



**Congressional  
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

---

# **The Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS): Cellulosic Biofuels**

**Kelsi Bracmort**

Specialist in Agricultural Conservation and Natural Resources Policy

August 1, 2014

**Congressional Research Service**

7-5700

[www.crs.gov](http://www.crs.gov)

R41106

## Summary

The Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) was expanded under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA; P.L. 110-140) in an effort to reduce dependence on foreign oil, promote biofuel use, and stabilize transportation fuel prices, among other goals. Over 15 years, the RFS requires that increasing amounts of biofuels—36 billion gallons by 2022—be used in transportation fuel. The mandate is to be accomplished in part with advanced biofuels, including cellulosic biofuels—fuels produced from cellulosic materials including grasses, trees, and agricultural and municipal wastes—which would increase over time to comprise some 44% of the RFS in 2022.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is required to set the annual standard for cellulosic biofuels under the RFS. If projected cellulosic biofuel production is less than the volume specified in the statute, EPA can lower the cellulosic biofuels standard. EPA concluded that the nation lacked sufficient production capacity to meet the RFS cellulosic biofuels mandate each year from 2010 to 2014. In 2010, EPA reduced the mandate from the statutory volume of 100 million gallons to 6.5 million ethanol-equivalent gallons, in 2011 from 250 million gallons to 6.0 million ethanol-equivalent gallons, in 2012 from 500 million gallons to 10.45 million ethanol-equivalent gallons, and in 2013 from 1 billion gallons to 810,185 ethanol-equivalent gallons. EPA proposes to lower the 2014 mandate from 1.75 billion gallons to 17 million ethanol-equivalent gallons, and to rescind the 2011 cellulosic biofuel standard. The 2010-2012 reduced mandates were not met by actual cellulosic biofuel production, which EPA reports was limited. Instead, these mandates were largely met with waiver credits. EPA extended the 2013 compliance deadline to 30 days following the date that the 2014 standard is finalized. EPA has not yet finalized the 2014 standard.

The cellulosic biofuels industry may ultimately be able to produce enough fuel to meet the RFS mandates if certain obstacles are overcome: lowering the cost of conversion technology at the initial stages of commercial application, easing access to financing, removing feedstock supply uncertainties, and creating certainty for tax incentives. Another challenge for the cellulosic biofuels industry—and all biofuels industries—is the petroleum industry’s opposition to the RFS overall, in part because it views the RFS as unworkable. Other industries—livestock and poultry producers in particular—have joined the petroleum industry in requesting that the RFS be modified, in many cases for reasons unrelated to cellulosic biofuel supply. Another supply constraint is the blend wall—the upper limit to the total amount of ethanol that by law can be blended into U.S. gasoline.

Several federal programs assist the cellulosic biofuels industry, including the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA’s) Biorefinery Renewable Chemical, and Biobased Manufacturing Assistance Program and Biomass Crop Assistance Program, and the U.S. Department of Energy’s (DOE’s) Loan Guarantee Program. EPA reports that some of the cellulosic biofuel companies identified in its 2014 proposed rule received or were offered significant federal financial support (approximately \$387 million) in the form of grants and loan guarantees from USDA and DOE.

## Contents

Introduction.....	1
The EISA RFS Cellulosic Biofuel Requirement.....	2
Waiver Authority .....	3
RFS Compliance.....	3
EPA Annual Cellulosic Biofuel Projections, 2010-2014.....	5
EPA Reported Cellulosic Biofuel Compliance, 2010-2013 .....	6
Legislative Context.....	8
The Role of Congress .....	8
The Role of EPA.....	11
Legal Challenges .....	12
Uncertainty .....	13
Cellulosic Biofuels.....	14
Potential Opportunities.....	15
Energy Security .....	15
Environment.....	15
Rural Economic Development .....	16
Potential Challenges .....	16
Financing.....	16
Feedstock Eligibility .....	17
Feedstock Supply .....	17
Existing Plant Capacity .....	18
Financial Assistance .....	18
Conclusion .....	21

## Tables

Table 1. RFS Biofuels Mandate in EPAct05 and EISA: Total Renewable Fuels and Cellulosic Biofuels .....	4
Table 2. Selected Proposed Legislation from the 113 <sup>th</sup> , 112 <sup>th</sup> , and 111 <sup>th</sup> Congresses Pertaining to Cellulosic Biofuels.....	9

## Contacts

Author Contact Information.....	21
---------------------------------	----

## Introduction

The Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS), created by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct05, P.L. 109-58) and expanded under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA; P.L. 110-140), mandates that domestic transportation fuel contain specified volumes of biofuels—including advanced biofuel, cellulosic biofuel, and biomass-based diesel—in an effort to reduce dependence on foreign oil, promote biofuel use, and stabilize transportation fuel prices, among other goals.<sup>1</sup> The RFS requires that increasing amounts of biofuels be included in transportation fuel over a 15-year period, starting with 9 billion gallons of total renewable fuel in 2008 building up to 36 billion gallons annually by 2022. The mandate is to be accomplished in large part with cellulosic biofuels, with 16 billion gallons required in 2022.

In addition to establishing annual volume requirements for each biofuel category of the RFS, Congress also gave the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) waiver authority to adjust the volumes given certain conditions. For instance, if the projected volume of cellulosic biofuel production is less than the volume specified in the statute, the EPA is required to lower the cellulosic biofuel volume. Due to a lack of U.S. cellulosic biofuel production capacity, the EPA, in successive years from 2010 to 2013, issued final rules under its waiver authority that lowered the cellulosic biofuel volume.<sup>2</sup> EPA also proposes to lower the 2014 cellulosic biofuel volume.<sup>3</sup>

Following the inception of the cellulosic biofuels mandate for the RFS, there continue to be questions about whether cellulosic biofuels can be produced in sufficient quantity to satisfy the RFS mandate in the near term, let alone in future years. Progress toward meeting the cellulosic biofuels mandate has been delayed on multiple fronts (e.g., financial, administrative, and technical). More specifically, feedstock supply, financial viability and financing, and technology advancement are considered among the limiting factors for cellulosic biofuel production. Following four consecutive years of RFS cellulosic biofuel volume reductions, and a proposed fifth year reduction, some contend that Congress should reconsider the configuration of the RFS, determine whether additional resources are necessary for cellulosic biofuel production, and assess the success rate of this effort compared to other renewable energy efforts. Others assert that the current structure provides adequate incentives and measures to address any cellulosic biofuel production shortfalls.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information on the expanded RFS, see CRS Report R43325, *The Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS): In Brief*, and CRS Report R40155, *Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS): Overview and Issues*.

<sup>2</sup> Additional information about the volume adjustments, including the federal court order to vacate the 2012 requirement and an EPA proposal to rescind the 2011 requirement, is provided in the cellulosic biofuel compliance section of this report. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Changes to Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Final Rule,” *75 Federal Register*, March 26, 2010; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2011 Renewable Fuel Standards; Final Rule,” *Federal Register*, December 9, 2010; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2012 Renewable Fuel Standards; Final Rule,” *Federal Register*, January 9, 2012; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Renewable Fuel Cellulosic Biofuel Standards; Direct Final Rule,” *79 Federal Register*, May 2, 2014.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “2014 Standards for the Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Proposed Rule,” *78 Federal Register*, November 29, 2013.

## The EISA RFS Cellulosic Biofuel Requirement

The expanded RFS established in Section 202 of EISA requires that a certain volume of cellulosic biofuels be included in the national transportation fuel supply.<sup>4</sup> The required volume increases incrementally each year. The RFS called for 100 million gallons in 2010, 3 billion gallons in 2015, 10.5 billion gallons in 2020, and 16 billion gallons by 2022 (see **Table 1**). Cellulosic biofuels would comprise some 44% of the mandate if 16 billion gallons of cellulosic biofuels were actually produced in 2022.

There are limited analyses that provide the backstory of how the EISA RFS annual cellulosic biofuel volume requirements were determined.<sup>5</sup> Data and analysis presented during the RFS debate and ultimate passage of EISA in 2007 supported the idea that the required levels of cellulosic biofuel production capacity could be achievable. Some argued that plentiful feedstock would be available<sup>6</sup> and that the conversion technology was close to being certified as commercially viable. Moreover, some presumed that the federal government would provide substantial financial support and enhance the infrastructure needed to spur a commercial cellulosic biofuels market.<sup>7</sup> Others were leery about the time frame provided to meet the RFS cellulosic biofuels mandate given the as-yet-undeveloped production capacity.<sup>8</sup>

### Cellulosic Biofuel Requirement Differences Between the RFS1 and the RFS2

Cellulosic biofuel requirements under the expanded RFS established by EISA, sometimes referred to as RFS2, are more substantial than the requirements under the original RFS (or RFS1) established by §1501 of EPCA05. There are three points in particular where differences exist between the expanded RFS and the original RFS: cellulosic biofuel type, cellulosic biofuel volume, and the production timeframe. First, the original RFS had a narrower definition of what constituted a cellulosic biofuel, limiting the mandate to only cellulosic biomass ethanol. The original RFS did have a broader definition as to what counted as cellulosic material. The expanded RFS has a broader definition for cellulosic biofuels, accepting a variety of biofuel types from cellulosic material. Second, under the expanded RFS, the cellulosic biofuel volumes required are much larger. Third, the timeframe to produce the biofuels was expedited under EISA. The original RFS was much smaller in scope, requiring 4.0 billion gallons of total renewable fuel for 2006, ascending to 7.5 billion gallons by 2012. Further, the original RFS would have required that 250 million gallons of the renewable fuel be derived from cellulosic biomass starting in 2013, whereas the expanded RFS required 250 million gallons of cellulosic biofuel in 2011.

