 - SH Aux ER
 - SH NG
 - SH Aux NG
 - SH HP Replacement
 - SH ER Replacement
 - Water Heating

- ER WH
 - NG WH
 - HP WH Replacement
 - ER WH Replacement
 - Gas Solar WH Replacement
 - Electric Solar WH Replacement
 - DR HP WH Replacement
 - DR ER WH Replacement
 - Cooling
 - Central AC
 - Room AC
 - Evaporative Cooling
 - HP Cooling
 - Fans
 - Furnace Fan
 - Ceiling Fan
- CZ2
- CZ3
- CZ4
- CZ5
- CZ6
- CZ7
- CZ8
- CZ9
- CZ10
- CZ11
- CZ12
- CZ13
- New Dwellings
- Other Fuels
 - Biodiesel
 - Diesel
 - Kerosene
 - Renewable Diesel
 - LPG
 - Wood
 - New Electricity
- Commercial
 - College
 - SCE
 - Lighting
 - Interior Lighting
 - Exterior Lighting
 - Misc Equipment
 - Electricity Misc
 - Air Compressor
 - Motors
 - Electricity Process
 - Gas Misc
 - Gas Process
 - RNG Misc
 - RNG Process
 - Fans
 - Vent

- Appliances
 - Refrigerator
 - Office Equipment
- SF Appliances
 - NG Range Oven
 - Electric Range Oven
 - Electric Range Oven Replacement
 - New Electric Panels
- Space Heating
 - Gas Boiler
 - Electric Boiler
 - Electric Boiler Replacement
 - SH NG
 - SH ER
 - SH ER Replacement
 - SH HP
 - SH HP Replacement
 - SH ER Radiator
- Water Heating
 - NG WH
 - HP WH Replacement
 - ER WH
 - ER WH Replacement
 - Gas Solar WH Replacement
 - Electric Solar WH Replacement
- Cooling
 - Rooftop AC
 - HP Cooling
 - Gas Fired Chiller
 - Centrifugal Chiller
 - Centrifugal Chiller Replacement
- PGE
- SDGE
- SMUD
- LADWP
- Small Office
- Large Office
- Restaurant
- Retail
- Food Store
- Refrigerated Warehouse
- Unrefrigerated Warehouse
- School
- Health
- Lodging
- Misc
- Non CEUS
- Other Fuels
 - Biodiesel
 - Diesel
 - Ethanol
 - Gasoline
 - Kerosene
 - Renewable Diesel

- LPG
- Wood
- New Electricity
- Industry
 - Cement
 - Cemex
 - Biomass
 - Coal Unspecified
 - LPG
 - Municipal Solid Waste
 - Natural Gas
 - Petroleum Coke
 - Tires
 - Electricity
 - RNG
 - CalPortland Mojave
 - CalPortland Oro Grande
 - Hanson Permanente
 - Lehigh Southwest Tehachapi
 - Lehigh Southwest Redding
 - Mitsubishi Cushenbury
 - National
 - Cemex CCS
 - Electricity
 - Natural Gas
 - RNG
 - CalPortland Mojave CCS
 - CalPortland Oro Grande CCS
 - Hanson Permanente CCS
 - Lehigh Southwest Tehachapi CCS
 - Lehigh Southwest Redding CCS
 - Mitsubishi Cushenbury CCS
 - National CCS
 - Food
 - Plants Greater 100k CO₂
 - General Use
 - Electricity
 - Process Heating
 - Natural Gas
 - RNG
 - Electric Resistance
 - Hydrogen Transmitted
 - Heat Pump
 - CCS
 - Electricity
 - Natural Gas
 - RNG
 - Plants 25k_100k CO₂
 - Plants Under 25k CO₂
 - Petrochemicals and Minerals
 - Plants Greater 100k CO₂
 - General Use
 - Electricity
 - Process Heating

- Natural Gas
 - RNG
 - Electric Resistance
 - Hydrogen Transmitted
 - CCS
 - Electricity
 - Natural Gas
 - RNG
 - Plants 25k_100k CO₂
 - Plants Under 25k CO₂
- Timber Drying
 - General Use
 - Electricity
 - Process Heat
 - Wood
 - Natural Gas
 - RNG
 - CCS
 - Electricity
 - Natural Gas
 - RNG
- Other
 - Electricity
 - Natural Gas
 - RNG
 - Biodiesel
 - Diesel
 - Ethanol
 - Gasoline
 - Renewable Diesel
 - Refinery Gas
 - Coal Bituminous
 - LPG
 - Wood
 - Biomass
 - Lubricants
 - Replacement Electricity
 - Replacement Hydrogen
- NG TD Leaks Not From Compressors
 - Natural Gas
- DAC
 - HT Aqueous Solution
 - Electricity
 - LT Solid Sorbent
 - Electricity
 - Heat Pump
- Transportation
 - LDVs
 - LDA Passenger Car
 - Diesel
 - Gasoline
 - Natural Gas
 - Electricity

- Hydrogen
 - Hybrid
 - Electricity Replacement
 - Hydrogen Replacement
 - Hybrid Replacement
- T1 Light Duty Truck T1
- T2 Light Duty Truck T2
- T3 Medium Duty Truck
- HDVs
 - T4 Light Heavy Duty Truck 1
 - Diesel
 - Gasoline
 - Natural Gas
 - Electricity
 - Hydrogen
 - Electricity Replacement
 - Hydrogen Replacement
 - T5 Light Heavy Duty Truck 2
 - T6 Medium Heavy Duty Truck
 - T7 Heavy Heavy Duty Truck
 - Bus
 - T6 OOS Medium Heavy Duty Truck OOS
 - T7 OOS Heavy Heavy Duty Truck OOS
 - T7 Port Heavy Heavy Duty Port
 - MC Motorcoach
 - MH Motorhome
- Aviation
 - Ethanol
 - Gasoline
 - Jet Kerosene
 - Avgas
 - Renewable Jet Fuel
 - Hydrogen Transmitted
 - Electricity
- Rail
 - Biodiesel
 - Diesel
 - Renewable Diesel
 - Hydrogen Transmitted
 - Electricity
- Water Borne
 - Biodiesel
 - Diesel
 - Ethanol
 - Gasoline
 - Renewable Diesel
 - Hydrogen Transmitted
- Other
 - Biodiesel
 - Diesel
 - Renewable Diesel
 - LPG
 - Lubricants

