Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Wednesday, April 29, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: Power Committee

FROM: Michael Schilmoeller, Staff Analyst

SUBJECT: Web Conference Presentation of Portfolio Model Results

This meeting will lay down some of the groundwork for the May 12 Power Committee meeting in Walla Walla, Washington. We will present specific model results and study conclusions to support the recommendations we intend to present in Walla Walla.

- Carbon emissions under alternative control schemes
- The economic and carbon implication of Regional Portfolio Standards
- Cost, risk, and carbon emission considerations in plan selection
- Alternative rates of implementation for conservation
- The consequences of breeching the dams on the lower Snake river
- The impact of climate change on the choice of resources along the efficient frontier

We expect the results will resemble those that we currently have at hand and have shared with the Power Committee. Those results are summarized in the attached PowerPoint.

851 S.W. Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100
Portland, Oregon 97204-1348
www.nwcouncil.org

Steve Crow
Executive Director

503-222-5161
800-452-5161
Fax: 503-820-2370

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Regional Portfolio Model Results

Michael Schilmoeller

for the

Power Committee Web Conference

Thursday, May 7, 2009

revised May 11, 2009

Overview

- Changes in assumptions and data
- Plans on the efficient frontier
- Interpreting a plan
- Issue Studies
  - Carbon control and climate change
  - The economic effects of the Regional Portfolio Standards

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Changes in Assumptions and Data

- CO_2 penalty likelihood distribution
- Conservation base case
  - New programs and re-evaluation of energy distributions over seasons and subperiods
  - Limit of 160MWa per year on discretionary
  - Sampling of discretionary conservation
- Geothermal assumptions regarding build rate

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

CO2 Penalty Distribution





Overview

- Changes in assumptions and data
- Plans on the efficient frontier
- Interpreting a plan
- Issue Studies
  - Carbon control and climate change
  - The economic effects of the Regional Portfolio Standards

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Efficient Frontier



Source: Analysis of Optimization Run_L811 090510 2101.xls

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Resources Selection by the Model – Least Risk (D)

Plan D Discretionary demand response: none

50 Lost opportunity conservation cost-effectiveness threshold, premium over market ($2006/MWh)

3253 Lost opportunity conservation by end of study (MWa)*

10 Discretionary conservation cost-effectiveness threshold, premium over market ($2006/MWh)

2573 Discretionary conservation by end of study (MWa) assuming 160MWa/year limit

5827 Total conservation (MWa)

Cumulative MW, by earliest date to begin construction

	Dec-10	Dec-13	Dec-15	Dec-17	Dec-19	Dec-23	Dec-25
CCCT	0	0	0	**415**	**830**	**830**	**830**
SCCT	0	0	**170**	**170**	**170**	**170**	**170**
Geothermal	0	0	0	**52**	**104**	**156**	**169**
and the *larger* of							
Wind	0	0	**1200**	**1200**	**3000**	**3000**	**3000**
RPS* req	0	**26**	**972**	**1842**	**2628**	**4979**	**5388**

Source: Schedules for plan resources.xls

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Reality Checks – Least Risk



Source: Adequacy 6th Plan Base Case 050609_MJS.xls

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Contribution to Peak – Least Risk



Source: JF, "Adequacy 6th Plan Base Case 051109 LR.xls"

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Contribution to Peak – Least Risk



Source: JF, "Adequacy 6th Plan Base Case 051109 LR.xls"

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Rate Impacts – Least Risk



Source: L811x1_LR2.xls, wksheet Data (3)

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Effect on Carbon Mitigation – Least Risk

- The regional carbon footprint is roughly 60 million tons of CO_2
- Regional coal plants contribute about 55 million tons of CO_2 annually. Replacing these with gas fired generation would result in net reduction of about 25 million tons.
- While this plan introduces carbon neutral or carbon-free resources, the principal determinants of emissions, electricity price and carbon penalties, are not, per se, elements of the plan.

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Effect on Carbon Mitigation – Least Risk



Source: "Studies\L811\L811 Extractions\Qtrly Rates, CO2, and others - LR+LC\ L811x1_LR.xls", worksheet "Data (6)"; no imp/exp adjustment, includes standard year and regional resource definition adjustments

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Discretionary Conservation Implementation Rate

Least-Risk Plan Results

Note: "Discretionary", "dispatchable", or "retroactive" conservation is referred to here by NLO ("non-lost op")

	Ramp rate (MWa/yr)	Selected premiums	NLO by end of study (MWa)	Total cons by end of study (MWa)	Plan Cost ($2006 B NPV)	Plan Risk ($2006 B NPV)
Low	100	50 for LO; NA for NLO	1996	4566	114.1	173.9
Base case	160	40 for LO; 10 for NLO	2573	5827	105.5	155.5
High	220	40 for LO; 10 for NLO	2657	5848	103.7	152.2

Source: Analysis of Optimization Run_L811 090502.xls, Analysis of Optimization Run_L811a.xls

L811c.xls (max case); summarized in "Effect of NLO ramp rate.xls"

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Resources Selection by the Model – Least Cost

Plan A Discretionary demand response: none

10 Lost opportunity conservation cost-effectiveness threshold, premium over market ($2006/MWh)

2941 Lost opportunity conservation by end of study (MWa)*

10 Discretionary conservation cost-effectiveness threshold, premium over market ($2006/MWh)

2585 Discretionary conservation by end of study (MWa) assuming 160MWa/year limit

5527 Total conservation (MWa)

Cumulative MW, by earliest date to begin construction

	Dec-10	Dec-13	Dec-15	Dec-17	Dec-19	Dec-23	Dec-25
CCCT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCCT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Geothermal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
and the *larger* of							
Wind	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RPS* req	0	**26**	**972**	**1842**	**2628**	**4979**	**5388**