<sup>4</sup> The EISA statute defines ‘cellulosic biofuel’ as renewable fuel derived from any cellulose, hemi-cellulose, or lignin that is derived from renewable biomass and that has lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions, as determined by the EPA Administrator, that are at least 60% less than the baseline lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions. More information is provided in the cellulosic biofuels section.

<sup>5</sup> One case study suggests that the expanded RFS volume requirements, overall and for individual biofuel categories, had “no reference within the energy policy subsystem.” For more information, see H. L. Breetz, “Fueled by Crisis: U.S. Alternative Fuel Policy, 1975-2007”, (Doctoral dissertation, Dartmouth College, 2012).

<sup>6</sup> U.S. Dept. of Energy, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, *Biomass as Feedstock for a Bioenergy and Bioproducts Industry: The Technical Feasibility of a Billion-Ton Annual Supply*, April 2005, [http://www1.eere.energy.gov/biomass/pdfs/final\\_billionton\\_vision\\_report2.pdf](http://www1.eere.energy.gov/biomass/pdfs/final_billionton_vision_report2.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> Diane Greer, “Creating Cellulosic Ethanol: Spinning Straw into Fuel,” *BioCycle*, April 2005; Biotechnology Industry Organization, *Achieving Sustainable Production of Agricultural Biomass for Biorefinery Feedstock*, Washington, DC, 2006, <http://www.bio.org/ind/biofuel/SustainableBiomassReport.pdf>; and Biotechnology Industry Organization, “Energy Bill Biofuels Mandates Will Be Achievable with Biotechnology Advances,” press release, November 18, 2007, [http://bio.org/news/pressreleases/newsitem.asp?id=2007\\_1218\\_01&p=yes](http://bio.org/news/pressreleases/newsitem.asp?id=2007_1218_01&p=yes).

<sup>8</sup> Ian Talley, “Renewed Energy: US Biofuel Mandate Calls for Big Production Boost,” *Dow Jones International News*, December 18, 2007, at <http://www.factiva.com/>.

## Waiver Authority

Congress granted EPA the authority to waive completely or in part the consumption mandates for cellulosic biofuels established in EISA, under certain circumstances.<sup>9</sup> For instance, the cellulosic biofuels requirement may be waived if the Administrator determines, after public notice and opportunity for comment, that there is an inadequate domestic supply.<sup>10</sup> Should EPA decide to lower the cellulosic biofuel volume in a given year, it is required to set the volume by November 30 of the preceding year. If EPA grants a cellulosic waiver, the agency must issue waiver credits.<sup>11</sup> EPA may also waive the RFS or any specific category of the RFS if there is evidence that full implementation may cause severe economic or environmental harm.

## RFS Compliance

EPA monitors RFS compliance by fuel blenders and other obligated parties according to their reported accumulation of renewable identification numbers (RINs) for each biofuel's yearly volumetric standard. A RIN is a unique 38-character number that is issued (in accordance with EPA guidelines) by the biofuel producer or importer at the point of biofuel production or the port of importation. Each qualifying gallon of renewable fuel has its own unique RIN. The EPA uses its Moderated Transaction System (EMTS) to manage RIN transactions.<sup>12</sup> Using data generated from EMTS, EPA provides aggregated monthly data on RIN generation and renewable fuel volume production for specific fuel categories, such as cellulosic biofuel.<sup>13</sup> In general, compliance is achieved by a fuel blender when the number of RINs generated and assigned each year for cellulosic biofuels equates to the volume requirement for that year. Previous-year RINs may be used to meet current-year compliance, although there are some stipulations.

As noted above, EPA has the authority to waive the cellulosic biofuel mandate on a yearly basis. In any year that EPA grants a waiver, the agency must also make waiver credits available at a set price, the formula for which is set in statute.<sup>14</sup> Waiver credits may be used by obligated parties to comply with the cellulosic biofuel volume obligation in lieu of RINs generated with the production of the cellulosic biofuel.<sup>15</sup> The 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013 prices for a cellulosic biofuel waiver credit were \$1.56, \$1.13, \$0.78, and \$0.42, respectively. EPA did not announce the price for the 2014 cellulosic biofuel waiver credit in its proposed rule. If waiver credits<sup>16</sup> are

---

<sup>9</sup> For more information on EPA's waiver authority, see CRS Report RS22870, *Waiver Authority Under the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS)*.

<sup>10</sup> 42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(7)(D).

<sup>11</sup> Waiver credits are discussed in the RFS compliance section of this report.

<sup>12</sup> For more information on EMTS, see <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/rfsdata/2014emts.htm>.

<sup>13</sup> Concerns have been raised about fraudulent RINs, especially due to recent biodiesel fraudulent RIN activity. While RIN fraud is possible as discussed in CRS Report R42824, *Analysis of Renewable Identification Numbers (RINs) in the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS)*, there has been no reported fraudulent cellulosic biofuel RIN activity. In July 2014, EPA issued a final rule that establishes a voluntary quality assurance program for verifying the validity of RINs. For more information, see U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "RFS Renewable Identification Number (RIN) Quality Assurance Program; Final Rule," 79 *Federal Register*, July 18, 2014.

<sup>14</sup> 42 U.S.C. 7545 (o)(7)(D)(ii)

<sup>15</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Questions and Answers on Changes to the Renewable Fuel Standard Program (RFS2)*, February 2013.

<sup>16</sup> Waiver credits are not allowed to be traded or banked for future use, and are only allowed to be used to meet the cellulosic biofuel standard for the year that they are offered.

issued (when the mandate is reduced), compliance is met when the combination of waiver credits and RINs equates to the volume requirement for that year.

**Table 1. RFS Biofuels Mandate in EPAAct05 and EISA: Total Renewable Fuels and Cellulosic Biofuels**  
(in billions of gallons)

Year	EPAAct05		EISA		
	Total renewable fuels	Cellulosic biomass ethanol	Total renewable fuels	Cellulosic biofuels	
				Original	EPA revised (ethanol-equivalent volume)
2006	4.0	—	—	—	—
2007	4.7	—	—	—	—
2008	5.4	—	9.00	0.00	—
2009	6.1	—	11.10	0.00	—
2010	6.8	—	12.95	0.100	0.0065 <sup>a</sup>
2011	7.4	—	13.95	0.250	0.0060 <sup>b</sup>
2012	7.5	—	15.20	0.500	0.0105 <sup>c</sup>
2013	†	0.250	16.55	1.00	0.0008 <sup>d</sup>
2014	†	◇	18.15 (15.21 EPA revised) <sup>e</sup>	1.75	<0.0170 <sup>e</sup>
2015	†	◇	20.5	3.00	—
2020	†	◇	30.0	10.5	—
2022	†	◇	36.0	16.0	—

**Source:** EPAAct05 (P.L. 109-58) Section 1501, and EISA (P.L. 110-140), Section 202. Ethanol-equivalent volume is the volume used for RFS compliance purposes, which takes into account the energy content of the fuel. † = according to EPAAct05 statute, the total renewable fuel amount for 2013 and thereafter shall be determined by the EPA Administrator. ◇ = according to EPAAct05 statute, a minimum of 250 million gallons of cellulosic biomass ethanol is required for 2013 and thereafter.

- a. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Changes to Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Final Rule,” 75 *Federal Register*, March 26, 2010.
- b. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2011 Renewable Fuel Standards; Final Rule,” *Federal Register*, December 9, 2010.
- c. Vacated under *API vs. EPA*. Level originally set by EPA at 0.00865 billion gallons. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2012 Renewable Fuel Standards; Final Rule,” *Federal Register*, January 9, 2012.
- d. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards; Final Rule,” 79 *Federal Register*, May 2, 2014.
- e. EPA proposes to reduce the 2014 cellulosic biofuel mandate to 17 million ethanol-equivalent gallons and the 2014 Renewable fuel mandate to 15.21 billion gallons. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “2014 Standards for the Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Proposed Rule,” 78 *Federal Register*, November 29, 2013.



## EPA Annual Cellulosic Biofuel Projections, 2010-2014

EPA generally conducts its cellulosic biofuels volume analysis based on an evaluation of individual producers' production plans and progress to date, following discussions with cellulosic biofuel producers, the Energy Information Administration (EIA), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Department of Energy (DOE), and an assessment of the probabilities associated with production schedules from each of these producers.<sup>17</sup> EPA's analyses concluded that the United States did not have sufficient cellulosic biofuel production capacity to meet the scheduled RFS mandates for 2010-2014. Therefore, for 2010 EPA reduced the mandate from the statutory volume<sup>18</sup> of 100 million gallons to 6.5 million ethanol-equivalent gallons;<sup>19</sup> for 2011 from 250 million gallons to 6.0 million ethanol-equivalent gallons;<sup>20</sup> for 2012 from 500 million gallons to 10.45 million ethanol-equivalent gallons;<sup>21</sup> and for 2013 from 1 billion gallons to 810,185 ethanol equivalent gallons.<sup>22</sup> EPA proposes to lower the 2014 mandate from 1.75 billion gallons to 17 million ethanol-equivalent gallons.<sup>23</sup>

In response to legal challenges for some years, EPA revised the annual cellulosic biofuel standard to zero or has proposed to voluntarily rescind an annual cellulosic biofuel standard.<sup>24</sup> This occurs when the standard reduced by EPA had not been met. For instance, the 2012 standard was vacated by a court decision. As a follow-up to the same court decision, EPA proposed to rescind the 2011 cellulosic biofuel standard.