- Electricity
- Agriculture
 - Natural Gas
 - RNG
 - Biodiesel
 - Diesel
 - Ethanol
 - Gasoline
 - Kerosene
 - Renewable Diesel
 - Electricity
- Remaining Electricity
 - Remaining Electricity Flat
 - Remaining Electricity Shape
- Transformation
 - Ethanol Production
 - Fermentation
 - Biodiesel Production
 - Transesterification
 - Refinery FCCU and CHP
 - LA Refinery Marathon
 - El Segundo Refinery Chevron
 - Richmond Refinery Chevron
 - Golden Eagle Refinery Marathon
 - Benecia Refinery Valero
 - LA Refinery Phillips66
 - Torrance Refinery PBF
 - Martinez Refinery PBF
 - Rodeo Refinery Phillips66
 - Wilmington Refinery Ultramar
 - Kern Oil And Refining
 - Greka Refining
 - Lunday Thafard South Gate
 - San Joaquin Refining
 - Valero Wilmington Refinery
 - Renewable Diesel Refining
 - New Plants
 - Converted Plants
 - Crude Oil Extraction
 - Crude Oil Extraction
 - Steam Generators
 - Steam Generators
 - Steam Generators With CCS
 - Crude Oil CHP
 - Elk Hills
 - Midway Sunset
 - Kern River
 - Sycamore
 - South Belridge
 - Salinas River
 - Berry
 - Berry Placerita
 - Kern River Eastridge
 - Western Pwr and Steam
 - Berry Tanne Hills 18

- Southeast Kern River
- Taft 26C
- Cymric 36W
- Dome Project
- Coalinga 25D
- McKittrick
- Lost Hills
- Coalinga
- Aera San Ardo
- Cymric 6Z
- Cymric 31X
- Welpport Lease
- Distributed PV
 - Solar Distributed
- Electricity TD
 - Electricity
- Electricity Production Exogenous
 - NW Coal
 - NW Natural Gas
 - NW Nuclear
 - NW Large Hydro
 - NW Small Hydro
 - NW Unspecified
 - NW Biomass
 - NW Geothermal
 - NW Solar
 - NW Wind
 - SW Coal
 - SW Natural Gas
 - SW Nuclear
 - SW Large Hydro
 - SW Small Hydro
 - SW Unspecified
 - SW Biomass
 - SW Geothermal
 - SW Solar
 - SW Wind
 - Natural Gas CCS
 - Hydrogen Fuel Cell
 - Landfill Gas
 - AD Manure
 - AD WWTP
 - AD Food Green Waste
- Hydrogen Production
 - SMR Chevron Richmond
 - SMR PBF Martinez
 - SMR Air Products Wilmington
 - SMR Torrance Refining
 - SMR Valero Benicia
 - SMR Air Liquide Rodeo
 - SMR Marathon Carson
 - SMR Phillips66 Wilmington
 - SMR Air Products Carson
 - SMR Air Products Martinez Waterfront Rd
 - SMR Marathon Martinez

- SMR Air Liquide El Segundo
- SMR Chevron El Segundo
- SMR Air Products Martinez
- SMR Phillips66 Rodeo
- SMR Praxair Ontario
- SMR San Joaquin Refining
- SMR Air Products Sacramento
- New SMR
- New SMR RNG
- New SMR CCS
- New SMR RNG CCS
- New ATR
- New ATR RNG
- New ATR CCS
- New ATR RNG CCS
- New Gasification
- New Gasification CCS
- New Electrolysis
- Electricity Production Optimal
 - Solar Current
 - Solar SPGE
 - Solar Kramer
 - Solar Northern California
 - Solar Sacramento River
 - Solar SCADSNV
 - Solar SW
 - Solar Tehachapi
 - Solar Westlands
 - Wind Current
 - Wind SPGE
 - Wind NW
 - Wind Sacramento River
 - Wind SCADSNV
 - Wind SW
 - Wind WY
 - Offshore Wind Cape Mendocino
 - Offshore Wind Diablo Canyon
 - Offshore Wind Humboldt Bay
 - Offshore Wind Morro Bay
 - Large Hydro
 - Small Hydro
 - Old Natural Gas
 - New Natural Gas
 - Natural Gas CCS Retrofit
 - New Natural Gas CCS
 - Geothermal
 - Biomass
 - Nuclear
 - Hydrogen Fuel Cell
 - BTM Li Ion
 - Li Ion
 - Pumped Hydro
 - New Pumped Hydro
- CNG Production
 - Compression

- CRNG Production
 - Compression
- RNG Compressors
 - RNG Compressor
 - RNG Compressor Upgraded
- RNG Production
 - Current Landfill Gas
 - Current AD Manure
 - Current AD WWTP
 - Current AD Food Green Waste
 - New AD Manure
 - New AD WWTP
 - New AD Food Green Waste
- NG Compressors
 - NG Compressor
 - NG Compressor Upgraded
- Non-Energy
 - Residential
 - Methane Leaks
 - Methane
 - Aerosols
 - HFC134a
 - HFC152a
 - HFC227ea
 - HFC4310mee
 - Foams
 - HFC134a
 - HFC245fa
 - Fertilizer
 - Nitrous Oxide
 - Refrigerants
 - Annual_Emissions
 - First Refrigerator
 - Second Refrigerator
 - Freezer
 - Central AC
 - SH HP
 - Room AC
 - HP WH
 - Dehumidifier
 - HP Clothes Dryer
 - Portable AC
 - EOL_Emissions
 - Commercial
 - Fertilizer
 - Nitrous Oxide
 - Aerosols
 - HFC134a
 - HFC152a
 - HFC4310mee
 - Fire Protection
 - PFC14
 - HFC125
 - HFC227ea

- HFC236fa
- Foams
 - HFC134a
 - HFC245fa
- Refrigerants
 - Annual_Emissions
 - HP WH
 - SH HP
 - Rooftop AC
 - Centrifugal Chiller
 - Cold Storage Large
 - Cold Storage Medium
 - Cold Storage Small
 - Non Retail Refrigerator Large
 - Non Retail Refrigerator Medium
 - Non Retail Refrigerator Small
 - Non Retail Refrigerator Sub Small
 - Food Processing and Dispensing Equipment
 - Ice Maker
 - Retail Refrigerator Large
 - Retail Refrigerator Medium
 - Retail Refrigerator Small
 - Retail Refrigerator Sub Small
 - Stand Alone Refrigerator
 - Vending Machine
 - Water Cooled Drinking Fountain
 - EOL_Emissions
- Industry
 - Cement Process CO₂
 - Cemex
 - CalPortland Mojave
 - CalPortland Oro Grande
 - Hanson Permanente
 - Lehigh Southwest Tehachapi
 - Lehigh Southwest Redding
 - Mitsubishi Cushenbury
 - National
 - Refrigerants
 - Annual_Emissions
 - Industrial Cooling Large
 - Industrial Cooling Medium
 - Industrial Cooling Small
 - EOL_Emissions
 - Semiconductor Manufacturing
 - C2F6
 - C3F8
 - C4F8
 - CF4
 - HFC23
 - NF3
 - SF6
 - Aerosols
 - HFC134a

