



# Assumptions to the Annual Energy Outlook 2026: Carbon Capture, Allocation, Transportation, and Sequestration Module

April 2026

The U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), the statistical and analytical agency within the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), prepared this report. By law, our data, analyses, and forecasts are independent of approval by any other officer or employee of the U.S. Government. The views in this report do not represent those of DOE or any other federal agencies.

## Table of Contents

Overview .....	1
Key assumptions .....	2
Capture facility assumptions .....	2
Pipeline network cost and assumptions .....	4
Saline storage assumptions.....	5
CO <sub>2</sub> EOR assumptions.....	5
CO <sub>2</sub> price assumptions.....	6
Technology improvement rate assumptions .....	6
Capacity expansion and financing assumptions.....	6
Legislation and Regulations .....	7
Energy Improvement and Extension Act of 2008 .....	7
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 .....	7
Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 .....	8
One Big Beautiful Bill Act of 2025 .....	8
Appendix A. Summary of Storage Formations.....	9
Notes and Sources .....	14

## Table of Figures

Figure 1. CCATS nodal network representation.....	1
Figure 2. Map of CO <sub>2</sub> enhanced oil recovery sites, as of April 2026.....	6

## Table of Tables

Table 1. CO <sub>2</sub> capture potential at represented existing facilities .....	3
Table 2. Select investment cost curves based on pipeline region from Brown et al.....	4
Table 3. Select maximum flow rates.....	5
Table 4. Summary of storage formations .....	5
Table 5. CCATS time periods and capacity expansion assumptions .....	7
Table 6. CCATS financing assumptions .....	7
Table A1. Summary of storage formations .....	9


## Overview

The Carbon Capture, Allocation, Transportation, and Sequestration (CCATS) Module in the National Energy Modeling System (NEMS) models and projects the capture, transport, and storage of energy-related carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) across the United States.

The CCATS module represents three distinct components of CO<sub>2</sub> flow as interconnected nodes in a network (Figure 1):

- **Supply sites:** Facilities where CO<sub>2</sub> is captured from various sources, including electric power generation, ethanol production, natural gas processing, hydrogen production, cement production, direct air capture (DAC), as well as naturally occurring source of CO<sub>2</sub>.
- **Trans-shipment points:** Points along a pipeline network that connects capture sites to sequestration locations, including both existing infrastructure and potential expansion routes.
- **Demand sites:** Locations where CO<sub>2</sub> is demanded, either stored in saline formations or as an input for enhanced oil recovery (EOR) wells.

Figure 1. CCATS nodal network representation



Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration

Note: CCS=carbon capture, allocation, transportation, and sequestration

For trans-shipment and demand node types, the module optimizes the flow of CO<sub>2</sub> from supply sources to demand sources using a linear program that minimizes the total system costs of moving captured CO<sub>2</sub> to demand nodes while incorporating applicable tax credits and other revenues as negative costs.

The CCATS module accounts for both operating and investment costs for capacity expansion for all trans-shipment nodes and for the sequestration demand nodes. Other NEMS modules provide CO<sub>2</sub>

supply captured from other sectors and CO<sub>2</sub> demand for EOR wells. The CCATS module then calculates CO<sub>2</sub> shadow prices, including transportation costs, sequestration costs, and potential net revenues from CO<sub>2</sub> sold, and returns prices to these other modules, which then inform their carbon capture and investment decisions.

The following sections detail the key assumptions, data sources, and methodologies used in modeling each component of the CCATS module system.

## Key assumptions

### *Capture facility assumptions*

CCATS represents CO<sub>2</sub> supply from both other NEMS modules as well as endogenously (within the CCATS module itself). External to CCATS, captured CO<sub>2</sub> supplies come from the following industries and corresponding NEMS modules:

- Electric power generation – Electricity Market Module (EMM)
- Ethanol production – Liquid Fuels Market Module (LFMM)
- Natural gas processing – Hydrocarbon Supply Module (HSM)
- Hydrogen production – Hydrogen Market Module (HMM)
- Cement production – Industrial Demand Module (IDM)

CCATS makes various assumptions on the granularity, geographic location, and costs associated with the CO<sub>2</sub> supplies from other NEMS modules. Geographically, the CCATS module receives captured CO<sub>2</sub> supplies from other modules in NEMS either at the [census-region](#) or [census-division](#) level. However, the CCATS module optimization model operates on a more granular level, specifically at the discrete facility level, to provide more precise projections. Accordingly, the CCATS module disaggregates captured CO<sub>2</sub> to specific CO<sub>2</sub> supply facilities.

To do this, we assign CO<sub>2</sub> supply to facilities with existing capture infrastructure. As the CO<sub>2</sub> industry grows, the CCATS module makes assumptions on which facilities start capturing CO<sub>2</sub> based on estimated costs to install capture technology and costs to connect supply facilities to the pipeline network. The methodology we use to model this varies by plant type.

For natural gas power plants, coal power plants, and bioenergy with carbon capture and storage power plants in the electric power sector, we use modified versions of National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) power plant studies.<sup>1,2</sup> These data provide the locations, expected cost of capture, and estimated CO<sub>2</sub> capture potential of existing power plants suitable for carbon capture retrofit.