---

<sup>17</sup> In its 2014 Standards for the Renewable Fuel Standard Program proposed rule, EPA reported it tracked the progress of several dozen potential cellulosic biofuel production facilities. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "2014 Standards for the Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Proposed Rule," *78 Federal Register*, November 29, 2013.

<sup>18</sup> A distinction between which type of gallon is being referred to—straight or ethanol-equivalent—must be made. The ethanol-equivalent value takes into account the difference in energy content between renewable fuels, and therefore allows for direct comparisons. An ethanol-equivalence value for a renewable fuel with a higher energy content than corn starch ethanol, such as biodiesel, may allow for that fuel to count more per gallon toward a mandate than other biofuels.

<sup>19</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Changes to Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Final Rule," *75 Federal Register*, March 26, 2010.

<sup>20</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2011 Renewable Fuel Standards; Final Rule," *Federal Register*, December 9, 2010.

<sup>21</sup> Environmental Protection Agency, *Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2012 Renewable Fuel Standards, Final Rule*, January 9, 2012. This rule was vacated by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit in *API v. EPA*. EPA revised the 2012 rule and set the final required level at zero.

<sup>22</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards; Final Rule," *79 Federal Register*, May 2, 2014; EPA had previously issued a final rule on August 15, 2013 reducing the 2013 cellulosic biofuel standard to 6.0 million ethanol-equivalent gallons.

<sup>23</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "2014 Standards for the Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Proposed Rule," *78 Federal Register*, November 29, 2013.

<sup>24</sup> Additional information about these volume adjustments is provided in the legal challenges section of this report.



## EPA Reported Cellulosic Biofuel Compliance, 2010-2013

In a straightforward scenario, cellulosic biofuel compliance for the RFS requires actual cellulosic biofuel production, waiver credits, or a combination of both. However, things quickly become complicated when cellulosic biofuels are not produced on schedule. Despite the RFS mandate for cellulosic biofuels starting in 2010, the first registered production of cellulosic biofuels in the United States was not achieved until 2012.<sup>25</sup>

Even before enactment of EISA, which expanded the RFS, reported production data indicated that overcoming any or all of the hurdles to increasing cellulosic biofuel production to meet the original 2010 RFS mandate of 100 million gallons set by Congress was unlikely. 2010 was a transition year for the RFS, going from the RFS established under EPAct05 (RFS1) to the RFS established under EISA (RFS2). RFS1 had different production requirements than RFS2 for cellulosic biofuels,<sup>26</sup> including an ethanol-equivalency ratio of 2.5-to-1, where each gallon of cellulosic ethanol counted as 2.5 gallons toward the EPAct05 mandate.<sup>27</sup> EPA reports that zero cellulosic biofuel RINs were produced in 2010 under the RFS2 rules.<sup>28</sup> EPA reports that the majority of compliance for 2010 was met with RINs generated (i.e., production) under RFS1.<sup>29</sup> EMTS records show that 12,186 cellulosic biofuel waiver credits were purchased in 2010, which likely made up for the remainder of 2010 compliance.<sup>30</sup>

More compliance data are available for the 2011 and 2012 RFS cellulosic biofuels mandates. However, evaluation of the available data is difficult. Compliance for both years could have been met with cellulosic biofuel RINs and waiver credits. EPA reports that zero cellulosic biofuel RINs were produced in 2011.<sup>31</sup> Compliance for 2011 was met with excess cellulosic biofuel RINs generated in 2010 under RFS1 and cellulosic biofuel waiver credits.<sup>32</sup> EMTS records report that

---

<sup>25</sup> EPA reports that the first cellulosic biofuel RINs were registered in 2012 for cellulosic biofuel produced at demonstration-scale facilities. For 2009 and 2010, cellulosic production was registered under the RFS pre-EISA. Under the earlier definition, cellulosic biofuel could either be fuel produced from cellulosic feedstocks or fuel from conventional feedstocks using biomass for process energy. EISA eliminated the latter option.

<sup>26</sup> The original RFS (RFS1) did not require a cellulosic biofuel production volume until 2013, when 250 million gallons were mandated. Further, the definition of cellulosic biofuel was amended by EISA.

<sup>27</sup> EISA did not stipulate a 2.5-1 ratio for cellulosic biofuel for the RFS2. Instead, the ethanol equivalence value depends on the type of biofuel being produced.

<sup>28</sup> EMTS reports zero RINs available for 2010 cellulosic biofuel and cellulosic diesel. For more information, see <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/rfsdata/2010emts.htm>.

<sup>29</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards; Proposed Rule," 78 *Federal Register*, February 7, 2013. The design of the RFS2 transition program allowed for RFS1 cellulosic RINs to be used towards compliance under the RFS2 program. The RFS1 cellulosic RINs likely came from non-cellulosic feedstocks that qualified under the then-effective definition of cellulosic biomass. EPA reports the 2010 cellulosic biofuel standard could have been met with cellulosic biofuel RINs generated under RFS2 regulations after July 1, 2010, cellulosic biomass ethanol RINs generated under RFS1 regulations between January 1, 2010 and July 1, 2010, and cellulosic biomass ethanol RINs generated under RFS1 regulations in 2009. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Questions and Answers on Changes to the Renewable Fuel Standard Program (RFS2)*, <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/renewablefuels/compliancehelp/rfs2-aq.htm>.

<sup>30</sup> See <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/rfsdata/rfs2cellulosicwaivercredits.htm>.

<sup>31</sup> EMTS reports zero RINs available for 2011 cellulosic biofuel and cellulosic diesel. For more information, see <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/rfsdata/2011emts.htm>.

<sup>32</sup> The statute allows companies to purchase cellulosic biofuel waiver credits in lieu of submitting RINs in years when (continued...)

4,248,388 RFS2 cellulosic biofuel waiver credits were purchased in 2011.<sup>33</sup> EPA reports that there is no “need to address compliance with the 2012 cellulosic biofuel standard” since there was a federal court decision that vacated the 2012 standard.<sup>34</sup> EMTS reports that 20,069 RINS were generated for cellulosic biofuel and 1,741 RINS were generated for cellulosic diesel in 2012.<sup>35</sup>

In its 2013 final rule, EPA set a 2013 cellulosic biofuel volume standard of 810,185 ethanol-equivalent gallons that is based on the Energy Information Administration’s (EIA’s) estimate of available supply, production volumes developed in consultation with the companies expected to produce cellulosic biofuel from commercial-scale facilities in 2013, and EPA’s judgment.<sup>36</sup> EPA projected that the 2013 cellulosic mandate would be met by production from two companies: INEOS Bio and KiOR.<sup>37</sup> EMTS reports that 422,740 RINS were generated for cellulosic biofuel and 387,445 RINS were generated for cellulosic diesel for the 2013 standard, as of July 17, 2014.<sup>38</sup> EPA announced in July 2014 that it would extend the 2013 compliance deadline for obligated parties to 30 days following the date that the 2014 standard is finalized.<sup>39</sup>

In its 2014 proposed rule, EPA proposes a 2014 cellulosic biofuel standard of 17 million ethanol-equivalent gallons. EPA projects that the mandate could be met by five companies with approved pathways, two of which are operational (INEOS Bio and KiOR). Additionally, the mandate may be met by potential cellulosic biofuel producers using new pathways finalized by EPA in July 2014 (e.g., compressed natural gas and liquefied natural gas produced from biogas from landfills, municipal waste-water treatment facility digesters, agricultural digesters, and separated municipal solid waste digesters, as well as electricity used to power electric vehicles produced from biogas from landfills, municipal waste-water treatment facility digesters, agricultural digesters, and separated municipal solid waste digesters). EPA also determined that corn kernel fiber meets the definition of a crop residue, if the source of the corn kernel fiber is incidental to some other primary purpose, allowing it to qualify as a renewable fuel feedstock.<sup>40</sup> Last, EPA acknowledges that there are potential foreign sources of cellulosic biofuels, although these entities are not

---

(...continued)

EPA lowers the mandate. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards; Final Rule,” *78 Federal Register*, August 15, 2013.

<sup>33</sup> See <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/rfsdata/rfs2cellulosicwaivercredits.htm>. If the 2011 cellulosic biofuel standard is rescinded, EPA reports that it would refund the money paid by obligated parties to purchase cellulosic waiver credits to comply with the 2011 cellulosic biofuel standard.

<sup>34</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Enviroflash, *Update - 2012 Cellulosic Biofuel Standard Mandate Issued*, February 27, 2013.

<sup>35</sup> Blue Sugar Corporation is the first company to be issued cellulosic biofuel RINs. EPA reports these RINs were “retired” because the cellulosic ethanol produced was exported to Brazil. For more information, see <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/rfsdata/2012emts.htm>. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards; Final Rule,” *78 Federal Register*, August 15, 2013.

