

Renewable Energy Advisory Council

Wednesday, January 13, 2010 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. http://energytrust.org/About/public-meetings/REACouncil.aspx Energy Trust Conference Rooms 851 SW Sixth Ave., Suite 1200 Portland, Oregon 97204

AGENDA

9:30 Welcome and Introductions

- Review agenda
- Approval of November minutes

9:35 RECs and WREGIS

Claiming ownership of RECs for retirement, sale, or transfer involves registering them with WREGIS (Western Regional Energy Generation Information System). Staff will explain how this works and discuss the implications for administrative and project costs.

10:00 Update on recommended changes to the BETC and impact on Information Energy Trust incentives and procedures

ODOE's report to the governor regarding the BETC recommended several changes that would have an impact on projects' above-market costs and Energy Trust's methods of determining incentives. Staff will outline the impacts of the recommendations.

10:20 Break

10:30 Wave projects – discussion about issues and roles

Does it make sense for Energy Trust to consider providing an incentive to a wave power project? Staff will present cost comparisons across technologies, a review of applicable Energy Trust policies, and a set of questions to discuss.

11:15 Update on solar budget

At the November meeting, the RAC discussed ways to handle the large number of solar applications received before the incentive decrease. Staff will provide an update about to how the situation was resolved and where the budget currently stands.

- 11:30 Public Comment
- 11:45 Meeting Adjournment



Informational

Informational

Action

Information

Discussion



RECS, WREGIS, and ETO Presentation to RAC January 13, 2010



Energy Trust policy on RECs

• We take title to some RECs for every project we fund

- Specified as part of our contract with project owner
- We can sell 50% -- We have not... yet



REC allocation by project types

- Utility Scale -100% direct to utilities through Master Agreement
- QF/on-site –Customized contracts with portion to Energy Trust and balance to project owner
- Net metered solar/ small wind– 1st 5 years to owner, balance to Energy Trust

ETO REC ownership by project type

- Utility Scale N/A
- QF & on-site annual estimates

 2010
 35,413
 2015
 143,600
- Net metered annual estimates

 2010:
 2015:
 2015:

Note: PGE 2015 RPS requirement = 3.4M RECs (Source: 2009 IRP)



Energy Trust REC policy

Our policy predates the existence of:

- RPS
- WREGIS



What is WREGIS?

A. Western Grid

举



Western Electricity Coordinating Council Western Renewable Energy Generation Information System

WECC manages grid via North Am. Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) via FERC. WREGIS tracks RECs associated with renewable generation & operates within WECC.



WREGIS REC - sample

Certificate Data

WREGIS Generating Unit ID: W12 Generating Unit Name: CPS Unit 1 Primary Facility Name: KG Vintage Year/Month: 2007/7 Certificate Serial Numbers: 12-ID-52-211 to 215 Total Certificate: 5 Generation Period Start Date: NA Generation Period End Date: NA Certificate Creation Date: 10/15/2007



Static Generating Unit Data

Facility County: Boise Facility State or Province: ID Facility Country: US Multi-Fuel Generator Indicator: No Generation Technology/Prime Mover: Solar Thermal Fuel Type/Energy Source: Solar Fuel Source/Other Criteria or Eligibility Characteristics: Solar-Solar*-Solar* Date when Generating Unit first commenced operation: 07/17/2001 Nameplate Capacity: 0.875 Facility Operator Info: Company or Organization Name: CPS Customer Sited Distributed Generation (Y/N): Yes Reporting Entity Company or Organization Name: QRE Test1 Reporting Entity Type: Balancing Authority Non-Balancing Authority Reporting Entity Generating Unit in WECC Region Declaration Indicator (Y/N): Yes Utility to which the Generating Unit is interconnected: Idaho Power Company Qualifying Facility Indicator (Y/N): No Facility Ownership type: Other Non-Utility California Supplemental Payment Received (Y/N): No Facility receives state/provincial public benefit fund support indicator (Y/N): No Federal Tax Credits received indicator (Y/N): No Most recent FERC Hydro license date, or: NA One of the following from the following valid values: Non-jurisdictional, application pending, or not applicable.: NA Repowered Indicator (Y/N): No Repower date: NA

State/Provincial/Voluntary RPS Selections

State	Eligible	Certification Number		
Arizona	No	NA		
British Columbia	No	NA		
California	No	NA		
Colorado	No	NA		
Nevada	No	NA		
New Mexico	No	NA		
Montana	No	NA		
Texas	No	NA		
Washington	No	NA		
Oregon	No	NA		
Alberta	No	NA		
California SEP Eligibility: No				
California Qualifying Facility Qualified to Claim Non-Renewable: No				
Green-e Eligible: No Certification Number:NA				
Ecologo Certified, No Certification Number:NA				
Low Impact Hydro Certification: No Certification Number:NA				



A REC is too large for this view!