For ethanol, natural gas processing, hydrogen (represented by ammonia), and cement facilities, we use the NETL Industrial Carbon Capture Retrofit Database<sup>3</sup> to identify facilities suitable for retrofit with carbon capture. Subsequently, we combine estimated capture cost and CO<sub>2</sub> capture potential from this dataset with geographic location data from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program.<sup>4</sup> We also use EPA Subpart PP<sup>5</sup> and an analysis by the Clean Air Task Force (CATF)<sup>6</sup> to determine whether a facility has been capturing CO<sub>2</sub>, and if so, for how long. Finally, we make modifications to assess CO<sub>2</sub> capture potential based on EIA-64A, EIA-757, and EIA-816 survey data.

Assumed current CO<sub>2</sub> capture potential for each of these facility types by census division is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. CO<sub>2</sub> capture potential at represented existing facilities**  
million metric tons (MMmt)

Census division	Ammonia	Cement	Coal power plant	Ethanol	Natural gas power plant	Natural gas processing	DAC/Natural CO <sub>2</sub>
New England	-	0.3	8.8	-	36.4	-	-
Middle Atlantic	-	5.1	67.1	0.5	165.8	-	-
East North Central	0.8	8.2	303.1	12.0	219.5	0.5	-
West North Central	2.5	14.1	425.7	31.5	25.8	0.0	-
South Atlantic	1.1	13.7	444.1	-	238.9	-	-
East South Central	0.9	6.4	214.5	1.0	147.8	-	15.9
West South Central	9.7	12.7	326.9	1.4	332.4	9.7	1.8
Mountain	0.6	8.0	219.1	-	120.4	3.3	97.7
Pacific	0.1	10.0	-	-	121.1	-	(s)
<b>Total</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>78.6</b>	<b>2,009.3</b>	<b>46.4</b>	<b>1,408.1</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>115.3</b>

Data source: U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Clean Air Task Force<sup>7</sup>

Note: Facilities with a capture cost greater than \$70/MMmt (2023\$) are excluded from the optimization.

- = No data

DAC = Direct Air Capture

(s) = Less than 0.1 million metric tons of capture potential

Within the CCATS module, CO<sub>2</sub> is supplied from both currently operating natural CO<sub>2</sub> domes and direct air capture (DAC). Data on CCATS endogenous CO<sub>2</sub> supply is obtained from several sources. We use data from DAC Coalition<sup>8</sup> for currently operating DAC pilot projects and facility characteristics. We use Fuhrman et al.<sup>9</sup> for projected DAC storage cost estimates. Locations of current and viable naturally existing CO<sub>2</sub> domes are taken from NETL's Subsurface Sources of CO<sub>2</sub> study<sup>10</sup> and paired with CO<sub>2</sub> extraction volumes from the EPA Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program. Spatially adjacent CO<sub>2</sub> domes are consolidated in CCATS as operational natural CO<sub>2</sub> fields. Cost estimates for natural CO<sub>2</sub> projects are also sourced from the NETL Subsurface Sources of CO<sub>2</sub> study, which are based on their CO<sub>2</sub> Resources Evaluation Analytical Model (CREAM), where costs are estimated based on geologic characteristics of each reservoir.

In addition to existing facilities, the CCATS module includes the option to install carbon capture at new facilities. These representative facilities use capture costs provided by the other NEMS modules. CCATS currently does not allow for expansion of new DAC facilities or new natural CO<sub>2</sub> fields.

### *Pipeline network cost and assumptions*

Supplies of CO<sub>2</sub> are transported via pipelines from capture sites to demand sites—either EOR or saline storage. In the CCATS module, CO<sub>2</sub> can be transported directly from a supply source to a demand source or indirectly via a series of trans-shipment points. This representation reflects current industry dynamics where some smaller CO<sub>2</sub> supply sites send captured CO<sub>2</sub> to a single storage or EOR site, while other groups of CO<sub>2</sub> capture infrastructure are connected via a regional pipeline network.

We built our transportation network by first representing the existing U.S. CO<sub>2</sub> pipeline network. We then created a second uniform grid to represent the trans-shipment network that can be used for capacity expansion. Finally, we included all the CO<sub>2</sub> capture sites, CO<sub>2</sub> EOR sites, and saline formation storage sites in the network.

Connections were then formed between these nodes based on pipeline length and node type. For example, sequestration nodes cannot connect to other sequestration nodes. Any pipelines that would cross over water or over land that is covered under the National Park Service<sup>11</sup> or National Register of Historic Places<sup>12</sup> have added cost multipliers that account for rerouting or additional permitting costs associated with these routes. The routes that are created are finally merged with cost calculations based on pipeline route distances.