- HFC152
 - HFC4310mee
- Fire Protection
 - CF4
 - HFC125
 - HFC227ea
 - HFC236fa
- Foams
 - HFC134a
 - HFC245fa
- Solvents
 - CF4
 - HFC245fa
 - HFC365mfc
 - HFC4310mee
 - Other PFC and PFE
- Waste
 - CH4
 - N2O
- Fugitives
 - Not Specified
 - Solvents and Chemicals
 - Oil and Gas
- Landfill
 - Landfill CH4
 - Landfill N2O
- Hydrogen DS
 - Industry
- Transportation
 - Refrigerants
 - Annual_Emissions
 - Transport Refrigerated Units
 - Refrigerated Shipping Containers
 - Ships
 - Mobile Vehicle AC LDVs
 - Mobile Vehicle AC HDVs
 - Mobile Vehicle AC Buses
 - EOL_Emissions
 - Aerosols
 - HFC134a
 - LDV Infrastructure Buildout
 - LDV BEV Home Chargers
 - LDV BEV Commercial Chargers
 - LDV FCEV Infrastructure
 - HDV Infrastructure Buildout
 - HDV BEV Chargers
 - HDV FCEV Infrastructure
 - Hydrogen DS LDVs
 - LDVs
 - Hydrogen DS HDVs
 - HDVs
- Agriculture
 - Residue Burning

- Methane
 - Nitrous Oxide
- Crop Residue
 - Nitrous Oxide
- Fertilizer
 - Nitrous Oxide
- Liming
 - Carbon Dioxide
- Manure
 - Nitrous Oxide
- Enteric Fermentation
 - Cattle
 - Other Livestock
- Histosol Cultivation
 - Nitrous Oxide
- Manure Management
 - Methane
 - Nitrous Oxide
- Rice Cultivation
 - Methane
- RNG Averted Methane
 - Manure
 - WWTP
 - Food Green Waste
- Electricity Production
 - SF6
 - TD Cost
- Carbon Removal
 - Electricity Production
 - NGCCS
 - NGCCS Bio
 - Hydrogen Production
 - Fossil
 - New SMR CCS
 - New SMR RNG CCS
 - New ATR CCS
 - New ATR RNG CCS
 - New Gasification CCS
 - SMR Chevron Richmond
 - SMR PBF Martinez
 - SMR Air Products Wilmington
 - SMR Torrance Refining
 - SMR Valero Benicia
 - SMR Air Liquide Rodeo
 - SMR Marathon Carson
 - SMR Phillips66 Wilmington
 - SMR Air Products Carson
 - SMR Air Products Martinez Waterfront Rd
 - SMR Marathon Martinez
 - SMR Air Liquide El Segundo
 - SMR Chevron El Segundo
 - SMR Air Products Martinez
 - SMR Phillips66 Rodeo
 - SMR Praxair Ontario

- SMR San Joaquin Refining
 - SMR Air Products Sacramento
- Bio
- Steam Generators
 - Steam Generators With CCS
 - Steam Generators With CCS Bio
- CHPs
 - Fossil
 - Elk Hills
 - Midway Sunset
 - Kern River
 - Sycamore
 - South Belridge
 - Salinas River
 - Berry
 - Berry Placerita
 - Kern River Eastridge
 - Western Pwr and Steam
 - Berry Tanne Hills 18
 - Southeast Kern River
 - Taft 26C
 - Cymric 36W
 - Dome Project
 - Coalinga 25D
 - McKittrick
 - Lost Hills
 - Coalinga
 - Aera San Ardo
 - Cymric 6Z
 - Cymric 31X
 - Welpport Lease
 - Bio
- Refining
 - Fossil
 - LA Refinery Marathon
 - El Segundo Refinery Chevron
 - Richmond Refinery Chevron
 - Golden Eagle Refinery Marathon
 - Benecia Refinery Valero
 - LA Refinery Phillips66
 - Torrance Refinery PBF
 - Martinez Refinery PBF
 - Rodeo Refinery Phillips66
 - Wilmington Refinery Ultramar
 - Kern Oil And Refining
 - Greka Refining
 - Lunday Thafard South Gate
 - San Joaquin Refining
 - Valero Wilmington Refinery
 - Bio
- Timber Drying
 - Timber Drying
- Petrochemicals and Minerals
 - Fossil
 - Plants Greater 100k CO₂

- Plants 25k_100k CO₂
 - Plants Under 25k CO₂
 - Bio
- Food
 - Fossil
 - Plants Greater 100k CO₂
 - Plants 25k_100k CO₂
 - Plants Under 25k CO₂
 - Bio
- Cement
 - Fossil
 - Cemex
 - CalPortland Oro Grande
 - CalPortland Mojave
 - Mitsubishi Cushenbury
 - National
 - Hanson Permanente
 - Lehigh Southwest Tehachapi
 - Lehigh Southwest Redding
- DAC
 - DAC
- In State Incentives
 - LCFS Fuel Production Pathway
 - Electricity Emissionless
 - Electricity Hydrogen Fuel Cell
 - Electricity Municipal Solid Waste
 - Electricity AD Manure
 - Electricity AD WWTP
 - Electricity Food Green Waste
 - Electricity NG
 - Electricity RNG
 - Electricity NGCCS
 - Electricity RNG CCS
 - Electricity Biomass
 - Hydrogen SMR
 - Hydrogen SMR CCS
 - Hydrogen SMR RNG CCS
 - Hydrogen ATR
 - Hydrogen ATR CCS
 - Hydrogen ATR RNG
 - Hydrogen ATR RNG CCS
 - Hydrogen Gasification
 - Hydrogen Gasification CCS
 - Hydrogen Electrolysis
 - Ethanol
 - Biodiesel
 - Renewable Diesel
 - CNG
 - CRNG
 - LCFS Carbon Removal Pathway
 - Old Hydrogen
 - Steam Generators
 - CHPs

	• Refining • DAC
▪	Cap and Trade • Credits
▪	RPS • Credits

Table 16: DECAL's Tree Structure.

Appendix E: Levers

Most levers available in DECAL are summarized in Table 17.