<sup>36</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Cellulosic Biofuel Standard; Final Rule,” *79 Federal Register*, May 2, 2014.

<sup>37</sup> INEOS Bio announced on July 31, 2013, that it started commercial production of cellulosic ethanol. KiOR announced on August 8, 2013, that it shipped over 75,000 gallons of cellulosic fuel from its commercial facility. The financial state of KiOR—and its impact on the company’s ability to produce cellulosic biofuels—is unclear.

<sup>38</sup> For more information, see <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/rfsdata/2013emts.htm>

<sup>39</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Extension of Compliance and Attest Engagement Reporting Deadlines for 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards,” Pre-publication copy, July 31, 2014.

<sup>40</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: RFS Pathways II, and Technical Amendments to the RFS Standards and E15 Misfueling Mitigation Requirements; Final Rule,” Pre-publication copy, July 2, 2014.

expected to export the fuel they produce to the United States in the near term. EPA reports that there are four foreign companies with approved fuel production pathways, but the companies have not registered their cellulosic biofuel facilities with the RFS. EPA made similar assessments of some of these same plants in its 2013 rule—assessments that proved inaccurate. It is not evident what has changed between the time the 2013 rule was finalized and the 2014 rule was proposed. EMTS reports that 72,754 RINs were generated for cellulosic biofuel and 11,213 RINs were generated for cellulosic diesel for the 2014 standard, as of July 17, 2014.<sup>41</sup>

## Legislative Context

The shift toward large-scale, economically feasible production of cellulosic biofuels has thus far proven to be illusive. Advancements have been made, but not in step with the pace set by Congress for the RFS. Multiple factors have contributed to the cellulosic biofuels market being at the stage it is today, with the two major factors being technological issues and a recession that slowed the economy, including energy demand.<sup>42</sup> Due to production shortfalls, EPA has significantly reduced the cellulosic biofuels mandate each year from 2010 through 2013 and proposes to do so again for 2014. It appears that Congress overestimated how much cellulosic biofuel production would occur on an annual basis. It also appears that projecting the production amount continues to be a challenge for both EPA and EIA.<sup>43</sup> Thus, it is difficult to state with certainty how much cellulosic biofuel may be produced in the future and in what time frame.

If mandate reductions and continual production shortfalls signify that the cellulosic biofuels mandate is not working as intended, Congress could decide modifications are necessary. Advocates of cellulosic biofuels may find it beneficial for Congress to make the mandate more attainable in the near term (e.g., two to five years), primarily so that the industry has more time to show whether large-scale commercial production is economically feasible. Opponents may view any additional congressional action to assist the cellulosic biofuels community as harmful to the entire renewable energy market in the long run, as some believe that it could be extending the life of dead-end technologies. Other opponents find the entire RFS unworkable and seek to eliminate it entirely (often for reasons unrelated to cellulosic biofuels specifically).

## The Role of Congress

Congress continues to have the authority to maintain or amend the RFS statutory mandates. Should the RFS be continued in its present form, amended, or eliminated completely? What additional public costs would each of these options engender? When expanding the RFS in EISA, Congress in effect made a technology choice by selecting a preferred technology (i.e., cellulosic biofuel) among many unknown technologies. Undoing that commitment by modifying or repealing the RFS could involve substantial costs to both public and private investors. Another issue to be analyzed may be a technology assessment to determine if selecting one unproven technology for financial and policy incentives fits into a larger energy policy context.

---

<sup>41</sup> For more information, see <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/fuels/rfsdata/2014emts.htm>

<sup>42</sup> These and other cellulosic biofuel production challenges are further explained in the cellulosic biofuels section.

<sup>43</sup> EIA reports that “its forecasts and projections to date have proven to be too optimistic, as volumes have been below expectations.” U.S. Energy Information Administration, *Cellulosic biofuels begin to flow but in lower volumes than foreseen by statutory targets*, February 26, 2013.

The discussion about whether the cellulosic biofuels industry requires additional federal support to meet the RFS mandate has continued since the inception of the RFS; however, the discussion became more pronounced when the RFS was expanded in 2007 to call for a much larger volume of cellulosic biofuel to be produced in a shorter timeframe. In response, Members of the 111<sup>th</sup>, 112<sup>th</sup>, and 113<sup>th</sup> Congresses have proposed a variety of bills that could affect the cellulosic biofuels industry (see **Table 2**). The 112<sup>th</sup> Congress passed legislation that may aid the industry. In particular, the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (ATRA, P.L. 112-240) extended the cellulosic biofuel production tax credit and the cellulosic biofuel plant special depreciation allowance through the end of 2013, and included algae as a qualified feedstock for both tax incentives. ATRA also renamed the tax credit and depreciation allowance to “second generation” biofuel, removing the term “cellulosic.”

**Table 2. Selected Proposed Legislation from the 113<sup>th</sup>, 112<sup>th</sup>, and 111<sup>th</sup> Congresses Pertaining to Cellulosic Biofuels**

Congress	Legislation
113 <sup>th</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• H.R. 550 and S. 251 would modify the way EPA projects yearly cellulosic biofuel mandates.</li> <li>• H.R. 796 would require a reduction in the advanced biofuel mandate if the cellulosic mandate is lowered in any given year.</li> <li>• H.R. 1461 would repeal the RFS.</li> <li>• H.R. 1462 would eliminate the non-advanced biofuel portion of the RFS and would modify the way EPA projects yearly cellulosic biofuel mandates.</li> </ul>
112 <sup>th</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• H.R. 230 would have modified the DOE Loan Guarantee Program, appropriating funds for EPAAct05 Section 1512 Conversion Assistance for Cellulosic Biomass Waste-Derived Ethanol Approved Renewable Fuels, establishing a loan guarantee program for cellulosic ethanol production technology development.</li> <li>• H.R. 424 would have amended the RFS to revert back to RFS1 targets and eliminated all advanced biofuel mandates.</li> <li>• H.R. 851, H.R. 2231, S. 884, S. 1294 would have implemented new financial support mechanisms, extending relevant tax provisions.</li> <li>• H.R. 6047 would have modified the way EPA projects yearly cellulosic biofuel volume mandates.</li> </ul>
111 <sup>th</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S. 943 and H.R. 2283 would have waived the lifecycle greenhouse gas emission reduction requirements for renewable fuel production.</li> <li>• Section 129 of the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 (H.R. 2454, also known as Waxman-Markey) would have amended the Loan Guarantee Program to incorporate renewable fuel pipeline construction.</li> <li>• Title I of the American Clean Energy Leadership Act of 2009 (ACELA, S. 1462) would have amended the Loan Guarantee Program and created a Clean Energy Deployment Administration, under DOE, to advance lending and implementation of commercial clean energy technologies.</li> </ul>

**Source:** CRS.

**Notes:** Legislation is presented in order of House introduction.

Congress could decide to modify the cellulosic biofuels mandate, and thus the RFS. This option could require an analysis of the cellulosic biofuels market and, perhaps more importantly, consideration of circumstances that were not as prevalent when the RFS was expanded in 2007. Some of these circumstances include budget concerns, the blend wall,<sup>44</sup> military interest in renewable fuels,<sup>45</sup> and the slow development of the cellulosic biofuels production sector. Such an analysis might quantify the amount of federal support already granted to the cellulosic biofuels industry. EPA reports that four of the ten production facilities with approved cellulosic biofuel pathways have received or were offered significant federal financial support (approximately \$387 million) in the form of grants and loan guarantees from USDA and DOE.<sup>46</sup> One analysis of federal and public funding data for advanced biofuel projects provided by Environmental Entrepreneurs suggest that, since 2009, USDA DOE and other federal entities have provided or offered some \$734 million in grants and loan guarantees to eight companies that Environmental Entrepreneurs expects to have cellulosic ethanol facilities come online by 2016.<sup>47</sup>

Alternatively, Congress could take a wait-and-see approach to address concerns with the cellulosic biofuels mandate. Given EPA's consecutive lowering of the mandate by approximately 95% to 99% for each of the last four years, some question whether the cellulosic biofuels industry can ramp up production over the next two years to meet the scheduled RFS mandates. There may be an upcoming shift where some corn ethanol facilities plan to transition to cellulosic biofuel production, and it is not known what effect this might have on cellulosic biofuel production estimates.<sup>48</sup> Further, it is not yet known what impact the additional feedstocks and production pathways recently approved by EPA may have on meeting the RFS cellulosic biofuel mandate.<sup>49</sup> Lastly, Congress may leave it to EPA, as required by the statute, to modify the applicable volumes of the RFS in its entirety starting in 2016 if certain conditions are met.<sup>50</sup>

Congress may find that a substantial portion of the cellulosic biofuels volume mandate is unattainable for years to come. EIA reports that while "cellulosic biofuels volumes are expected to grow significantly relative to current levels, they will likely remain well below the targets envisioned in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007."<sup>51</sup> Congress has multiple options to address the lack of cellulosic biofuels production. Congress could make a statutory change to the definition of cellulosic biofuels for the RFS to open it up to additional feedstocks

---

<sup>44</sup> The blend wall is the upper limit to the total amount of ethanol that can be blended into U.S. gasoline without exceeding the currently utilized 10% level. For more information, see CRS Report R40445, *Intermediate-Level Blends of Ethanol in Gasoline, and the Ethanol "Blend Wall"*.