Regionalized pipeline costs are based on the Fossil Energy and Carbon Management (FECM)/NETL CO<sub>2</sub> Transport Cost Model,<sup>13</sup> which uses a natural gas pipeline study from Brown et al. that is modified to account for the higher costs of CO<sub>2</sub> pipelines.<sup>14</sup> The FECM/NETL CO<sub>2</sub> Transport Cost Model is highly granular and inclusive of capital, operating, and financing costs by pipeline diameter, length, and pump count. By applying these cost factors across dozens of pipeline diameters and pump counts, we produce a minimum cost curve for each pipeline length, assuming a 20-year project lifespan. Once a minimum cost curve is calculated for each assessed pipeline length, electricity costs are backed out of the cost curve, leaving only fixed operating and maintenance costs and capital costs. Finally, a linear regression is performed on the minimum cost curve data for each pipeline length to produce cost equations for the model.

**Table 2. Select investment cost curves based on pipeline region from Brown et al.**

<b>Pipeline region</b>	<b>Pipeline length (miles)</b>	<b>Cost curve slope (dollars per metric ton of CO<sub>2</sub>)</b>
New England	150	\$51.42
Great Plains	150	\$23.47
New England	400	\$142.93
Great Plains	400	\$68.67

Data source: U.S. Energy Information Administration

Variable electricity operating costs for pipelines in the CCATS module are based on maximum flowrates and pump requirements. We treat CO<sub>2</sub> that is within the pipelines as a supercritical fluid, modeling the fluid as incompressible. We assume pump stations are built along the pipeline at a frequency of no more than two pumps per 100 miles. With these parameters, and with an array of pipeline lengths and pipe diameters, we calculate a maximum flowrate for each diameter, pump, and length combination and a corresponding pump power requirement. Electricity prices are received endogenously from NEMS.

**Table 3. Select maximum flow rates**

million metric tons per year

Pipeline length (miles)	Number of pumps	Diameter (inches)			
		12	24	36	48
150	0	2.50	15.15	43.39	91.45
150	1	3.54	21.48	61.48	129.53
150	2	4.35	26.33	75.36	158.75
400	0	1.52	9.23	26.47	55.81
400	1	2.16	13.11	37.54	79.13
400	2	2.65	16.08	46.04	97.02

Data source: U.S. Energy Information Administration

***Saline storage assumptions***

Saline formations are the only permanent CO<sub>2</sub> storage option in the CCATS module. Accurately modeling CO<sub>2</sub> storage requires multiple calculations to determine not only the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> that can be stored in each formation but also the cost of setting up an injection site, injecting CO<sub>2</sub>, and storing CO<sub>2</sub> in the formation. To do this, we relied on the Fossil Energy (FE)/NETL CO<sub>2</sub> Saline Storage Cost Model<sup>15</sup> for the list of geologic formations, as well as the base geologic/engineering calculations for injection rates and maximum CO<sub>2</sub> storage amounts in the formations. We used this same tool to estimate the costs for each individual injection project. A summary of the storage formations that are input into the module are shown in Table 4. A detailed list of formations that are input to the module are listed in the [Appendix](#).

**Table 4. Summary of storage formations**


	South	Midwest	West	Midwest	Northeast
Area (square miles)	675,703	262,009	375,353	17,128	8,201
Average maximum CO <sub>2</sub> per injection project (million metric tons)	7,783,104	5,679,189	8,472,865	4,021,910	5,037,070
Maximum number of injection projects	9,145	3,172	4,357	90	30
Average injection rate per project (million metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> per project per year)	2,334,931	1,135,838	1,694,573	134,064	167,903

Data source: U.S. Energy Information Administration

***CO<sub>2</sub> EOR assumptions***

Maximum demand for captured CO<sub>2</sub> from EOR sites is provided by the HSM in NEMS at the geological formation level. The CCATS module meets CO<sub>2</sub> demanded for EOR through either captured CO<sub>2</sub> or natural CO<sub>2</sub> domes. Natural sources of CO<sub>2</sub> fulfilled 62% of CO<sub>2</sub> supplied to EOR in 2023.<sup>16</sup>

**Figure 2. Map of CO<sub>2</sub> enhanced oil recovery sites, as of April 2026**



Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration, Hydrocarbon Supply Module  
 Note: EOR=enhanced oil recovery

### *CO<sub>2</sub> price assumptions*

CO<sub>2</sub> prices are calculated after the CCATS module linear program has solved using a regional weighted average of the shadow prices produced by the module. This price is inclusive of transportation and sequestration costs, net policy revenue, and revenue from selling CO<sub>2</sub> to EOR sites. This price does not include capture-related costs because these costs are calculated by the other NEMS modules that interface with the CCATS module as part of their carbon capture decisions.

### *Technology improvement rate assumptions*

The CCATS module includes a technology improvement rate that reduces the cost of a technology over time. A report by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)<sup>17</sup> estimates that major cost reductions are possible for carbon capture but only small reductions for transport and storage. We therefore include an annual improvement rate of 1% for pipeline transport and saline storage.

### *Capacity expansion and financing assumptions*

The CCATS module projects operation and capacity expansion of carbon transport and storage using three time periods (Table 5). The first time period is the current NEMS year, the second time period is the following year, and the third time period is a longer time horizon to inform long-term decisions. Capacity can be added during any period, but it is not available to use until the following time period.