Sector	Lever Type	Levers
Residential	Cost Levers	- Cost over time of appliances - Cost over time of top-down residential electrification - Cost over time of refrigerant mitigation
	Bottom-up Levers	- Sales rate of electric space heaters, water heaters, ovens, and clothes dryers - Space heater technology choice: heat pump, electric resistance - Water heater technology choice: heat pump, electric resistance, thermal solar water heater (electric backup), thermal solar water heater (gas backup) - RNG blend fraction - Refrigerant GWPs - Refrigerant EOL Leak Rate - Water heater load shape: standard, solar focused
	Top-down Levers	Adoption rate of Residential Other electrification
Commercial	Cost Levers	- Cost over time of appliances - Cost over time of top-down commercial electrification - Cost over time of refrigerant mitigation
	Bottom-up Levers	- Sales rate of electric space heaters, water heaters, ovens, and gas fired chillers - Space heater technology choice: heat pump, electric resistance - Water heater technology choice: heat pump, electric resistance, thermal solar water heater (electric backup), thermal solar water heater (gas backup) - RNG blend fraction - Refrigerant GWPs - Refrigerant EOL Leak Rate
	Top-down Levers	- Adoption rate of Commercial Other electrification - Commercial Other renewable diesel blend conversion
Industry and Fossil Fuel Production	Cost Levers	- Cost over time of CCS - Cost over time of manufacturing fuel switch (food, petrochemicals and minerals) - Cost over time of NG compression - Cost over time of DAC - Cost over time of top-down industry fuel switch
	Bottom-up Levers	- CCS capture rate (by default 90%) - CCS adoption rate (separately for each subsector – cement, food, petrochemicals and minerals, timber drying, crude oil CHPs, crude oil SGs, refineries) - Fuel switching adoptions rate (separately for each subsector – food, petrochemicals and minerals) - Fuel switching technology choice (separately for each subsector – food, petrochemicals and minerals): heat pump, electric resistance, hydrogen - Direct air capture adoption rate - Direct air capture technology choice (low temperature solid sorbent, high temperature aqueous solution) - DAC load shape: fraction solar focused

		• NG compressor upgrade adoption rate • RNG blend fraction • Refrigerant GWPs • Refrigerant EOL Leak Rate • Refinery dispatch rule: proportional to capacity (refinery operations ramp down with less demand) vs full capacity (refinery operations are maintained with less demand and fuels are exported)
	Top-down Levers	• Adoption rate of Industry Other fuel switch • Industry Other fuel switch technology choice: electricity, hydrogen • Industry Other renewable diesel blend conversion
Transportation	Cost Levers	• Cost over time of automobiles (separately for each vehicle type and ZEV option) • Cost over time of transportation infrastructure (BEV chargers, hydrogen refueling stations) • Cost over time of top-down transportation fuel switch • Cost over time of refrigerant mitigation
	Bottom-up Levers	• Sales rate of LDV ZEVs and HDV ZEVs • LDV ZEV technology choice: BEVs, FCEVs, hybrids • HDV ZEV technology choice: BEVs, FCEVs • VMT multiplier over time • Fuel economy multiplier over time • Bioenergy blend fractions: Ethanol, Biodiesel, Renewable Diesel, CRNG • Refrigerant GWPs • Refrigerant EOL Leak Rate • LDV load shape: residential focused, commercial focused • HDV load shape: fraction solar focused
	Top-down Levers	• Aviation adoption rate • Aviation technology choice: electricity, hydrogen, renewable jet fuel • Rail adoption rate • Rail technology choice: electricity, hydrogen • Rail renewable diesel blend conversion • Boat adoption rate • Boats renewable diesel blend conversion • Adoption rate of Transportation Other fuel switch • Transportation Other renewable diesel blend conversion
Agriculture	Cost Levers	• Seaweed feed additive mitigation cost over time
	Top-down Levers	• Agriculture Other technology rate • RNG blend conversion • Agriculture Other renewable diesel blend conversion • Seaweed feed additive adoption rate • Seaweed feed additive fraction of cattle applicable • Seaweed feed additive burp reduction rate
Electricity Production	Cost Levers	• Cost of generators/storage over time (separately for each generator type – e.g., solar, wind, offshore wind, geothermal, hydrogen fuel cell, biomass, NGCCS, battery storage, pumped storage, etc.). • Cost of transmission & distribution over time
	Bottom-up Levers	• Clean generation constraint

		- Imports multiplier: nuclear, coal, and natural gas - Renewable qualified NGCCS, Hydro, & Nuclear: separately control how clean the optimization model considers NGCCS (default 90%), hydro (default 100%), and nuclear (default 100%) - RNG blend fraction
Hydrogen Production	Cost Levers	- Cost of new hydrogen generation over time (separately for SMR, SMR CCS, ATR, ATR CCS, Gasification, Gasification CCS, Electrolysis) - Cost of distribution & storage over time
	Bottom-up Levers	- CCS adoption rate on refinery SMR plants - RNG blend fraction for refinery SMR plants - New hydrogen technology choice: SMR, SMR RNG, SMR RNG CCS, ATR, ATR RNG, ATR RNG CCS, Gasification, Gasification CCS, Electrolysis
Bioenergy Production	Cost Levers	- Cost over time for RNG production, separately for landfill gas, wastewater, food/green waste, manure - Cost over time for Ethanol production - Cost over time for Biodiesel production
	Bottom-up Levers	- RNG Production adoption rate: separately for landfill gas, wastewater, food/green waste, manure - Fraction of biogas used for electricity production (balance of biogas is upgraded to RNG) - In-state Biodiesel production multiplier - In-state Ethanol production multiplier - In-state Renewable Diesel production adoption rate - In-state Renewable Diesel production: fraction coming from existing plant retrofit vs new plants
Commodities and Incentives	Cost Levers	- Credit prices for incentives listed in Chapter 2 - End-dates (where applicable) for incentives listed in Chapter 2 - Durations (where applicable) for incentives listed in Chapter 2 - Fuel prices for fuels listed in Chapter 2

Table 17: DECAL's Levers.

Appendix F: Learning Rates From Literature

Cost projections were available for vehicles, DAC, and electricity generators, as shown in Table 18. In the table, the normalized cost reduction fraction over time is shown, which can be applied to calculate cost over time using Eq. 10. The reduction fraction is only shown in particular time steps, with linear interpolation used for time steps in-between. The table is written in LEAP's interpolation syntax.