<sup>45</sup> Keith Johnson, "Navy's Biofuel Plan Gets Senate Support," *The Wall Street Journal*, November 28, 2012; P.L. 112-81; H.Rept. 112-329.

<sup>46</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "2014 Standards for the Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Proposed Rule," 78 *Federal Register*, November 29, 2013.

<sup>47</sup> Environmental Entrepreneurs, *Advanced Biofuel Market Report 2013: Capacity Through 2016*. CRS tallied federal funding from Appendix H of the report for those companies with facilities coming online in the United States before 2016 that were identified as producing the fuel type cellulosic ethanol in Appendix A of the report.

<sup>48</sup> POET LLC, "POET and Agrivida sign technology collaboration joint development agreement," press release, August 21, 2012.

<sup>49</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: RFS Pathways II, and Technical Amendments to the RFS Standards and E15 Misfueling Mitigation Requirements; Final Rule," Pre-publication copy, July 2, 2014.

<sup>50</sup> More information is provided in the "Uncertainty" section of this report, below.

<sup>51</sup> U.S. Energy Information Administration, *Cellulosic biofuels begin to flow but in lower volumes than foreseen by statutory targets*, February 26, 2013.



that can assist with meeting the annual production targets. Or Congress may continue to require the EPA to set the cellulosic biofuels mandate based on the best available evidence—the status quo option.<sup>52</sup> In the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress, some Members have proposed legislation (e.g., H.R. 550, S. 251) that would require EPA to base the cellulosic mandate on actual production from the previous year. Congress could also eliminate the cellulosic biofuels portion of the mandate, or the RFS entirely.

## The Role of EPA

Congress directed EPA to implement the RFS. After assessing the cellulosic biofuels market, consulting with EIA, and taking other measures, EPA has lowered the cellulosic biofuel mandate when the scheduled mandate could not be met. Some contend that EPA has not carried out its responsibilities regarding the RFS cellulosic biofuels standard as expeditiously or accurately as desired. Some are not satisfied with the success rate of meeting the cellulosic biofuels standard. Some could argue that EPA has a difficult job trying to follow through on Congress’s directions, given the challenges in the cellulosic biofuels industry. Further, it could be argued that any federal agency would likely find it difficult to accurately project when a new technology selected by Congress, not yet proven at commercial scale, would come online and at what pace. EPA can modify its projection procedure for cellulosic biofuels, but any major changes to its procedure would likely require additional instruction from Congress.

With regard to the 2012 standard, a federal court responded to the question of whether EPA is using an appropriate methodology to estimate the amount of cellulosic biofuels that can be produced. The court ruling contains principles that EPA will have to apply in future standards as well. EPA accepted the federal court’s decision to vacate the 2012 cellulosic biofuel standard, and has proposed rescinding the 2011 standard as well.<sup>53</sup> The court discussed, at length, one significant factor that EPA, in its 2013 final rule, appears to address—that is, EPA’s responsibility to accurately project how much cellulosic biofuel will be produced, not to “individually advance a technology-forcing [cellulosic biofuels] agenda.”<sup>54</sup>

There are at least three significant distinctions in the 2013 final rule compared to previous rules: the changes made in projecting cellulosic biofuel production, the discussions regarding feedstock supply, and the facility start dates and corresponding ramp-up periods. EPA reports it made several changes to the way the agency projects cellulosic biofuel production based on the recent federal court ruling and to help “ensure a neutral projection that aims at accuracy.” Some of the projection changes were not including production volumes from pilot and demonstration scale facilities, not including production volumes from facilities with start-up dates near the end of the year, and setting benchmarks for how quickly EPA assumes new facilities will ramp up to full production. In its 2013 final rule, EPA discussed feedstock supply more thoroughly than in previous rules. EPA noted that feedstock agreements or contracts have been reached for structurally complete facilities and for facilities expected to be complete by the end of the year.<sup>55</sup>

<sup>52</sup> Although some stakeholders have questioned whether EPA does, in fact, use the best available evidence.

<sup>53</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Enviroflash, *Update - 2012 Cellulosic Biofuel Standard Mandate Issued*, February 27, 2013; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “2014 Standards for the Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Proposed Rule,” 78 *Federal Register*, November 29, 2013.

<sup>54</sup> *American Petroleum Institute v. EPA*, 706 F.3d 474 (D.C. Cir. 2013).

<sup>55</sup> EPA reports that the INEOS Bio, KiOR, Poet, and Abengoa facilities all have feedstock agreements or contracts in place.

Additionally, in its 2013 rule EPA noted the possibility for cellulosic biofuel to be produced from other sources, such as from corn fiber or landfill biogas, depending on if and when these pathways are approved by EPA. Nevertheless, the 2013 rule still overstated the rate at which new production would come online.

The 2014 proposed rule builds on the information given in the 2013 final rule, and gives more insight on certain factors that impact the 2014 cellulosic biofuel volume projection and how that projection may be met. For example, there is a new section with details about modeling the uncertainty associated with estimated cellulosic biofuel production ranges from numerous facilities. EPA explains how it proposes to take into account uncertainty due to the completion and commissioning phases of a facility, the ramp-up phase of new facilities, and the ability of a facility to maintain consistent production. Further, in the 2014 proposed rule EPA explores how potentially the 2014 mandate may be met if a new pathway—the production of compressed or liquified natural gas from landfill biogas if used as transportation fuel—is approved.<sup>56</sup>

EPA has not been given much guidance by the courts, or Congress, on how to calculate a cellulosic biofuels projection, although the methodology the agency used previously was under scrutiny from the oil industry, among others, as evidenced by the recent court case concerning the 2012 cellulosic biofuels production projection and a pending court case addressing the 2011 projection. It is not clear if the current methodology being used for the 2014 projections will face the same scrutiny. If a projection repeatedly is not met and sources enlisted for assistance provide projections that turn out to be wrong (e.g., EIA, cellulosic biofuel industry), should EPA at some point have set the cellulosic biofuels standard at close to zero (e.g., 100,000 gallons) until actual commercial production of a certain threshold is reached? Arguably, setting a standard too low could impact federal support (e.g., grants, tax incentives) and private investment for the technology. This could hinder the overall goals of the RFS, such as economic development in rural areas. Prospects for the cellulosic biofuels industry could be affected if EPA continues to incorrectly project annual amounts of cellulosic biofuel production.

## Legal Challenges

Mainly due to implementation issues, some aspects of the RFS have been legally challenged in the courts. Since 2010, five cases involving the EPA and its administration of the RFS have been brought before a federal court.<sup>57</sup> One case in particular is germane to the cellulosic biofuel mandate: *American Petroleum Institute v. EPA* (hereinafter *API vs. EPA*).

API challenged the EPA about two aspects of the RFS, and subsequently the challenge was referred to the U.S. Court of Appeals. The first aspect, which is directly related to cellulosic biofuels, was an objection to EPA's 2012 cellulosic biofuels projection. The court agreed with API and found that EPA's methodology for making its cellulosic biofuel projection did not take neutral

---

<sup>56</sup> EPA approved new pathways in July 2014. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: RFS Pathways II, and Technical Amendments to the RFS Standards and E15 Misfueling Mitigation Requirements; Final Rule," Pre-publication copy, July 2, 2014.

<sup>57</sup> *Monroe Energy, LLC v. EPA*, 750 F.3d 909 (D.C. Cir. 2014); *American Petroleum Institute v. EPA*, 706 F.3d 474 (D.C. Cir. 2013); *Vinmar Overseas, Ltd. v. OceanConnect, LLC*, 2012 Westlaw 3599486 (S.D. Tex. Aug. 20, 2012), 2012 Westlaw 5989206 (S.D. Tex. Nov 29, 2012); *Grocery Manufacturers Association v. EPA*, 693 F.3d 169 (D.C. Cir. 2012); *National Petrochemical & Refiners Association v. EPA*, 630 F.3d 145 (D.C. Cir. 2010).



aim at accuracy, and therefore it was an unreasonable exercise of agency discretion.<sup>58</sup> The court went on to explain that the Clean Air Act tasked EPA with establishing a projection that aims at accuracy, not at deliberately indulging a greater risk of overshooting than undershooting.<sup>59</sup> The 2012 rule was vacated and remanded to EPA, which set the final 2012 level at zero. The second aspect of the petition was an objection to EPA not providing a reasoned explanation for its refusal to reduce the 2012 advanced biofuels volume standard. The court rejected this part of the petition.

## Uncertainty

There is one overwhelming theme associated with the RFS cellulosic biofuel mandate: uncertainty. It comes from all stakeholders—government and non-government. What will the revised annual cellulosic biofuel standard be? When will the final standard be released? What federal funding opportunities (e.g., tax incentives, farm bill energy provisions) exist for cellulosic biofuel facilities? How many cellulosic biofuel plants exist? How many are operating? How much cellulosic biofuel will be produced? Many times, the only known constant seems to be the statute itself. Such uncertainty can potentially wreak havoc on an emerging industry. This section discusses some of the uncertainties.