**Table 5. CCATS time periods and capacity expansion assumptions**

Time period	Duration (years)	Capacity expansion
1	1	Yes
2	1	Yes
3	18	Yes

Data source: U.S. Energy Information Administration

Note: CCATS= Carbon Capture, Allocation, Transportation, and Sequestration Module

The CCATS module uses the assumptions shown in Table 6 for transportation and storage infrastructure investments. The fixed operation and maintenance (O&M) fraction is the relative amount of fixed O&M costs as compared with the capital investment cost. The buffer assumption is the amount of extra capacity that must be built to accommodate growth in CO<sub>2</sub> storage demand.

**Table 6. CCATS financing assumptions**

Parameter	Value
Debt ratio	40%
Return over capital cost	5%
Risk premia	2%
Financing years—transportation	20
Financing years—storage	26
Fixed O&M—transportation	2.5%
Fixed O&M—storage	8.7%
Capacity expansion buffer	15%

Data source: U.S. Energy Information Administration

Note: CCATS=Carbon Capture, Allocation, Transportation, and Sequestration Module;

O&M=operation and maintenance costs

## Legislation and Regulations

CCATS takes pertinent legislation and regulations into account when calculating the price of transporting and sequestering CO<sub>2</sub>. In recent years, this has been in the form of the IRS 45Q tax credit, which subsidizes carbon capture and storage through enhanced oil recovery or saline storage. The most recent update to this tax credit was made in the 2025 One Big Beautiful Bill Act (OBBBA), and these updates are reflected in all AEO2026 cases.

### Energy Improvement and Extension Act of 2008<sup>18</sup>

The Energy Improvement and Extension Act of 2008 included the establishment of the 45Q tax credit for the capture and sequestration of CO<sub>2</sub> from industrial facilities. This law established that CO<sub>2</sub> must be captured and disposed of within the United States.

### Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018<sup>19</sup>

The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 included extending the availability of the 45Q tax credit to facilities that began construction before 2024 and increased the tax credit. For EOR, the tax credit began at

\$10/metric ton (mt) and increased to \$35/mt in 2027. For saline storage, the tax credit began at \$20/mt and increased to \$50/mt in 2027. After 2027, the tax credit is inflation adjusted. The tax credit is available for 12 years.

### **Inflation Reduction Act of 2022<sup>20</sup>**

The Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (IRA) extended the 45Q tax credit to facilities that begin construction before 2032 and increased the credit. The tax credit value of captured CO<sub>2</sub> sent to EOR sites was increased to \$60/mt, while the tax credit value of captured CO<sub>2</sub> sent to storage sites was increased to \$85/mt.

### **One Big Beautiful Bill Act of 2025<sup>21</sup>**

The One Big Beautiful Bill Act of 2025 maintained many of the same fundamental features of the 45Q tax credit from the IRA but increased the tax credit for CO<sub>2</sub> sent to EOR sites. Under this new legislation, all CO<sub>2</sub> captured receives a tax credit of \$85 per metric ton, regardless of whether it is sent to EOR or to permanent saline storage. Similarly, CO<sub>2</sub> captured from DAC receives a credit of \$180 per metric ton for both EOR and saline storage.

## Appendix A. Summary of Storage Formations

Table A1. Summary of storage formations

Formation	State	Basin	Area (square miles)	Maximum CO <sub>2</sub> per injection project (million metric tons)	Maximum number of injection projects	Injection rate (million metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> /project/year)
Arbuckle1	OK	Northern Shelf Area	10,229.00	1,952,657.66	265.00	65,088.59
Arbuckle3	KS	Las Animas Arch	3,039.00	4,776,083.73	19.00	159,202.79
Arbuckle4	KS	Ozark Plateau	32,460.00	12,889,089.28	157.00	429,636.31
Atoka1	TX	Permian	51,294.00	2,863,937.62	809.00	95,464.59
Basal Cambrian1	MT	Kevin Dome	8,799.00	2,539,374.01	55.00	84,645.80
Basal Cambrian8	ND	Williston	11,350.00	1,442,924.17	179.00	48,097.47
Canyon1	TX	Palo Duro	15,157.00	3,201,386.12	239.00	106,712.87
Canyon2	NM	Tucumcari	8,502.00	1,670,288.41	257.00	55,676.28
Canyon3	TX	Permian	49,915.00	3,794,327.57	953.00	126,477.59
Cedar Keys-Lawson1	FL	South Florida	5,666.00	1,668,290.87	137.00	55,609.70
Cedar Keys-Lawson2	FL	South Florida	16,981.00	13,335,416.14	80.00	444,513.87
Cedar Keys-Lawson3	FL	South Florida	889.00	4,949,458.38	7.00	164,981.95
Cisco1	TX	Palo Duro	15,012.00	5,122,363.46	55.00	170,745.45
Dakota2	CO	Piceance	3,054.00	1,754,409.67	27.00	58,480.32
Dakota3	CO	San Juan	2,904.00	2,283,712.42	13.00	76,123.75
Dakota5	UT	Uinta	10,678.00	2,912,670.48	44.00	97,089.02
Dakota6	CO	Raton	2,540.00	2,550,808.39	10.00	85,026.95
Dakota8	CO	Denver	22,831.00	4,913,197.51	101.00	163,773.25
Dakota9	WY	Denver	5,028.00	3,326,973.64	20.00	110,899.12
Dakota10	NE	Denver	8,564.00	4,251,048.57	45.00	141,701.62
Domengine1	CA	Sacramento	2,069.00	17,495,740.20	10.00	583,191.34
Entrada1	CO	Piceance	9,237.00	3,865,293.80	50.00	128,843.13
Entrada2	UT	Uinta	10,799.00	22,806,044.88	44.00	760,201.50
Entrada6	WY	Denver	5,028.00	12,612,289.66	20.00	420,409.66
Entrada7	NE	Denver	8,564.00	3,792,771.09	45.00	126,425.70
Entrada9	NM	San Juan	5,705.00	2,234,254.79	47.00	74,475.16
Eutaw1	MS	Gulf Coast Onshore	29,518.00	2,968,396.80	129.00	98,946.56
Eutaw2	AL	Gulf Coast Onshore	8,478.00	1,873,159.34	41.00	62,438.64
Eutaw3	FL	Gulf Coast Onshore	13,014.00	1,498,763.65	59.00	49,958.79
Fountain1b	CO	Denver	5,044.00	12,090,925.60	31.00	403,030.85
Fountain2a	CO	Denver	2,794.00	4,536,023.46	11.00	151,200.78