[Source: PacifiCorp]



If the REC isn't registered with WREGIS, it can't be sold, bought, transferred or retired.

Therefore...





...Energy Trust does not really have any RECs, only the contractual language to enable the perfection of contractually-obligated RECs.



REC certification-related benefits

- WREGIS provides the industry with a rigorous accounting system
- Transparent, known criteria and standards
- Would give us the ability to officially retire, transfer, and sell our RECs
- Would enable project owners to officially retire, transfer, or sell their RECs EnergyTrus

WREGIS Requirements

WREGIS requirements

尜

- The project owner owns the RECs but can designate an agent
- Account registration different for individual generators, utilities, and companies that aggregate RECs
- Revenue quality meter output
- Regular reporting Qualified Reporting Entity (self reporting if <360kW)

Ø Hard for small scale projects to play(<1 MW)

REC certification-related costs

To WREGIS

尜

- Annual flat fees \$200-\$1,500
- Transaction fees for issuance, transfer, retirement, or export of RECs - \$0.005-\$0.01/certificate

To QRE

- Set up fee (\$297)
- Monthly fee (\$59/mo)

Compliant metering Administrative costs = staff time





How various projects would incur fees for registering RECs with WREGIS

Stahlbush Island Farms biopower



Annual fees for registering and reporting RECs:

\$708/yr - \$1,558/yr (depends on type of account holder)

Cost per REC: \$0.12 - \$0.26

1.6 MW Energy Trust claims 6,000 (52%) RECs per year



Hypothetical residential PV system



3 kW nameplate Produces 3 RECs per year (100% claimed by ETO after 1st 5 yrs) Annual costs for registering and reporting:

\$200/yr - \$908/yr (depends on who reports)

Cost per REC: \$67 - \$302

Option: ETO or 3rd party as an aggregator for small systems



The important issues to think about

* Additional complexities

Each custom project agreement is different (% RECs, term)
To retain this flexibility, a cookie cutter

approach may not fit

- Project owners have a variety of motivations
 - Retire only
 - Sell as additional revenue stream
 - If we claim all the RECs project owners have no additional motivation to participate with WREGIS



Important issues to think about

- What could our role look like? Best least cost way to go?
- Who would pay the costs of registering, reporting, administration, equipment?
- Do the benefits outweigh the costs? From whose perspective? For which projects?
- Are there options to mitigate the costs, especially for small projects?
- How does timing impact costs and benefits?





BETC changes: Impacts to Energy Trust incentives and procedures



Areas of change

ODOE Goal: Reduce BETC Fiscal

- Temporary Rules (11/09 5/10)
- "Pass-Through" Rule Making
- Recommendations to the Governor



Temporary Rules

Temporary Rules - History

- Gov. vetoed HB2472
- Told ODOE to "tighten" rules
- Temp. rules released 11/3
- Further legislative action expected



Solution Temporary Rules - Impact

Most changes don't impact Energy Trust projects, except --

- Final BETC limited to 100% of pre-cert (not 110%)
- "Separate and distinct" facilities may limit \$20MM / developer / year, not per project`



Pass Through Rule Making

Pass Through Rule Making - History

- HB2068 required ODOE to establish new formula, tied to "inflation and market real rate of return"
- Process timeline:
 - Announced 11/13
 - Public meeting 11/30
 - Formal comments 12/16
 - New rule 1/11



Pass Through Rule Making - Impact

- New formula based on T-Note and inflation
- Increases pass-through rate to:
 - Public entities: 36.8%
 - For-profit entities: 41.18%
- New rate started January 1. Pre-certs get old rate.

Pass Through Rule Making - Impact

- May make finding partners difficult for for-profit customers
 - Risk : Rate of Return
- May necessitate changes in project deal structures, potentially increasing costs



ODOE's Recommendations to the Governor

ODOE's Recommendations - History

- 8/26 Gov. asked ODOE to study and implement changes for:
 - Single/Multiple facilities
 - Address Permitting / Licensing
 - Back taxes

举

- Job creation and facility operation
- R&D projects, cost-overruns
- Any other area at ODOE's discretion



Solution ODOE's Recommendations - History

- Many areas addressed in temporary rules
- ODOE sends recommendations to Governor on 11/30



- Tighter application requirements
- Deduction of public purpose funds prior to eligible cost calculation
- Program cap of 1-4% of 2008 operating revenues of OR energy suppliers
- Alternative incentive cap Wind
- Priority Setting
- Retroactivity



- Tighter application requirements
 - More detailed information will be required for preliminary certification
 - Favors well thought-out, feasible projects
 - Unknown Energy Trust impact