Differing actions by different segments of the government create uncertainty. Those in favor of continuing an RFS with a cellulosic biofuels component argue that adequate production and consumption of cellulosic biofuels can be achieved in a cost-effective manner if there is consistent federal policy, possibly allaying the concerns of some investors.<sup>60</sup> However, minimal actual production has led some to question the viability of cellulosic biofuels over the long term.<sup>61</sup> Furthermore, a cellulosic biofuels industry that has regularly missed the reduced mandates has drawn criticism from groups—especially the petroleum industry—that contend they are being unfairly targeted to purchase credits for a fuel that is unlikely to be produced at the required levels.<sup>62</sup>

Further, EPA's waiver authority creates uncertainty for investors in cellulosic biofuel ventures. Investors may fear that the full cellulosic biofuels mandate will continually be waived to lower amounts by EPA, thus depriving them of the government-mandated market on which they had originally based their investment. EPA's 2014 proposal to lower the overall RFS may further hamper investment.

Another form of uncertainty for all involved parties is the delayed announcement of the proposed annual renewable fuel standards. Under the Clean Air Act, each year's standards are required to be finalized by November 30 of the previous year, although the statute does not stipulate any penalty or other action if this deadline is missed. EPA was two months late in proposing, let alone finalizing, the 2013 standard. The delay may lead to uncertainty in investments and planning for the biofuel and petroleum industries, among others. EPA announced it will extend the compliance deadline for the 2013 RFS standards from to 30 days after the date that the 2014 standard is

---

<sup>58</sup> 706 F.3d 474, \*476

<sup>59</sup> 706 F.3d 474, \*479

<sup>60</sup> John M. Biers, "Non-Food Ethanol Projects Coming to Life," Dow Jones Newswires, November 20, 2012.

<sup>61</sup> "Zero Dark Ethanol," *The Wall Street Journal*, January 30, 2013.

<sup>62</sup> "Oil Industry Sues EPA A Second Time Over RFS Mandate," *The Energy Daily*, July 26, 2012.

finalized.<sup>63</sup> EPA issued the proposed 2014 standards prior to the November 30 deadline, although the final rule has not yet been issued.

Lastly, investors and the cellulosic biofuels community alike may be more apprehensive about the federal policy for advanced biofuels as 2016 draws nearer. There is a provision in the RFS statute that requires the EPA Administrator, starting in 2016, to modify the applicable volumes of the RFS in its entirety for subsequent years if the Administrator waives the renewable fuel mandate, the advanced biofuel mandate, the cellulosic biofuels mandate, or the biomass-based diesel mandate by at least 20% for two consecutive years or by at least 50% for a single year.<sup>64</sup> As a result, in 2016, some biofuel industries (e.g., corn ethanol) that are satisfying their mandates may find that they are being penalized because of another biofuel industry (e.g., cellulosic biofuel) that is not meeting its specified mandate.<sup>65</sup>

## Cellulosic Biofuels

Cellulosic biofuels are liquid, solid, or gaseous fuels made from materials containing cellulose. Cellulose—a complex carbohydrate—is the organic matter found in plant walls that, along with hemicellulose and lignin, helps to give a plant its rigid structure. Cellulose feedstock includes agricultural residues (e.g., corn stover), forestry residues (e.g., wood chips), dedicated energy crops (e.g., switchgrass, hybrid poplar), and urban sources of waste (e.g., municipal solid waste).

The most widely discussed cellulosic biofuel is cellulosic ethanol for transportation.<sup>66</sup> Cellulosic ethanol differs from the corn-starch ethanol, which dominates transportation biofuels in the United States; it is made from feedstock with no or only limited food value, potentially results in fewer greenhouse gas emissions, and has a higher lifecycle energy balance.<sup>67</sup> Converting cellulosic feedstock to ethanol, however, is more expensive and difficult than converting corn starch to ethanol. The conversion of cellulose to ethanol generally happens in three phases—pretreatment, hydrolysis, and fermentation to ethanol. Pretreatment weakens the plant wall structure so that the cellulose is easier to obtain during hydrolysis. Hydrolysis—acid or enzymatic—separates the cellulose into sugars. Fermentation converts the sugars into ethanol. Cellulose can also be converted to liquid fuels through processes other than fermentation (e.g., thermochemical processes).<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Extension of Compliance and Attest Engagement Reporting Deadlines for 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards,” Pre-publication copy, July 31, 2014.

<sup>64</sup> 42 U.S.C. 7545 (o)(7)(F).

<sup>65</sup> Some may argue that there is evidence of this currently occurring, as 2014 is the first year that EPA proposed to lower both the advanced biofuel mandate and the total renewable fuel mandate, partly due to an “inadequate domestic supply of these fuels.” U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “2014 Standards for the Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Proposed Rule,” 78 *Federal Register*, November 29, 2013.

<sup>66</sup> For more information on cellulosic biofuels, see CRS Report RL34738, *Cellulosic Biofuels: Analysis of Policy Issues for Congress*.

<sup>67</sup> For more information on ethanol, see CRS Report RL33290, *Fuel Ethanol: Background and Public Policy Issues*.

<sup>68</sup> Cellulose feedstocks can also be used to provide heat or generate electricity via gasification, combustion, anaerobic digestion, and other conversion processes. For more information, see CRS Report R40667, *Anaerobic Digestion: Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction and Energy Generation*; and CRS Report R41440, *Biomass Feedstocks for Biopower: Background and Selected Issues*.

## Potential Opportunities

It is anticipated that cellulosic biofuel production will assist various energy, environment and economic efforts. Although cellulosic biofuel production has not yet reached full-scale making it difficult to quantify its impact, there are some general potential opportunities that can be explored.

### Energy Security

Cellulosic biofuel production—once at full capacity and with the proper infrastructure—may expand the fuel types available to the average consumer. This could lead to potential cost savings, strengthen energy security, and galvanize a market for services, technologies and products that are associated with its production and use. Any such developments are likely to be contingent, at a minimum, on a cellulosic biofuel that is sustainable, cost-effective to produce (which may require continued government support), and has an energy density suitable to what the energy industry has come to expect from fossil fuels.

### Environment

Cellulosic biofuels, if they can be produced at scale, may result in some environmental benefits, including greenhouse gas emission reduction, air quality improvement, and the use of more water efficient strategies, among other things. In order to qualify as a cellulosic biofuel for the RFS, EISA requires any cellulosic biofuel registered with the RFS to have lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions that are at least 60% less than the baseline lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions (i.e., of the gasoline or diesel it is to replace).<sup>69</sup> One lifecycle greenhouse gas emission analysis of petroleum gasoline, corn ethanol, and cellulosic ethanol reported that cellulosic ethanol offered the largest reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.<sup>70</sup> Further, within the cellulosic biofuel feedstock arena, it may be that greater greenhouse gas emissions reductions are possible by using forest-based feedstocks as opposed to agricultural-based feedstocks.<sup>71</sup> While more operational plants are needed to gauge the air quality impact and the water use from cellulosic biofuel production, it may be that technological advances over time will lead to adoption of more efficient water use and better air pollution control, based partially on lessons learned from conventional corn ethanol facilities.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> 42 U.S.C. 7545 (o)(1)(E)

<sup>70</sup> Michael Wang, Jeongwoo Han, and Zia Haq, et al., “Energy and greenhouse gas emission effects of corn and cellulosic ethanol with technology improvements and land use changes,” *Biomass and Bioenergy*, vol. 35 (2011).

<sup>71</sup> Jesse Daystar, Ronalds Gonzalez, and Carter Reeb, et al., “Economics, Environmental Impacts, and Supply Chain Analysis of Cellulosic Biomass for Biofuels in the Southern US: Pine, Eucalyptus, Unmanaged Hardwoods, Forest Residues, Switchgrass, and Sweet Sorghum,” *Bioresources*, vol. 9, no. 1 (2014). The study considered pine, eucalyptus, unmanaged hardwood, and forest residuals to be forest-based feedstock, and switchgrass and sweet sorghum to be agriculture-based feedstock.

<sup>72</sup> National Research Council, “Water Implications of Biofuels Production in the United States,” 2008; Donna Jones, “Potential air emission impacts of cellulosic ethanol production at seven demonstration refineries in the United States,” *Journal of the Air and Waste Management Association*, vol. 60 (September 2010).

## Rural Economic Development

Thus far, cellulosic biofuel production facilities have been constructed in close proximity to the feedstock to be utilized (e.g., crop residue, forestry residue). With the exception of some eligible feedstocks (e.g., yard waste, food waste), this would place cellulosic biofuel production facilities in rural areas which could enhance some rural economies. A transportation conundrum may result from cellulosic biofuel production facilities being located in rural areas, specifically the transfer of fuel to where it is needed most which is areas with high demands for transportation fuel (e.g., large cities). Currently, availability of rail capacity and tank cars for conventional ethanol is limited—a situation that could be exacerbated if their demand grows with additional cellulosic biofuel production.

## Potential Challenges

U.S. production of cellulosic biofuels has had a slow start. Impediments to increasing capacity involve a variety of factors including financing, feedstock eligibility, and feedstock supply, among others.