$$Cost(t) = (Cost\ in\ 2019) * (1 - Cost\ Reduction\ Fraction(t)).....(Eq. 10)$$

TECHNOLOGY	SUBCATEGORY	COST REDUCTION INTERPOLATION STATEMENT
TRANSPORTATION		
[74]		
Passenger Cars	PHEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.05, 2030, 0.08, 2035, 0.1, 2040, 0.11, 2045, 0.12)
	BEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.07, 2030, 0.17, 2035, 0.23, 2040, 0.25, 2045, 0.28)
	FCEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.06, 2030, 0.11, 2035, 0.18, 2040, 0.19, 2045, 0.21)
T1	PHEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.05, 2030, 0.09, 2035, 0.11, 2040, 0.12, 2045, 0.13)
	BEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.07, 2030, 0.17, 2035, 0.23, 2040, 0.26, 2045, 0.28)
	FCEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.06, 2030, 0.11, 2035, 0.18, 2040, 0.19, 2045, 0.21)
T2	PHEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.06, 2030, 0.11, 2035, 0.14, 2040, 0.15, 2045, 0.16)
	BEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.07, 2030, 0.19, 2035, 0.25, 2040, 0.28, 2045, 0.31)
	FCEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.08, 2030, 0.14, 2035, 0.21, 2040, 0.23, 2045, 0.25)
T3	PHEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.06, 2030, 0.12, 2035, 0.17, 2040, 0.18, 2045, 0.18)
	BEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.07, 2030, 0.16, 2035, 0.22, 2040, 0.24, 2045, 0.26)
	FCEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.14, 2030, 0.2, 2035, 0.25, 2040, 0.26, 2045, 0.28)
T4	BEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.06, 2030, 0.15, 2035, 0.2, 2040, 0.22, 2045, 0.24)
	FCEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.2, 2030, 0.26, 2035, 0.3, 2040, 0.31, 2045, 0.33)
T5	BEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.06, 2030, 0.14, 2035, 0.18, 2040, 0.2, 2045, 0.21)
	FCEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.19, 2030, 0.24, 2035, 0.27, 2040, 0.29, 2045, 0.3)
T6	BEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.05, 2030, 0.12, 2035, 0.16, 2040, 0.18, 2045, 0.2)
	FCEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.18, 2030, 0.22, 2035, 0.25, 2040, 0.27, 2045, 0.28)
T7	BEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.09, 2030, 0.23, 2035, 0.3, 2040, 0.33, 2045, 0.36)
	FCEV	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2025, 0.19, 2030, 0.27, 2035, 0.31, 2040, 0.32, 2045, 0.34)
DAC		

TECHNOLOGY	SUBCATEGORY	COST REDUCTION INTERPOLATION STATEMENT
[104]		
High temperature aqueous solution	CAPEX	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.54, 2040, 0.67, 2050, 0.73)
	Fixed OM Cost	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.54, 2040, 0.67, 2050, 0.73)
Low temperature solid sorbent	CAPEX	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.54, 2040, 0.67, 2050, 0.73)
	Fixed OM Cost	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.54, 2040, 0.67, 2050, 0.73)
ELECTRICITY PRODUCTION		
[118]		
Natural Gas	CAPEX	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.023, 2035, 0.046, 2040, 0.068, 2045, 0.088)
	Fixed OM Cost	No learning
	Variable OM Cost	No learning
Solar	CAPEX	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.239, 2035, 0.393, 2040, 0.421, 2045, 0.448)
	Fixed OM Cost	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.168, 2035, 0.189, 2040, 0.21, 2045, 0.23)
	Variable OM Cost	No learning
Wind	CAPEX	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.169, 2035, 0.286, 2040, 0.322, 2045, 0.359)
	Fixed OM Cost	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.045, 2035, 0.081, 2040, 0.117, 2045, 0.153)
	Variable OM Cost	No learning
Offshore Wind	CAPEX	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.166, 2035, 0.262, 2040, 0.309, 2045, 0.345)
	Fixed OM Cost	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.082, 2035, 0.136, 2040, 0.177, 2045, 0.21)
	Variable OM Cost	No learning
Geothermal	CAPEX	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.08, 2035, 0.133, 2040, 0.154, 2045, 0.175)
	Fixed OM Cost	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.036, 2035, 0.036, 2040, 0.036, 2045, 0.036)
	Variable OM Cost	No learning
Hydrogen Fuel Cell	CAPEX	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.249, 2035, 0.451, 2040, 0.558, 2045, 0.627)
	Fixed OM Cost	No learning
	Variable OM Cost	Variable OM Cost: No learning
Hydro	All	No learning
Nuclear	All	No learning
Biomass	CAPEX	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.017, 2035, 0.047, 2040, 0.081, 2045, 0.113)
	Fixed OM Cost	No learning
	Variable OM Cost	No learning
Natural Gas CCS	CAPEX	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.097, 2035, 0.173, 2040, 0.266, 2045, 0.321)
	Fixed OM Cost	No learning
	Variable OM Cost	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.015, 2035, 0.033, 2040, 0.061, 2045, 0.07)
Battery Storage	CAPEX	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.252, 2035, 0.347, 2040, 0.386, 2045, 0.425)
	Fixed OM Cost	Interp(BaseYear, 0, 2030, 0.165, 2035, 0.214, 2040, 0.262, 2045, 0.311)
	Variable OM Cost	No learning

TECHNOLOGY	SUBCATEGORY	COST REDUCTION INTERPOLATION STATEMENT
Pumped Hydro Storage	All	No learning

Table 18: Cost reduction fraction over time for Transportation, DAC, and Electricity Subsectors.

Appendix G: Additional Resources

The following resources can be found at this link: <https://sccs.stanford.edu/california-projects/pathways-carbon-neutrality-california>

- A full excel export of the DECAL model – including the entire tree structure, raw data inputs, and expressions.
- The DECAL LEAP file as well as installation instructions. The model can be explored and even run for free, but results cannot be saved without subscribing to LEAP for an annual fee.
- In order to run DECAL systematically and efficiently, a VBA program was created; said program can input large batches of levers from an excel file into DECAL, and then output results back into excel. At the link, you can view the excel files that were used to create the scenarios shown in this report. There is one master excel file that contains all the scenario definitions, and then several others that contain results. At the webpage, you will also find the VBA script itself. Note however it is only possible to run the script as a LEAP subscriber.
- Finally, in order to interpret results quickly and effectively, a python program was created to take graphing instructions populated in excel, as well as result files created using the aforementioned VBA script, and produce legible graphs.