Formation	State	Basin	Area (square miles)	Maximum CO <sub>2</sub> per injection project (million metric tons)	Maximum number of injection projects	Injection rate (million metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> /project/year)
Fountain2b	CO	Denver	2,794.00	18,853,646.70	11.00	628,454.89
Frio1	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	4,855.00	16,653,776.68	20.00	555,125.89
Frio2	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	4,357.00	34,495,968.50	20.00	1,149,865.62
Frio3a	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	1,193.00	32,675,228.34	8.00	1,089,174.28
Frio3b	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	1,193.00	15,498,370.92	8.00	516,612.36
Frio4	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	694.00	21,721,909.90	5.00	724,063.66
Frio5	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	323.00	8,392,730.31	3.00	279,757.68
sFrio6	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	1,889.00	2,808,286.19	137.00	93,609.54
Frio7a	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	1,537.00	23,918,233.97	15.00	797,274.47
Frio7b	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	1,537.00	4,509,141.32	15.00	150,304.71
Frio8	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	1,200.00	10,117,116.81	15.00	337,237.23
Frio9a	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	2,342.00	31,001,127.13	16.00	1,033,370.90
Frio9b	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	2,342.00	14,668,101.05	16.00	488,936.70
Frio10	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	2,317.00	36,601,443.29	12.00	1,220,048.11
Frio11	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	259.00	12,413,314.70	3.00	413,777.16
Frio12a	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	2,121.00	52,124,769.01	8.00	1,737,492.30
Frio12b	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	2,121.00	49,280,181.29	8.00	1,642,672.71
Frio13a	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	1,762.00	34,052,725.44	9.00	1,135,090.85
Frio13b	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	1,762.00	31,471,352.98	9.00	1,049,045.10

Formation	State	Basin	Area (square miles)	Maximum CO <sub>2</sub> per injection project (million metric tons)	Maximum number of injection projects	Injection rate (million metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> /project/year)
Frio13c	TX	Gulf Coast Onshore	1,762.00	28,758,682.49	9.00	958,622.75
Fusselman1	TX	Permian	51,068.00	16,710,464.42	195.00	557,015.48
Glorieta1	NM	Albuquerque	1,834.00	4,776,489.80	7.00	159,216.33
Hermosa1a	CO	Paradox	1,466.00	7,284,078.15	9.00	242,802.60
Hermosa1b	CO	Paradox	1,466.00	7,843,455.80	9.00	261,448.53
Knox1	IL	Illinois	10,500.00	5,155,921.61	56.00	171,864.05
Knox2	IL	Illinois	5,560.00	4,969,805.46	21.00	165,660.18
Knox3	IN	Illinois	4,930.00	1,038,353.39	149.00	34,611.78
Knox4	IN	Illinois	1,275.00	3,975,685.45	6.00	132,522.85
Knox5	KY	Illinois	2,610.00	6,529,070.24	11.00	217,635.67
Knox6	KY	Illinois	1,700.00	3,978,697.40	8.00	132,623.25
Leonard1	TX	Permian	51,294.00	4,722,387.15	809.00	157,412.91
Leonard2	NM	Permian	9,346.00	1,231,927.08	565.00	41,064.24
Lower Tuscaloosa1	AL	Gulf Coast Onshore	10,592.00	7,644,937.56	113.00	254,831.25
Lower Tuscaloosa2	AL	Gulf Coast Onshore	2,571.00	2,014,798.71	133.00	67,159.96
Lower Tuscaloosa3	FL	Gulf Coast Onshore	9,454.00	5,408,449.23	127.00	180,281.64
Lower Tuscaloosa5	GA	Gulf Coast Onshore	2,855.00	7,126,558.24	15.00	237,551.94
Lower Tuscaloosa7	LA	Gulf Coast Onshore	2,857.00	10,470,488.21	14.00	349,016.27
Lower Tuscaloosa8	MS	Gulf Coast Onshore	13,379.00	3,633,394.79	211.00	121,113.16
Lower Tuscaloosa9	MS	Gulf Coast Onshore	8,003.00	18,873,440.48	29.00	629,114.68
Lower Tuscaloosa10	MS	Gulf Coast Onshore	4,393.00	16,965,974.56	27.00	565,532.49
Lyons2	CO	Denver	2,784.00	2,335,698.67	12.00	77,856.62
Lyons3	CO	Canon City	1,590.00	2,276,967.95	6.00	75,898.93
Madison Gp-Mission Canyon1	ND	Williston	29,617.00	9,118,374.74	131.00	303,945.82
Madison Gp-Mission Canyon2	ND	Williston	3,536.00	5,884,731.43	21.00	196,157.71
Madison Gp-Mission Canyon3	SD	Williston	10,420.00	2,368,032.56	64.00	78,934.42

