

# California Renewables Portfolio Standard Update

*Progress towards reaching 20% and challenges that lie  
ahead*

California Manufacturers and Technology Association  
July 28, 2005



Matt Freedman  
The Utility Reform Network  
freedman@turn.org

## California RPS program elements

- ↓ **Obligated Load-Serving Entities**
  - ↓ All IOUs, ESPs, CCAs (“retail sellers”)
  - ↓ Municipal utilities required to create and self-enforce RPS programs.
- ↓ **Targets and Timetables**
  - ↓ Beginning on 1/1/2003, retail sellers must increase the quantity of renewable procurement by at least 1% of retail sales per year until reaching a 20% portfolio.
  - ↓ Full compliance by 2017. Acceleration to 2010 under Energy Action Plan.
  - ↓ Flexible compliance provisions permit banking and borrowing.
- ↓ **Dedicated renewable energy procurement plans and solicitations**
  - ↓ IOUs conduct regular competitive solicitations and offer long-term contracts.
  - ↓ Least-cost/best-fit ranking and evaluation.
- ↓ **Price protections for customers**
  - ↓ Purchase obligation limited by Market Price Referent (MPR) plus coordinated awards of Public Goods Charge awards by the California Energy Commission.
- ↓ **Non-compliance penalties (5 cents/kwh)**
- ↓ **Facilitation of new transmission to interconnect renewables**

## IOU renewable energy procurement activities since 2002

- ↓ **2002 CPUC-ordered interim solicitations**
  - ↓ SDG&E (15 contracts for 237 MW -- 156 MW of wind, 32 MW biogas, 49 MW biomass). Annual deliveries equal to ~7% of retail sales.
  - ↓ SCE (200 MW from Calpine's Geysers, 5 MW TrueSolar PV, other MWs from biomass and small hydro).
  - ↓ PG&E (110 MW from Calpine's Geysers, 9 MW from 2 biomass plants). Annual deliveries equal to 1.1% of retail sales.
- ↓ **Bilateral contracts in 2003/2004**
  - ↓ PG&E (2003 -- 3 biomass contracts/44 MW), (2004 -- 1 wind repower/18 MW)
  - ↓ SDG&E (2004 -- 51 MW of new wind)
- ↓ **SCE pre-RPS solicitation (2003-2005)**
  - ↓ 142-428 MW of new capacity -- equal to 0.9-2.9% of retail sales.
  - ↓ Biomass (12.5-37.5 MW), wind (99-270 MW) and geothermal (30-120 MW).
  - ↓ Ongoing negotiations for 500 MW of solar thermal.
- ↓ **PG&E 2004-2005 RPS solicitations**
  - ↓ 4 wind contracts for 233 MW -- 2 new (158 MW) and 2 repowers (75 MW)
- ↓ **SDG&E 2004-2005 RPS solicitation**
  - ↓ Contracts expected to be filed soon.

## Renewable power vs. fossil unit costs

- ↓ **Data on recent CCGTs**
  - ↓ Otay Mesa/Calpine (\$19.38/MWh in non-fuel costs)
  - ↓ Mountainview/SCE (\$16.56/MWh in non-fuel costs)
  - ↓ Gas price assumptions vary -- could add \$37 - 50/MWh
- ↓ **Refurbished Mohave cost -- \$48-59/MWh**
- ↓ **Renewable power purchased by DWR in 2001**
  - ↓ PG&E Energy Trading wind (10 years) -- \$58.50/MWh
  - ↓ Clearwood Geothermal (10 years) -- \$67.40/MWh
- ↓ **All 2002 interim solicitation contracts executed by SDG&E, SCE and PG&E priced at or below \$53.70/MWh.**
- ↓ **All bilateral contracts in 2003 and 2004 priced at or below \$53.70/MWh.**
- ↓ **SCE and PG&E 2005 contracts all priced below 2005 Market Price Referent (~\$60/MWh).**

## Progress towards reaching 20%

### ↓ IOU renewable portfolios

- ↓ SDG&E -- 4.5% in 2004, 5.7% in 2005
- ↓ PG&E -- 12.4% in 2003, 11.7% in 2004, 12.6% in 2005
- ↓ SCE -- 17.7% in 2003, 18.2% in 2004, 18.3% in 2005.