References

- [1] M. A. Winkler, *California Poised to Overtake Germany as World's No. 4 Economy*, Bloomberg, 2022.
- [2] California Air Resources Board, "AB 32 Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006," [Online]. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/fact-sheets/ab-32-global-warming-solutions-act-2006>.
- [3] E. G. Brown, "Executive Order B-55-18 to Achieve Carbon Neutrality," Executive Department of the State of California, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ca.gov/archive/gov39/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/9.10.18-Executive-Order.pdf>.
- [4] California Air Resources Board, "Advanced Clean Cars II Regulation," [Online]. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/rulemaking/2022/advanced-clean-cars-ii>.
- [5] California Air Resources Board, "Advanced Clean Fleets," [Online]. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/advanced-clean-fleets>.
- [6] California Air Resources Board, "California approves groundbreaking regulation that accelerates the deployment of heavy-duty ZEVs to protect public health," [Online]. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/news/california-approves-groundbreaking-regulation-accelerates-deployment-heavy-duty-zevs-protect>.
- [7] E. G. Brown, "Governor Brown Takes Action to Increase Zero-Emission Vehicles, Fund New Climate Investments," [Online]. Available: <https://www.ca.gov/archive/gov39/2018/01/26/governor-brown-takes-action-to-increase-zero-emission-vehicles-fund-new-climate-investments/index.html>.
- [8] C. Davenport, "California to Require Half of All Heavy Trucks Sold by 2035 to Be Electric," *New York Times*, 21 03 2023.
- [9] *City of Berkeley, Natural Gas Prohibition & Reach Code for Electrification*, 2019.
- [10] *City of Oakland, Ordinance No. 13632*, 2020.
- [11] *Cit of San Jose, Ordinance No. 30330*, 2019.
- [12] California Energy Commission, *Building Energy Efficiency Standards Summary*, 2021.
- [13] California Air Resources Board, "Zero-Emission Appliance Standards," [Online]. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/zero-emission-appliance-standards>.
- [14] California Air Resources Board, "Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reporting," 15 October 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/mandatory-greenhouse-gas-emissions-reporting>.
- [15] Caballero, "Senate Bill 905," 2022. [Online]. Available: https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB905.
- [16] G. Newsom, "Office of Governor Gavin Newsom," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gov.ca.gov/2020/10/07/governor-newsom-launches-innovative-strategies-to-use-california-land-to-fight-climate-change-protect-biodiversity-and-boost-climate-resilience/>.
- [17] K. de Leon, *SB-100 California Renewables Portfolio Standard Program: emissions of greenhouse gases*, California State Senate, 2018.
- [18] California Air Resources Board, "F-gas Reduction Incentive Program," [Online]. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/FRIP/about>.
- [19] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Background on HFCs and the AIM Act," [Online]. Available: <https://www.epa.gov/climate-hfcs-reduction/background-hfcs-and-aim-act>.
- [20] A. Tarplin, S. D. Saltzer, J. de Chalendar and S. M. Benson, "Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: Decarbonizing the Commercial Sector," Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, 2022.
- [21] J. Neutel, A. Brandt, S. M. Benson and S. D. Saltzer, "Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: Decarbonizing the Residential Sector," Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and the Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, 2022.
- [22] I. J. Cho, M. L. Machala, A. Evers, S. D. Saltzer and A. Brandt, "Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: Decarbonizing the Industrial Sector," Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, 2022.
- [23] E. M. Hennessy, M. Singh, A. R. Berson, S. D. Saltzer and I. L. Azevedo, "Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: Decarbonizing the Transportation Sector," Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, 2023.

- [24] E. Baik and S. M. Benson, "Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: Decarbonizing the Electricity Sector," Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, 2022.
- [25] A. Arifi and C. B. Field, "Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: The Bioenergy Opportunity," Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, 2022.
- [26] J. Foye and C. Field, "Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: The Forest Management Opportunity," Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, 2022.
- [27] J. Bracci, A. Brandt, S. M. Benson, G. Shrimali and S. D. Saltzer, "Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: The Hydrogen Opportunity," Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, 2022.
- [28] T. Surles, T. Grossman and S. D. Saltzer, "Pathways to Carbon Neutrality in California: Clean Energy Solutions that Work for Everyone - Summary of Interview and Workshop Findings," Stanford Center for Carbon Storage and Stanford Carbon Removal Initiative, 2021.
- [29] J. H. Williams, A. Debenedictis, R. Ghanadan, A. Mahone and et al, "The Pivotal Role of Electricity," *Science*, vol. 335, pp. 53-60, 2012.
- [30] A. Mahone, E. Hart, B. Haley, J. Williams, S. Borgeson, N. Ryan and et al, "California PATHWAYS:GHG Scenario Results," 2015.
- [31] California Energy Commission, "Deep Decarbonization in a High Renewables Future," CEC-500-20, 2018.
- [32] M. Wei, J. H. Nelson, J. B. Greenblatt, A. Mileva, J. Johnston, M. Ting and et al, "Deep Carbon Reductions in California Require Electrification and Integration Across Economic Sectors," *Environmental Research Letters*, vol. 8, 2013.
- [33] C. Yang, S. Yeh, S. Zakerinia, K. Ramea and D. McCollum, "Achieving California's 80% Greenhouse Gas Reduction Target in 2050: Technology, policy and scenario analysis," *Energy Policy*, vol. 77, pp. 118-130, 2015.
- [34] M. Z. Jacobson, M. A. Delucchi, A. R. Ingraffea, R. W. Howarth, G. Bazouin, B. Bridgeland and et al, "A Roadmap for Repowering California for all Purposes with Wind, Water and Sunlight," *Energy*, vol. 73, pp. 875-879, 2014.
- [35] E. Larson, C. Greig, J. Jenkins, E. Mayfield, A. Pascale, C. Zhang and et al, "Net-Zero America: Potential Pathways, Infrastructure, and Impacts," Princeton, NJ, 2020.
- [36] J. H. Williams, R. A. Jones, B. Haley, G. Kwok, J. Hargreaves, J. Farbes and et al, "Carbon-Neutral Pathways for the United States," *AGU Advances*, 2021.
- [37] California Air Resources Board, "2022 Scoping Plan Documents," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/ab-32-climate-change-scoping-plan/2022-scoping-plan-documents>.
- [38] Stockholm Environment Institute, "Low Emissions Analysis Platform," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://leap.sei.org/>.
- [39] Climate Interactive, "The En-Roads Climate Solutions Simulator," [Online]. Available: <https://www.climateinteractive.org/en-roads/>.
- [40] J. Neutel, A. Berson, S. Saltzer, F. Orr, A. Brandt and S. Benson, "What will it take to get to net-zero emissions in California?," in *SPE Western Region*, Palo Alto, 2024.
- [41] J. Bracci, E. Sherwin, N. Boness and A. Brandt, "A cost comparison of hourly-reliable and net zero hydrogen production pathways in the United States," *Nature Communications*, 2023.
- [42] California Air Resources Board, "Current California GHG Emissions Inventory Database," [Online]. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/ghg-inventory-data>.
- [43] California Energy Commission, "2021 SB 100 Joint Agency Report Achieving 100% Clean Energy in California: An initial assessment," CEC-200-2021-001, 2021.
- [44] Solar Energies Industry Association, [Online]. Available: [https://www.seia.org/initiatives/land-use-solar-development#:~:text=Depending%20on%20the%20specific%20technology,\(MW\)%20of%20generating%20capacity..](https://www.seia.org/initiatives/land-use-solar-development#:~:text=Depending%20on%20the%20specific%20technology,(MW)%20of%20generating%20capacity..)
- [45] S. Powell, G. V. Cezar and R. Rajagopal, "Scalable probabilistic estimates of electric vehicle charging given observed driver behavior," *Applied Energy*, vol. 309, p. 118382, 2022.
- [46] California Energy Commission, "Home Charging Access in California," CEC-600-2022-021, 2022.
- [47] Inside EVs, "California Plug-In Car Sales Set New Record In Q2 2023: 25% Share," [Online]. Available: [https://insideevs.com/news/680900/california-plugin-car-sales-2023q2-share/#:~:text=In%20Q2%202023%2C%20125%2C939%20new,also%20a%20massive%20new%20record\)..](https://insideevs.com/news/680900/california-plugin-car-sales-2023q2-share/#:~:text=In%20Q2%202023%2C%20125%2C939%20new,also%20a%20massive%20new%20record)..)
- [48] J. Sallee, "Are Electric Trucks Ready for Primetime?," [Online]. Available: <https://energyathaas.wordpress.com/2023/07/05/are-electric-trucks-ready-for-primetime/>.