Formation	State	Basin	Area (square miles)	Maximum CO <sub>2</sub> per injection project (million metric tons)	Maximum number of injection projects	Injection rate (million metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> /project/year)
Madison Gp-Mission Canyon4	MT	Williston	42,151.00	3,309,151.39	695.00	110,305.05
Madison1	WY	Powder River	27,700.00	12,864,049.47	157.00	428,801.65
Mesaverde1	CO	San Juan	2,024.00	1,838,940.28	61.00	61,298.01
Mesaverde2	NM	San Juan	8,455.00	6,647,575.83	42.00	221,585.86
Minnelusa1	WY	Powder River	9,960.00	9,510,675.74	43.00	317,022.52
Minnelusa2	MT	Powder River	3,611.00	10,075,616.00	17.00	335,853.87
Mokelumne River1	CA	Sacramento	2,069.00	3,426,070.09	125.00	114,202.34
Morrison1	CO	San Juan	1,958.00	15,204,270.08	10.00	506,809.00
Morrison2	NM	San Juan	8,520.00	6,725,462.48	103.00	224,182.08
Morrison3	CO	Denver	24,922.00	4,304,702.66	113.00	143,490.09
Morrison7	UT	Uinta	8,007.00	5,011,104.70	121.00	167,036.82
Mount Simon2	IL	Illinois	5,957.00	15,162,834.74	24.00	505,427.82
Mount Simon3	IL	Illinois	20,633.00	1,658,830.92	1,069.00	55,294.36
Mount Simon5	IN	Illinois	5,054.00	6,660,417.16	47.00	222,013.91
Mount Simon6	IN	Illinois	29,370.00	3,025,531.38	761.00	100,851.05
Mount Simon7	MI	Michigan	5,446.00	4,971,305.34	79.00	165,710.18
Mount Simon8	MI	Michigan	4,788.00	3,577,577.19	28.00	119,252.57
Mount Simon11	KY	Arch-Cincinnati	10,350.00	1,059,960.60	139.00	35,332.02
Nugget1	CO	Green River	5,877.00	4,261,737.98	71.00	142,057.93
Nugget2	WY	Green River	22,707.00	7,384,532.77	142.00	246,151.09
Paluxy1	TX	East Texas	409.00	13,556,553.59	2.00	451,885.12
Paluxy2	TX	East Texas	8,108.00	2,661,385.92	173.00	88,712.86
Paluxy3	TX	East Texas	11,534.00	1,002,212.76	523.00	33,407.09
Paluxy4	AL	Gulf Coast Onshore	16,568.00	2,286,732.20	601.00	76,224.41
Paluxy5	FL	Gulf Coast Onshore	9,820.00	5,930,552.54	137.00	197,685.08
Queen1	TX	Palo Duro	51,294.00	3,405,636.08	809.00	113,521.20
Queen2	NM	Tucumcari	9,346.00	4,442,134.02	113.00	148,071.13
Red River1	ND	Williston	55,614.00	14,348,516.32	262.00	478,283.88
Red River2	MT	Williston	21,307.00	7,496,199.80	131.00	249,873.33
Repetto1	CA	Los Angeles	51.00	3,870,653.93	3.00	129,021.80
Repetto2a	CA	Los Angeles	320.00	26,976,584.54	2.00	899,219.48
Repetto2b	CA	Los Angeles	320.00	32,671,038.51	2.00	1,089,034.62
Repetto2c	CA	Los Angeles	320.00	30,209,182.11	2.00	1,006,972.74
Repetto3a	CA	Los Angeles	125.00	5,043,356.42	3.00	168,111.88
Repetto3b	CA	Los Angeles	125.00	20,635,791.92	1.00	687,859.73