### ↓ Munis

- ↓ City of Anaheim opts out of SONGS to meet renewable targets.
- ↓ LADWP -- 3% in 2003 -- goals of 13% by 2010, 20% by 2017. Announced 120 MW wind project.
- ↓ SMUD -- 9% in 2003, committed to 20% by 2011.
- ↓ Broader compliance data lacking

### ↓ ESPs

- ↓ No announced procurement despite partial ESP obligations that began on January 1, 2003. Full ESP participation required by 2006.

### ↓ CCA rules yet to be established

## Direct access compliance challenges

### ↓ No ESP compliance with RPS targets to date

- ↓ Full compliance begins 1/1/06

### ↓ Significant renewable capacity required to serve 20% of existing direct access loads

- ↓ 550-600 average MW (1700 MW of wind)
- ↓ Who will build this new capacity?
- ↓ New supplies not being built without long-term contracts

### ↓ Possible compliance structures

- ↓ Procurement entity
- ↓ Long-term contracting by ESPs
- ↓ Tradable RECs, short-term contracts

### ↓ Failure to secure long-term supplies will create price volatility

- ↓ Difficult to compartmentalize risk.
- ↓ Threatens PGC funds and overall viability of RPS program.

## Procurement Entity Concept

- ↓ **3<sup>rd</sup> party agent capable of entering into long-term renewable contracts on behalf of direct access customers**
  - ↓ not an IOU or state agency
  - ↓ responsible for achieving RPS compliance for customers opting in through their current ESP
  - ↓ subject to CPUC oversight (procurement plans, contract approval)
  - ↓ all RPS program rules apply (flexible compliance, SEP awards)
  - ↓ granted rate recovery of contract costs
- ↓ **Obligations incurred by Procurement Entity follow customers switching between retail providers**
  - ↓ physical power scheduled by PE into the ISO with each customer's retail provider accepting a pro-rata allocation
  - ↓ costs collected from customers through separate rate component
- ↓ **Transitional issues**
  - ↓ treatment of ESPs during interim set-up period
  - ↓ rules for non-participating ESPs

## Use of Renewable Energy Credits

- ↓ **Legal issues**
  - ↓ SB 1078 bars the use of unbundled RECs for RPS compliance. No changes contemplated in SB 107.
- ↓ **Value of RECs to customers**
  - ↓ Flexibility.
  - ↓ Price hedging benefits? What stability do customers receive?
  - ↓ Lower costs?
- ↓ **Where will the RECs come from?**
  - ↓ Developers need long-term contracts to finance new infrastructure.
  - ↓ Will developers build "on spec" hoping to sell RECs?
  - ↓ Very few potential REC suppliers. Market power problems.
- ↓ **Risks**
  - ↓ Moving from long-term contracts to short-term REC transactions.
  - ↓ Potential scarcity, market power problems, price volatility.
  - ↓ Remember RECLAIM?
- ↓ **QF REC ownership**
  - ↓ FERC decision leaves issue to states. Concerns over rising QF prices if RECs are not bundled with energy as part of avoided cost pricing.

## Other RPS issues

- ↓ **All-source RFOs vs. dedicated RPS solicitations**
  - ↓ Carbon adders -- back to the externality wars?
  - ↓ Are renewables a different product?
- ↓ **QF issues**
  - ↓ Repowering existing wind facilities
  - ↓ Treatment of expiring contracts
- ↓ **Production Tax Credit uncertainty**
- ↓ **Core/Non-core debate creates bundled load uncertainty**
  - ↓ Should IOUs plan for load departures, or assume rising bundled sales?
- ↓ **Transmission constraints**
  - ↓ Tehachapi, Imperial Valley
  - ↓ Utility Transmission Ranking Cost Reports - good idea gone wrong
  - ↓ Delivery flexibility offers realistic alternative.