- [49] California Energy Commission, "Hydrogen Refueling Stations in California," [Online]. Available: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/zero-emission-vehicle-and-infrastructure-statistics/hydrogen-refueling>.
- [50] S. J. Davis, N. S. Lewis and others, "Net-zero emissions energy systems," *Science*, vol. 360, no. 6396, 2018.
- [51] California Air Resources Board, "California EPA Air Resources Board High Global Warming Potential Gases Emissions Inventory (2015)," [Online]. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/ghg-slcip-inventory>.
- [52] Energy Futures Initiative and Stanford University, "An Action Plan for Carbon Capture and Storage in California: Opportunities, Challenges, and Solutions," 2020.
- [53] National Renewable Energy Lab, "Biogas potential in the United States," [Online]. Available: <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy14osti/60178.pdf>.
- [54] U.S. Energy Information Association, "EIA projects US biofuel production to slowly increase through 2050," [Online].
- [55] International Energy Agency, "Biofuels," [Online]. Available: <https://www.iea.org/reports/renewables-2021/biofuels>.
- [56] International Energy Agency, "Direct Air Capture," [Online]. Available: <https://www.iea.org/reports/direct-air-capture>.
- [57] D. Sandalow, R. Aines, J. Friedmann, C. McCormick and D. Sanchez, "Biomass Carbon Removal and Storage (BiCRS) Roadmap," Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, 2021.
- [58] Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, "Getting to Neutral: Options for negative carbon emissions in California," 2020.
- [59] Y. Kaya and K. Yokobori, *Environment, energy, and economy: strategies for sustainability*, Tokyo: United Nations Univ. Press, 1997.
- [60] United States Census Bureau, "United States Census Bureau," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://data.census.gov/>.
- [61] State of California Department of Finance, "Population Projections," 2021.
- [62] California Energy Commission, "2019 Residential Appliance Saturation Study," 2019.
- [63] California Energy Commission, "California Energy Consumption Database," 2019.
- [64] Navigant Consulting, "Updated Buildings Sector Appliance and Equipment Costs and Efficiencies," EIA, 2018.
- [65] G. Gallagher, B. Deshpande, P. Gupta and A. Huang, "California's High Global Warming Potential Gases Emission Inventory: Emission Inventory Methodology and Technical Support Document," CARB, 2016.
- [66] S. Ong and N. Clark, "Commercial and Residential Hourly Load Profiles for all TMY3 Locations in the United States," NREL, 2014.
- [67] Itron, Inc., "2006 California Commercial End-Use Survey (CEUS)," CEC, 2006.
- [68] U.S. Energy Information Association, "Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS)," 2018.
- [69] California Energy Commission, "2019 Total System Electric Generation," 2019.
- [70] California Energy Commission, "Electric Generation Capacity and Energy," 2019.
- [71] U.S. Energy Information Association, "Annual Electric Power Industry Report, Form EIA-861 detailed data files," 2023.
- [72] California Independent System Operator, "Supply and renewables," 2019.
- [73] California Public Utilities Commission Energy Division, "Distributed Generation Interconnection Program Data," 2023.
- [74] National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://atb.nrel.gov/transportation/2022/index>.
- [75] California Air Resources Board, "EMFAC," [Online]. Available: <https://arb.ca.gov/emfac/>.
- [76] A. Burnham, D. Gohlke, L. Rush, T. Stephens, Y. Zhou, M. A. Delucchi, C. Hunter, Z. Lin, S. Ou, F. Xie, C. Proctor, S. Wiryadinata, N. Liu and M. Bloor, "Comprehensive Total Cost of Ownership Quantification for Different Size Classes and Powertrains," Argonne National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, 2021.
- [77] S. Powell, G. V. Cezar and R. Rajagopal, "Scalable probabilistic estimates of electric vehicle charging given observed driver behavior," *Applied Energy*, vol. 309, p. 118382, 2022.
- [78] HomeAdvisor, "How Much Does An Electric Car Charging Station Cost?," [Online]. Available: <https://www.homeadvisor.com/cost/garages/install-an-electric-vehicle-charging-station/>. [Accessed 2024].
- [79] M. Smith and J. Castellano, "Costs Associated With Non-Residential Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment," U.S. Department of Energy , 2015.
- [80] U.S. Department of Energy, "Alternative Fuels Data Center, California Laws and Incentives," [Online]. Available: https://afdc.energy.gov/laws/state_summary?state=CA. [Accessed 2024].