Formation	State	Basin	Area (square miles)	Maximum CO <sub>2</sub> per injection project (million metric tons)	Maximum number of injection projects	Injection rate (million metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> /project/year)
Repetto3c	CA	Los Angeles	125.00	6,187,250.37	3.00	206,241.68
Repetto3d	CA	Los Angeles	125.00	16,457,241.00	1.00	548,574.70
Rose Run3	PA	Appalachian	8,201.00	5,037,069.78	30.00	167,902.33
Seven Rivers1	NM	Permian	9,346.00	5,947,611.62	113.00	198,253.72
Seven Rivers2	TX	Permian	51,068.00	18,834,103.45	195.00	627,803.45
St. Peter7	MI	Michigan	2,100.00	7,336,445.47	8.00	244,548.18
St. Peter8	MI	Michigan	11,160.00	2,164,875.21	44.00	72,162.51
St. Peter10	MI	Michigan	9,200.00	5,769,950.09	47.00	192,331.67
Starkey1	CA	Sacramento	2,069.00	2,971,953.83	125.00	99,065.13
Stevens1	CA	San Joaquin	2,393.00	4,427,856.87	14.00	147,595.23
Strawn1	TX	Permian	51,068.00	3,080,878.23	195.00	102,695.94
Tensleep4	WY	Wyoming Thrust Belt	6,902.00	1,326,490.78	417.00	44,216.36
Tensleep5	UT	Wyoming Thrust Belt	4,436.00	14,230,266.81	24.00	474,342.23
Washita- Fredericksburg1	AL	Gulf Coast Onshore	13,025.00	2,596,912.00	787.00	86,563.73
Washita- Fredericksburg2	FL	Gulf Coast Onshore	10,473.00	9,954,416.53	131.00	331,813.88
Waste Gate1	MD	Coastal Plain	904.00	9,883,387.52	5.00	329,446.25
Weber2	CO	Piceance	5,438.00	4,269,542.52	34.00	142,318.08
Weber3	CO	Sand Wash	5,712.00	9,499,292.61	28.00	316,643.09
Winters1a	CA	Sacramento	2,069.00	21,648,469.58	15.00	721,615.65
Winters1b	CA	Sacramento	2,069.00	29,175,917.97	10.00	972,530.60
Wolfcamp1	TX	Palo Duro	15,012.00	10,468,354.72	99.00	348,945.16
Wolfcamp2	NM	Tucumcari	8,502.00	2,284,004.67	257.00	76,133.49
Woodbine1	TX	East Texas	13,575.00	2,455,364.20	547.00	81,845.47