## Financing

The production of cellulosic biofuels has been reported to be “complex, capital-intensive, and costly.”<sup>73</sup> Commercial cellulosic biofuel facilities are estimated to cost hundreds of millions of dollars, significantly more than a traditional corn ethanol plant, especially when measured in terms of the amount of biofuel produced (measured in million gallons per year, or mgy). For example, the company INEOS Bio reports that its Indian River 8 mgy production capacity plant cost approximately \$130 million.<sup>74</sup> American Process, Inc., reports that its Alpena 0.8 mgy pilot plant cost approximately \$36 million.<sup>75</sup> POET-DSM reports that its 25 mgy commercial cellulosic ethanol plant cost approximately \$250 million.<sup>76</sup> DuPont reports that its 30 mgy cellulosic ethanol plant costs approximately \$225 million.<sup>77</sup> In comparison, a 40 mgy corn ethanol plant cost approximately \$80 million to construct in 2006.<sup>78</sup> Some lenders find it extremely risky, perhaps even cost-prohibitive, to provide financial backing to cellulosic biofuel plants, mainly because the conversion technology has not been applied or proven on a commercial scale.<sup>79</sup> These costs, and the perceived financial risk, are likely to decrease if a significant number of commercial-scale plants come online and prove to be economically viable.

---

<sup>73</sup> U.S. Congressional Budget Office, *The Renewable Fuel Standard: Issues for 2014 and Beyond*, June 2014.

<sup>74</sup> Email from Bryan Stockton of ML Strategies, December 13, 2012.

<sup>75</sup> Email from Kim Nelson of American Process, Inc., December 11, 2012.

<sup>76</sup> POET-DSM, *Testimony of Kevin Potas, Business Development Manager at POET-DSM Advanced Biofuels*, EPA Public Hearing for the 2014 Standards for the Renewable Fuel Standard Program, December 5, 2013, <http://www.poetdsm.com/testimony>.

<sup>77</sup> *DuPont Cellulosic Ethanol: Commercializing Advanced Renewable Fuel in Iowa*, 2013, [http://biofuels.dupont.com/fileadmin/user\\_upload/live/biofuels/DuPont\\_Nevada\\_CE\\_final.pdf](http://biofuels.dupont.com/fileadmin/user_upload/live/biofuels/DuPont_Nevada_CE_final.pdf).

<sup>78</sup> Clean Fuels Development Corporation, Nebraska Ethanol Board, and U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, *A Guide for Evaluating the Requirements of Ethanol Plants*, 2006, [http://www.ethanol.org/pdf/contentmgmt/guide\\_for\\_evaluating\\_the\\_requirements\\_of\\_ethanol\\_plants.pdf](http://www.ethanol.org/pdf/contentmgmt/guide_for_evaluating_the_requirements_of_ethanol_plants.pdf).

<sup>79</sup> For more information on federal spending for cellulosic biofuels, see CRS Report RL34738, *Cellulosic Biofuels: Analysis of Policy Issues for Congress*.

## Feedstock Eligibility

When determining feedstock eligibility for the RFS, definitions matter. Due to the many biofuel programs at various federal agencies and tax incentives, there is a plethora of biomass definitions and other terminology that describe biomass feedstock for cellulosic biofuel production. However, only the definitions contained in EISA Section 201 may deem a feedstock or fuel eligible for the RFS.

There are some important distinctions about the renewable biomass definition for the RFS. For example, the renewable biomass definition for the RFS under EISA does not allow for biomass removed from federal lands, and excludes crops from forested lands.<sup>80</sup> Some argue that opening federal lands for biomass removal could provide an inexpensive supply of cellulosic feedstock that would be immediately available to biorefineries for cellulosic biofuel production. Others contend that biomass removal from federal lands is a short-term response to the cellulosic feedstock source problem and might not be carried out in a sustainable manner, leading to deterioration of the nation's parks and recreation areas. Further, the definition of biomass under EISA also excludes most municipal solid waste (MSW), which some view as a potential source for conversion to biofuels.

## Feedstock Supply

Another cellulosic biofuel production challenge is feedstock contracts, which will likely cover multiple years. Cellulosic biofuel production companies generally want to “lock in” their feedstock supply preferably at a set price for a predetermined time in order to have a better understanding of operational costs. Agricultural and forestry producers may not agree to a contract for a cellulosic feedstock that requires a lengthy time commitment. For example, it generally takes three years for switchgrass crops to reach maturity.<sup>81</sup> As a result, a producer would have to commit their land to one particular cellulosic feedstock crop for a number of years, thus limiting the producer's choice to grow other, potentially more remunerative crops during that period. Some are concerned about collecting cellulosic feedstocks in a way that could possibly harm the landscape (e.g., soil carbon, water quality). One potential strategy is the use of conservation planning for any land involved in cellulosic feedstock collection.<sup>82</sup> Additionally, there are concerns about the equipment and time needed to harvest, transport, and store the cellulosic feedstock. Some could contend that these concerns are perfectly normal for an emerging business model, and that the feedstock supply challenges will be overcome as more cellulosic biofuel production plants come into operation. In early 2013, EPA reported that the industry has made significant progress regarding feedstock supply, citing companies that have secured feedstock contracts with local agricultural producers.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> For more information on biomass definitions, see CRS Report R40529, *Biomass: Comparison of Definitions in Legislation*.

<sup>81</sup> University of Tennessee, *Growing and Harvesting Switchgrass for Ethanol Production in Tennessee*, SP701-A, <http://www.utextension.utk.edu/publications/spfiles/SP701-A.pdf>.

<sup>82</sup> For example, the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service and DuPont signed a memorandum of understanding with the goal “to safeguard natural resources on private lands used to supply bio-based feedstocks for cellulosic ethanol production.” U.S. Department of Agriculture, “USDA Announces New Conservation Collaboration with DuPont to Promote Sustainable Harvesting of Bio-based Feedstocks for Cellulosic Ethanol,” press release, March 29, 2013.

<sup>83</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards; (continued...)”

There are programs available to address feedstock supply concerns. For instance, the Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP) is designed to assist producers with annual payments that could mitigate some of the risks involved with shifting from traditional crop production to energy crop production.<sup>84</sup>

## Existing Plant Capacity

EPA reports that cellulosic biofuel production in the United States remains limited.<sup>85</sup> In its 2014 proposed rule, EPA provides information on 11 companies and one additional industry (compressed and liquified natural gas) with the potential to produce cellulosic biofuels.<sup>86</sup> EPA's assessment includes their biofuel production estimates, technology process, and anticipated start dates. Four of the companies identified in the 2014 proposed rule were also identified in the 2013 final rule. EPA reports that two facilities commenced operation in 2013: KiOR and INEOS Bio.

As observed over the last few years, due to unforeseen financial and technical issues, it can be difficult to determine when or if cellulosic biofuel companies will actually come online and how much cellulosic biofuel will be produced. In 2010, it was reported that approximately two dozen demonstration- or pilot-scale cellulosic ethanol plants existed in the United States.<sup>87</sup> The Advanced Ethanol Council reported in 2012 that there were nine cellulosic biofuel pilot/demonstration facilities, eight commercial facilities under construction or commissioning, and seven commercial facilities at the engineering stage.<sup>88</sup> Environmental Entrepreneurs—a national community of business leaders—projects that 18 commercial cellulosic ethanol facilities will come online in the United States by 2016.<sup>89</sup>

## Financial Assistance

Several forms of federal financial support exist for cellulosic biofuel production, including the DOE Loan Guarantee Program, the USDA Biorefinery Renewable Chemical, and Biobased

---

(...continued)

Final Rule,” 78 *Federal Register*, August 15, 2013.

<sup>84</sup> For more information, see CRS Report R41296, *Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP): Status and Issues*.

<sup>85</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards; Final Rule,” 78 *Federal Register*, August 15, 2013.

<sup>86</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “2014 Standards for the Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Proposed Rule,” 78 *Federal Register*, November 29, 2013.

<sup>87</sup> Wallace E. Tyner and Sarah Brechbill, “Cellulosic Biofuels: Feedstocks, Conversion Technologies, Economics, and Policy Issues,” CRS Workshop on the Development of the U.S. Cellulosic Biofuels Industry, Washington, DC, October 6, 2009; and conversation with Wallace Tyner from Purdue University, February 2, 2010; CRS Report R41460, *Cellulosic Ethanol: Feedstocks, Conversion Technologies, Economics, and Policy Options*; EPA, *Renewable Fuel Standard Program (RFS2) Regulatory Impact Analysis*, EPA-420-R-10-006, Washington, DC, February 2010, pp. 171 and 186, <http://www.epa.gov/oms/renewablefuels/420r10006.pdf>.

<sup>88</sup> Advanced Ethanol Council (AEC), *Cellulosic Biofuels Industry Progress Report 2012-2013*, December 2012, <http://ethanolrfa.org/page/-/PDFs/AEC%20Cellulosic%20Biofuels%20Industry%20Progress%20Report%202012-2013.pdf?nocdn=1>. AEC acknowledges the report does not profile all cellulosic biofuel projects under development in the United States.

<sup>89</sup> Environmental Entrepreneurs, *Advanced Biofuel Market Report 2013: Capacity Through 2016*, 2013.