- [81] XENEREGY Inc, "California Industrial Energy Efficiency Market Characterization Study," XENEREGY, Oakland, CA, 2001.
- [82] Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, "Energy Flow Charts," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://flowcharts.llnl.gov/commodities/energy>. [Accessed 2014].
- [83] California Energy Commission, "Petroleum Watch," March 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-03/March_2020_Petroleum_Watch.pdf. [Accessed 2024].
- [84] A. Elgowainy, M. Mintz, U. Lee, T. Stephens, P. Sun, K. Reddi, Y. Zhou, G. Zang, M. Ruth, P. Jadun, E. Connelly and R. Boardman, "Assessment of Potential Future Demands for Hydrogen in the United States," Argonne National Laboratory, Chicago, 2020.
- [85] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Facility Level Information on GreenHouse gases Tool (FLIGHT)," [Online]. Available: <https://ghgdata.epa.gov/ghgp/main.do>. [Accessed 2022].
- [86] Center for Hydrogen Safety, "Hydrogen Tools," [Online]. Available: <https://h2tools.org/hyarc/hydrogen-production>. [Accessed 2022].
- [87] Diamond Green Diesel, [Online]. Available: <https://d1ip4j1950xau.cloudfront.net/Corporate/Misc%20files/Diamond%20Green%20Diesel%20presentation-2021.pdf>. [Accessed 2024].
- [88] Oil and Gas Journal, "Diamond Green Diesel to build new Port Arthur plant," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ogj.com/refining-processing/article/14196486/diamond-green-diesel-to-build-new-port-arthur-plant>.
- [89] Darling Ingredients, "Creating Value through Circularity," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://d1ip4j1950xau.cloudfront.net/Corporate/Darlingii.com%202020/ESG/Darling%20Ingredients-ESG%20Report%2032022.pdf>. [Accessed 2024].
- [90] Phillips 66, "News Releases: Phillips 66 Makes Final Investment Decision to Convert San Francisco Refinery to a Renewable Fuels Facility," 11 May 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://investor.phillips66.com/financial-information/news-releases/news-release-details/2022/Phillips-66-Makes-Final-Investment-Decision-to-Convert-San-Francisco-Refinery-to-a-Renewable-Fuels-Facility/default.aspx>. [Accessed 2024].
- [91] (S&T)2 Consultants, Inc, "CARB LCFS Fuel Pathway Report Renewable Diesel," (S&T)2 Consultants, Inc, Delta, BC, Canada, 2019.
- [92] (S&T)2 Consultants, Inc, "CARB LCFS Tier 2 Fuel Pathway Report Corn Oil Renewable Diesel," (S&T)2 Consultants, Inc, Delta, BC, Canada, 2017.
- [93] M. Herman and A. Tran, "Renewable Energy Group (REG) Carbon Intensity Report: Renewable Diesel Produced from Soy Oil, Used Cooking Oil, Animal Fats, Canola Oil, and Corn Oil," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.whatcomcounty.us/DocumentCenter/View/45253/MDP2019-00001-Carbon-Intensity-Report->.
- [94] E. K. Vakkilainen, *Steam Generation from Biomass: Construction and Design of Large Boilers*, Elsevier, 2017.
- [95] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID)," [Online]. Available: <https://www.epa.gov/egrid>. [Accessed 2024].
- [96] U.S. Energy Information Association, "Today in Energy: More than 60% of energy used for electricity generation is lost in conversion," 21 July 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=44436>. [Accessed 2024].
- [97] E. Warner, D. Seinberg and E. Hodson, "Potential Cost-Effective Opportunities for Methane Emission Abatement," National Energy Renewables Laboratory, Golden, CO, 2015.
- [98] E. Lewis, S. McNaul, M. Jamieson, M. S. Henriksen, H. S. Matthews, L. Walsh, J. Grove, T. Shultz, T. J. Skone and R. Stevens, "Comparison of Commercial, State-of-the-Art, Fossil-Based Hydrogen Production Technologies," National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, CO, 2022.
- [99] E. D. Sherwin, "Electrofuel Synthesis from Variable Renewable Electricity: An Optimization-Based Techno-Economic Analysis," *Environmental Science & Technology*, vol. 55, no. 11, pp. 7583-7594, 2021.
- [100] Y. K. Salkuyeh, B. A. Saville and H. L. MacLean, "Techno-economic analysis and life cycle assessment of hydrogen production from different biomass gasification processes," *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 43, no. 20, pp. 9514-9528, 2018.
- [101] Argonne National Laboratory, "Hydrogen Delivery Scenario Analysis Model (HDSAM)," [Online]. Available: <https://hdsam.es.anl.gov/index.php?content=hdsam>. [Accessed 2024].
- [102] National Conference of State Legislatures , "State Gas Pipelines - Breaking It Down: Understanding the Terminology," 22 Feb 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ncsl.org/energy/state-gas-pipelines>. [Accessed 2024].

- [103] U.S. Energy Information Association, "Natural Gas Annual Supply & Disposition by State," [Online]. Available: https://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/ng_sum_snd_a_EPGO_VCO_Mmcf_a.htm. [Accessed 2024].
- [104] M. Fasihi, O. Efimova and C. Breyer, "Techno-economic assessment of CO2 direct air capture plants," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 224, pp. 957-980, 2019.
- [105] Index Mundi, "Commodity Price Indices," 2022.
- [106] World Bank Group, "Commodity Markets," 2022.
- [107] U.S. Department of Energy, "Alternative Fuel Price Report," 2022.
- [108] International Energy Association, "Fossil jet and biojet fuel production cost ranges, 2010-2030," 2021.
- [109] ICF and American Gas Foundation, "Renewable Sources of Natural Gas: Supply and Emissions Reduction Assessment," 2019.
- [110] California Air Resources Program, "Cap-and-Trade Program Data Dashboard," 2022.
- [111] California Air Resources Board, "Monthly LCFS Credit Transfer Activity Reports," 2022.
- [112] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "RIN Trades and Price Information," 2022.
- [113] Bloomberg Tax, "Internal Revenue Code," 2022.
- [114] U.S. Department of Energy, "Biodiesel Production and Blending Tax Credit," 2007.
- [115] California Air Resources Board, "LCFS Pathway Certified Carbon Intensities," 2022.
- [116] California Air Resources Board, "LCFS Data Dashboard," 2022.
- [117] US Environmental Protection Agency, "Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories," 2014.
- [118] National Renewables Energy Laboratory, "2021 Electricity ATB Technologies and Data Overview," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://atb.nrel.gov/electricity/2021/index>. [Accessed 2022].

Revisions in this version

- Updated H2 D&S costs (from literature)
- Updated electricity T&D costs (from literature)
- Updated LCFS & H2 PTC assumptions (H2 PTC was formerly dependent on LCFS, now it is a separate calculation)
- “Top down” abatement costs (the ones that we don’t know) change from \$250/t to \$500/t (e.g. planes/trains/boats)
- Regrouped/lumped technologies in Figures 12/13 to make them more mathematically precise
- Updated costs of transportation vehicles and learning rates (All data now from NREL. Previously vehicle cost data was from KBB and learning rates were from various websites)
- LEAP battery bug fix, as well as various small bug fixes
- CDR has now been split explicitly into DAC and BECCS. Rev. 0 had 75 Mt of DAC (which was called CDR), as well as 10 Mt of CCS Gasification (which is essentially BECCS). This meant there was 85 Mt of CDR. CARB has only 75 Mt of CDR. Technically this was an error/oversight which has now been fixed.
- “Learning rates” have been re-envisioned, and are now flipped and termed “cost reduction potential”. The defaults have also changed slightly for items that could not be found in literature:
 - Previous mid case: High maturity= 0.1, Medium maturity =0.15, Low maturity =0.2, DAC = 0.3
 - Current mid case: High cost reduction potential =0.3 Low cost reduction potential =0.1
- Learning rates for transportation and DAC have been found in the literature and are now used instead of the defaults listed above.
- Electricity sector analysis updated based on new cost data. Additionally, broader selection of model runs has been selected to constrain potential future grid growth.
- BEV and FCEV analysis (in Chapter 7) now compares new sales fractions that are 100% BEV or 100% FCEV. Previous version assumed 80% BEV/20% FCEV or 80% FCEV/20% BEV.