- Deduction of public purpose funds prior to eligible cost calculation
 - Initial concern about circular math
 - ODOE's goal: Project must not receive more than 100% of (eligible?) costs through incentives or tax credits.
 - Poor projects may see incentive cap



- Program cap: 1-4% of 2008 operating revenues of OR energy suppliers
 - Limits BETC funding based on energy usage
 - Range for 2008: \$73MM \$292MM
 - Potentially less money allocated to RE projects
 - Energy Trust above-market costs may increase

- Alternative incentive cap Wind
 - Projects with costs >\$100,000: 5% BETC, up to \$200MM eligible project cost
 - BETC reduced 1% each year until zero
 - Big cut for projects between 10kW and 20MW
 - If projects can move forward, Above Market Costs may be greater – projects may need more funds from Energy Trust



- Priority Setting
 - ODOE allowed to prioritize projects based on jobs, generation, and market readiness
 - Unknown impact as only select projects would be funded



- Retroactivity
 - Apply Program Cap and Alternative Incentive Model to all pre-cert projects back to at least July 1, 2009
 - Accountability measures to all projects without final certifications.
 - No known impact to any projects working with Energy Trust



Discussion...



Wave Energy Discussion January 13, 2010



During our last discussion...

Examined state of the industry

- Still young less than 1 MW worldwide
- Stakeholder engagement underway
- Fewer companies than a couple of years ago



Looked at technology





Looked at technology

尜



The Pelamis Wave Energy Converter is a semi-submerged, articulated structure composed of cylindrical sections linked by hinged joints.



The wave-induced motion of these joints is resisted by hydraulic rams which pump high pressure fluid through hydraulic motors via smoothing accumulators.



The hydraulic motors drive electrical generators to produce electricity. Power is fed to the seabed via a single dynamic umbilical connected to a transformer in the machine's nose.





Looked at technology





Examined options for involvement:

- Wait until one or more wave technologies has a proven commercial track record
- Support Oregon Wave Energy Trust
- Examine the idea of providing financial support to a project



Took a quick look at OPT project

- Phase I 150 kW, \$20 million
- Phase II 1.5 MW, \$45 million
- Phase III 100 MW



Discussion of issues

Cost comparison (project cost/MWh)



What we do:

- Fund projects using commercial technology
- Evaluate and pay above-market costs
- Expect a project life of 15-20 years
- Take title to some tags
- PGE or PAC ratepayers derive direct benefits from the project via electricity sales and tags (kWhs and RECs created)
- Projects use replicable technology
- Projects are under 20 MW

Wave projects don't fit our model

Commercial?	Not yet
Above-market costs	Difficult to determine
Project life: 15-20 yrs	Unclear
Tags?	Unclear
Sell to PGE or PAC	Unlikely in short term
Replicable technology?	Unclear
Under 20 MW?	Yes, in the short run. Unlikely later.

What we do under demo policy:

尜

- Demo project must lead to projects in PGE/PAC territory
- Must have a plan for what will be demonstrated and to whom
- Incentives are calculated using abovemarket cost methodology
- Must deliver benefits (RECs) to PGE or PAC.

- more -

What we do under demo policy (cont.):

- Demonstrations must be in realistic conditions
- Designed to deliver power for at least five years, preferably more.
- Ownership by a stable entity

尜

Technology needs to be important for the market

Demonstration project model

尜

Lead to PGE/PAC	Likely	
Demonstration value	Unclear	
Above-market cost	Difficult to determine	
Tags	Unclear	
Realistic conditions	Yes	
Timeframe of more than 5 years	Unclear	
Stable owner	Unclear	
Important for whole market	Unclear	nergy Tr

米

of Oregon

Would need a compelling reason:

- 1. Are we essential? What value do we bring?
- 2. What direct benefit do we (and ratepayers) receive?
- 3. What role will these early projects play in developing the market as a whole?
- 4. What precedent are we setting?
- 5. Can we live with all outcomes?
- 6. Do the economics of our incentive make sense?

Complexities in evaluating

- How do we evaluate a project that has no internal rate of return (IRR)?
- What is the benefit to investors? Is it an appropriate benefit for us? What role is funding playing?
- If our funds are used to guarantee a rate of return for the venture capitalist investors, are they still venture capitalists?
- There is likely no break-even time for this project. How do we determine above-market costs?

Links to demo project and commercial policies <u>E:\BOARD PACKETS\Policies Adopted by the Board\4.13.0002A_Protocol for</u> <u>Considering RE Demo Projects.doc</u>

<u>E:\RENEWABLE RESOURCES\PROGRAM POLICIES\RE programs</u> <u>CommercialTechnology_guidelines.doc</u>