Manufacturing Assistance Program (BAP), BCAP, and tax incentives.<sup>90</sup> Other sources of financial assistance include smaller grants awarded by federal agencies for unique initiatives.<sup>91</sup>

To help promote cleaner energy technologies, including cellulosic biofuel production technologies, Congress established the Department of Energy (DOE) Loan Guarantee Program (LGP).<sup>92</sup> Loans may not exceed 80% of total project costs. The DOE Section 1703 loan program supports clean energy technologies that are high technology risks (e.g., biomass, solar, alternative fuel vehicle technologies). In addition, the DOE Section 1705 loan program, which expired in 2011, supported renewable energy systems, electric power transmission systems, and leading-edge biofuels.<sup>93</sup> Some in the industry are concerned that the LGP is not being carried out at a pace responsive to market momentum for cellulosic biofuels.<sup>94</sup>

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) reviewed DOE's execution of the Loan Guarantee Program in 2010, 2012, and 2014.<sup>95</sup> In 2014, GAO found that "DOE was making loans and disbursing funds from 2009 through 2013 without a fully developed loan monitoring function" which "limited assurance that DOE was completing activities important to monitoring the loans and protecting the government's interest." In 2012, GAO found that DOE "improved the speed at which it was able to move section 1705 applications through its review process" and that DOE had "not closed any section 1703 loan guarantees or otherwise demonstrated that the program is fully functional." Even though Section 1705 expired in 2011, GAO issued three recommendations

<sup>90</sup> For example, USDA has \$181 million available to fund, through the Biorefinery Assistance Program, commercial-scale biorefineries or to retrofit existing facilities with appropriate technology to develop advanced biofuels. U.S. Department of Agriculture, "USDA Announces Availability of Funding to Develop Advanced Biofuels Projects," press release, October 21, 2013, <http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?contentid=2013/10/0195.xml>. USDA reports that the applications received for this funding opportunity are under review. Email from USDA June 25, 2014.

<sup>91</sup> For example, the DOE offered \$10 million in funding to advance the production of advanced biofuels, substitutes for petroleum-based feedstocks, and bioproducts made from renewable, non-food-based biomass, such as agricultural residues and woody biomass in April 2014. Also, in July 2014, DOE issued a loan guarantee solicitation for up to \$4 billion in loan guarantees available for innovative renewable energy and energy efficiency projects located in the United States that avoid, reduce, or sequester greenhouse gases, including drop-in biofuels. U.S. Department of Energy, "Energy Department Announces \$10 Million for Technologies to Produce Advanced Biofuel Products from Biomass," press release, April 16, 2014. U.S. Department of Energy, "Energy Department Makes Additional \$4 Billion in Loan Guarantees Available for Innovative Renewable Energy and Efficient Energy Projects," press release, July 3, 2014.

<sup>92</sup> A loan guarantee is defined as a "pledge with respect to the payment of all or a part of the principal or interest on any debt obligation of a non-federal borrower to a non-federal lender." The LGP was first authorized under Title XVII of EPAct05 and then amended under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5). DOE may issue loan guarantees to eligible projects that "avoid, reduce, or sequester air pollutants or anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases" and "employ new or significantly improved technologies as compared to technologies in service in the United States at the time the guarantee is issued." Eligible projects include commercial-scale renewable energy systems. EISA authorized the DOE to issue loan guarantees in part to support renewable energy projects. For more information on loan guarantees, see CRS Report R42152, *Loan Guarantees for Clean Energy Technologies: Goals, Concerns, and Policy Options*.

<sup>93</sup> In 2011, a Section 1705 loan for \$132.4 million was awarded to Abengoa Bioenergy Biomass of Kansas, LLC for a commercial-scale cellulosic ethanol project. U.S. Department of Energy, "Energy Department Finalizes \$132 Million Loan Guarantee to Support the Abengoa Bioenergy Project," press release, September 29, 2011, <http://energy.gov/articles/energy-department-finalizes-132-million-loan-guarantee-support-abengoa-bioenergy-project>.

<sup>94</sup> Renewable Fuels Association, "2010 State of the Industry Address," 2010 National Ethanol Conference, Orlando, FL, February 16, 2010, [http://ethanolrfa.3cdn.net/b76292e4bf133edd34\\_e1m6bhh33.pdf](http://ethanolrfa.3cdn.net/b76292e4bf133edd34_e1m6bhh33.pdf).

<sup>95</sup> U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Further Actions Are Needed to Improve DOE's Ability to Evaluate and Implement the Loan Guarantee Program*, GAO-10-627, July 2010. U.S. Government Accountability Office, *DOE Loan Guarantees: Further Actions Are Needed to Improve Tracking and Review of Applications*, GAO-12-157, March 2012 <http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/589210.pdf>. U.S. Government Accountability Office, *DOE Loan Programs: DOE Should Fully Develop Its Loan Monitoring Function and Evaluate Its Effectiveness*, GAO-14-367, May 2014.



for the overall loan guarantee program, including that DOE “implement a consolidated system that enables the tracking of the status of applications and that measures overall program performance.”

The USDA BAP assists in the development of new and emerging technologies for advanced biofuels.<sup>96</sup> BAP provides competitive grants and loan guarantees for construction and/or retrofitting of demonstration-scale biorefineries to demonstrate the commercial viability of one or more processes for converting renewable biomass to advanced biofuels. Because BAP has not received any discretionary funding needed to implement the grant portion of the program, USDA has only implemented the loan guarantee portion of the program using mandatory funding. USDA reports that seven biorefineries were granted a BAP conditional commitment for a loan guarantee at a total of approximately \$704 million from FY2009 through FY2012.<sup>97</sup> Under the 2014 farm bill, BAP received mandatory funding of \$100 million in FY2014 for loan guarantees.

Another federal government program, focused on feedstock development, is the USDA Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP).<sup>98</sup> The two main program objectives of BCAP are to support the establishment and production of eligible crops for conversion to bioenergy in selected areas, and to assist agricultural and forest land owners and operators with collection, harvest, storage, and transportation of eligible materials for use in a biomass conversion facility. USDA issued the BCAP final rule on October 27, 2010, implementing both program components. Since the program’s inception, 11 BCAP project areas have been established.<sup>99</sup> According to USDA, BCAP matching payments<sup>100</sup> totaled approximately \$1.02 million for the transportation of nearly 24,100 dry tons of herbaceous crop residue (i.e., corn stover) in FY2012.<sup>101</sup> BCAP received no new mandatory funding in FY2013.<sup>102</sup>

Additionally, the government provides tax incentives to support cellulosic biofuel production.<sup>103</sup> The 2008 farm bill offers a production credit of \$1.01 per gallon of biofuel produced from qualifying second-generation biofuel feedstocks, including cellulosic matter. The credit expired on December 31, 2012, but ATRA extended it and expanded the credit to include fuels produced from algae. The credit expired at the end of calendar year 2013. There is also a special depreciation allowance for a new cellulosic biofuel plant that originated under the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-432). ATRA amended the allowance to include algae as a qualified feedstock for the special allowance. The allowance also expired at the end of 2013.

---

<sup>96</sup> For more information, see CRS Report R43416, *Energy Provisions in the 2014 Farm Bill (P.L. 113-79)*.

<sup>97</sup> Email from Ashley Martin, USDA, March 1, 2013.

<sup>98</sup> BCAP receives its authorization from Title IX of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-171) and was amended by Title IX of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-246). For more information on BCAP, see CRS Report R41296, *Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP): Status and Issues*; or visit <http://www.fsa.usda.gov/FSA/webapp?area=home&subject=ener&topic=bcap>.

<sup>99</sup> BCAP project areas are specific geographic areas where producers may enroll land to grow specified biomass crops. Participants may be eligible to receive financial and technical assistance as well as annual payments to establish these crops.

<sup>100</sup> Matching payments are provided for the collection, harvest, storage and transport of eligible biomass materials to qualified biomass conversion facilities.

<sup>101</sup> Email from Ashley Martin, USDA, July 23, 2014.

<sup>102</sup> For more information, see the “Interim Funding in 2013” section of CRS Report R41296, *Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP): Status and Issues*.

<sup>103</sup> For more information, see CRS Report R42566, *Alternative Fuel and Advanced Vehicle Technology Incentives: A Summary of Federal Programs*.

## **Conclusion**

Cellulosic biofuel has supporters and detractors. Proponents suggest that increased use of cellulosic biofuels for transportation could potentially help to reduce U.S. dependence on foreign oil, strengthen rural economies, and improve the environment. In contrast, others argue that cellulosic biofuels at RFS volumes may never materialize, require a substantial feedstock supply that has yet to be verified and may never be cost-competitive without government support.

Cellulosic biofuel production is not at the stage many predicted it to be. The lower production levels make it nearly impossible to meet the RFS annual cellulosic biofuel volume obligations in the near future. The crux of the matter could be that a lack of cellulosic biofuel production may eventually jeopardize the entire advanced biofuel component of the RFS. Year after year, the same reasons are given as to why production has stagnated—technological setbacks, lack of financing, etc. Additionally, uncertainty is a recurring theme both for biofuel production and RFS implementation. It will likely be difficult for the current situation to change without unifying steps taken by all stakeholders—clear direction from Congress, prompt program implementation by the EPA, swift financial and technical support from USDA and DOE, and investment and transparency from the private sector, among others.

## **Author Contact Information**

Kelsi Bracmort  
Specialist in Agricultural Conservation and Natural  
Resources Policy  
kbracmort@crs.loc.gov, 7-7283