Data source: U.S. Energy Information Administration

## Notes and Sources

- <sup>1</sup> U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory. *Cost and Performance Baseline for Fossil Energy Plants Volume 1: Bituminous Coal and Natural Gas to Electricity*. Tommy Schmitt, Sarah Leptinsky, Marc Turner, Alexander Zoelle, Charles W. White, Sydney Hughes, Sally Homsy, Mark Woods, Hannah Travis Shultz; Robert E. James III, <https://doi.org/10.2172/1893822>
- <sup>2</sup> U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory. *Eliminating the Derate of Carbon Capture Retrofits (Rev. 2)*. Kyle L. Buchheit, Alex Zoelle, Eric Lewis, Marc Turner, Tommy Schmitt, Norma Kuehn, Sally Homsy, Shannon McNaul, Sarah Leptinsky, Allison Guinan, Mark Woods, Travis Shultz, Timothy Fout, Gregory Hackett, <https://doi.org/10.2172/1968037>
- <sup>3</sup> U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory. *Industrial CO<sub>2</sub> Capture Retrofit Database (IND CCRD)*. By Sydney Hughes, Alex Zoelle, Mark Woods, Samuel Henry, Sally Homsy, Sandeep Pidaparti, Norma Kuehn, Hannah Hoffman, Katie Forrest, Timothy Fout, William Summers, Steve Herron, and Eric Grol. Report no. DOE/NETL-2024/4408. 2023. <https://netl.doe.gov/energy-analysis/details?id=42be56f6-f37e-46f4-88ea-a77868da32f3>.
- <sup>4</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Atmospheric Protection. Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP) FLIGHT. Accessed February 5, 2025. <https://www.epa.gov/ghgreporting>.
- <sup>5</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Subpart PP – Suppliers of Carbon Dioxide. Accessed February 5, 2025. <https://www.epa.gov/ghgreporting/subpart-pp-suppliers-carbon-dioxide>.
- <sup>6</sup> Clean Air Task Force. US Carbon Capture Activity and Project Table. Accessed February 5, 2025. <https://www.catf.us/ccstableus/>.
- <sup>7</sup> U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory. *Cost and Performance Baseline for Fossil Energy Plants Volume 1: Bituminous Coal and Natural Gas to Electricity*. Tommy Schmitt, Sarah Leptinsky, Marc Turner, Alexander Zoelle, Charles W. White, Sydney Hughes, Sally Homsy, Mark Woods, Hannah Travis Shultz; Robert E. James III, <https://doi.org/10.2172/1893822>; U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory. *Eliminating the Derate of Carbon Capture Retrofits (Rev. 2)* Kyle L. Buchheit, Alex Zoelle, Eric Lewis, Marc Turner, Tommy Schmitt, Norma Kuehn, Sally Homsy, Shannon McNaul, Sarah Leptinsky, Allison Guinan, Mark Woods, Travis Shultz, Timothy Fout, Gregory Hackett, <https://doi.org/10.2172/1968037>; U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory. *Industrial CO<sub>2</sub> Capture Retrofit Database (IND CCRD)*. By Sydney Hughes, Alex Zoelle, Mark Woods, Samuel Henry, Sally Homsy, Sandeep Pidaparti, Norma Kuehn, Hannah Hoffman, Katie Forrest, Timothy Fout, William Summers, Steve Herron, and Eric Grol. Report no. DOE/NETL-2024/4408. 2023. <https://netl.doe.gov/energy-analysis/details?id=42be56f6-f37e-46f4-88ea-a77868da32f3>; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Atmospheric Protection. Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program (GHGRP) FLIGHT. Accessed February 5, 2025. <https://www.epa.gov/ghgreporting>; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Subpart PP – Suppliers of Carbon Dioxide. Accessed February 5, 2025. <https://www.epa.gov/ghgreporting/subpart-pp-suppliers-carbon-dioxide>; Clean Air Task Force. U.S. Carbon Capture Activity and Project Table. Accessed February 5, 2025. <https://www.catf.us/ccstableus/>.
- <sup>8</sup> Direct Air Capture Coalition. URL: <https://daccoalition.org/>.
- <sup>9</sup> Jay Fuhman, Andres Clarens, Katherine Calvin, Scott C Doney, James A Edmonds, Patrick O'Rourke, Pralit Patel, Shreekar Pradhan, William Shobe, and Haewon McJeon. The role of direct air capture and negative emissions technologies in the shared socioeconomic pathways towards +1.5 °C and +2 °C futures. *Environmental Research Letters*, 16:114012, 2021.
- <sup>10</sup> Chris Nichols, Jeffrey Eppink, Michael Marquis, Ramon Alvarado, Tom Heidrick, Phil DiPietro, and Robert Wallace. Subsurface sources of CO<sub>2</sub> in the contiguous United States. Volume 1: discovered reservoirs. Technical Report, National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), Pittsburgh, PA, Morgantown, WV, and Albany, OR (United States), 03 2014. URL: <https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1503261>.
- <sup>11</sup> U.S. General Services Administration. "National Park Boundaries." Data.Gov. Last modified December 2, 2020. Accessed February 5, 2025. <https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/national-park-boundaries>.
- <sup>12</sup> U.S. General Services Administration. "National Register of Historic Places." Data.Gov. Last modified November 2, 2014. Accessed February 5, 2025. <https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/national-register-of-historic-places-7eebd>.

- 
- <sup>13</sup> National Energy Technology Laboratory U.S. Department of Energy. *FECM/NETL CO<sub>2</sub> Transport Cost Model (2023): Description and User's Manual*. David Morgan, Allison Guinan, Alana Sheriff. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1992905>
- <sup>14</sup> D. Brown, K. Reddi and A. Elgowainy, "The Development of Natural Gas and Hydrogen Pipeline Capital Cost Estimating Equations," *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 47, pp. 33813-33826, 2022.
- <sup>15</sup> National Energy Technology Laboratory. *FE/NETL CO<sub>2</sub> Saline Storage Cost Model: User's Manual*. U.S. Department of Energy, Pittsburgh, PA, 2017.
- <sup>16</sup> EPA. Supply, Underground Injection, and Geologic Sequestration of Carbon Dioxide. Last modified January 14, 2025. Accessed February 5, 2025. <https://www.epa.gov/ghgreporting/supply-underground-injection-and-geologic-sequestration-carbon-dioxide>.
- <sup>17</sup> U.S. Department of Energy. *Pathways to Commercial Liftoff: Carbon Management*. By Ramsey Fahs, Rory Jacobson, Andrew Gilbert, Dan Yawitz, Catherine Clark, Jill Capotosto, Colin Cunliff, Brandon McMurtry, and Uisung Lee. 2023. Accessed February 5, 2025. [https://liftoff.energy.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/20230424-Liftoff-Carbon-Management-vPUB\\_update4.pdf](https://liftoff.energy.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/20230424-Liftoff-Carbon-Management-vPUB_update4.pdf).
- <sup>18</sup> H.R.6049 - 110th Congress (2007-2008): Energy Improvement and Extension Act of 2008. (2008, September 29). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/110th-congress/house-bill/6049>
- <sup>19</sup> H.R.1892 - 115th Congress (2017-2018): Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018. (2018, February 9). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/1892>
- <sup>20</sup> H.R.5376 - 117th Congress (2021-2022): Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. (2022, August 16). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/5376>
- <sup>21</sup> H.R.1 - 119th Congress (2025): An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title ii of h. con. res. 14. (2025, July 4). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/1>