Source: Schedules for plan resources.xls

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Reality Checks – Least Cost



Source: Least cost plan from "Analysis of Optimization Run_L811 090510 2101.xls"; adequacy calculation from "Adequacy 6th Plan Base Case 051109 LC L8112 MJS.xls "

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Contribution to January Peak Least Cost



Source: Least cost plan from "Analysis of Optimization Run_L811 090510 2101.xls"; adequacy calculation from "Adequacy 6th Plan Base Case 051109 LC L8112 MJS.xls "

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Contribution to July Peak Least Cost



Source: Least cost plan from "Analysis of Optimization Run_L811 090510 2101.xls"; adequacy calculation from "Adequacy 6th Plan Base Case 051109 LC L8112 MJS.xls "

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Rate Impacts – Least Cost



Source: L811x1_LC2.xls, wksheet Data (4)

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Overview

- Changes in assumptions and data
- Plans on the efficient frontier
- Interpreting a plan
- Issue Studies
  - Carbon control and climate change
  - The economic effects of the Regional Portfolio Standards

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Decision Criteria For Construction



Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Interpreting and Using a Plan

- As a ceiling for what should be sited and licensed
- To develop signposts for re-evaluation

Additions in Megawatts

Beginning of year	2008	2010	2012	2014	2016	2018	2020
CCCT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	610.00	1,220.00
SCCT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	800.00
Coal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Demand Response	500.00	750.00	1,000.00	1,250.00	1,500.00	1,750.00	2,000.00
Wind_Capacity	0.00	100.00	1,500.00	2,400.00	4,400.00	5,000.00	5,000.00
IGCC	0.00	0.00	425.00	425.00	425.00	425.00	425.00
Conservation cost-effectiveness premium over market	10.00	5.00					
avg New Conservation	443	746	1071	1416	1774	2020	2198

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Build Decision for CCCT



Source: Illustrations for the 090512 P4 PPT.xls based on L810X.sls

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Build Decision for Geothermal*



Source: Illustrations for the 090512 P4 PPT.xls based on L810X.sls

*This illustration developed from earlier, unconstrained geothermal schedule.

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

The Value of Using Construction Options for a Resource Plan

- More realistic
- Necessary for capturing construction cost risk
- Consistent with earlier Council Plans
- Consistent with statutory requirement for 20-year resource plan

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Overview

- Changes in assumptions and data
- Plans on the efficient frontier
- Interpreting a plan
- Issue Studies
  - Carbon control and climate change
  - The economic effects of the Regional Portfolio Standards

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Issue Studies

- Carbon control and climate change
  - Cost, risk, and carbon emission considerations in plan selection
  - Displacement by renewables and conservation
  - Reduction through dispatch penalties
  - Direct curtailment of coal-fired power production
  - The effects of climate change on energy production and requirement
- The economic consequences of the Regional Portfolio Standards

Cost, Risk, And Carbon Emission Considerations In Plan Selection

- Mechanisms: displacement, dispatch, direct curtailment
- Resource-oriented versus requirement-oriented perspective
- Definition of regional resources
- Transfer costs and the use of collected revenues

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Mechanisms

- Displacement
  - Example: building renewables
- Dispatch penalty
  - Example: tax of fuels, emission; trading regimes
- Direct curtailment
  - Example: new source requirements

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Mechanisms



Normal order



Dispatch Order



Displacement



Curtailment

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Mechanisms

- Different Effects
  - Wholesale electricity price
  - Cost to ratepayers
- Different Advantages and Disadvantages
  - Administrative control
    - Administrative boundary issues
    - Geographic boundary issues
    - Reversibility
  - Efficiency & Flexibility

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Cost, Risk, And Carbon Emission Considerations In Plan Selection

- Mechanisms: displacement, dispatch, direct curtailment
- Resource-oriented versus requirement-oriented perspective
- Definition of regional resources
- Transfer costs and the use of collected revenues

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Resource-oriented Perspective

no adjustment for imports and exports



Power and Conservation Council

Requirement-oriented Perspective

adjustment for imports and exports



Power and Conservation Council

Resource-oriented Versus Requirement-oriented Perspective

- Very distinct pictures emerge
- If all the fossil-fired generation in the region were curtailed, would the region region have solved its carbon emission problem?

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Trade-Off Curves for Emissions and Penalties



Source:: L811s - Sensitivity study on Carbon.xls, with sensitivity moved to the horizontal axis and 2013 selected

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Cost, Risk, And Carbon Emission Considerations In Plan Selection

- Mechanisms: displacement, dispatch, direct curtailment
- Resource-oriented versus requirement-oriented perspective
- Definition of regional resources
- Transfer costs and the use of collected revenues

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Definition of Regional Resources

Name	Installed Capacity (MW)	Availability (%)	Capability (MWa)	Average Heat Rate (Btu/kWh)	tons CO2/MWh	RPM & Genesys (%)	Council's Carbon Footprint paper
Boardman	601.0	84%	504.8	10840	1.149	75%	100%
Centralia 1 (85% IPP)	730.0	84%	613.2	10240	1.085	100%	100%
Centralia 2 (100% IPP)	730.0	84%	613.2	10240	1.085	100%	100%
Colstrip 1	358.4	84%	301.1	11170	1.184	50%	100%
Colstrip 2	358.4	84%	301.1	11170	1.184	50%	100%
Colstrip 3	778.0	84%	653.5	10870	1.152	70%	100%
Colstrip 4	778.0	84%	653.5	10870	1.152	92%	100%
Corrette (J.E. Corette)	172.8	84%	145.2	11010	1.167	0%	100%
Jim Bridger 1	577.9	84%	485.4	10570	1.120	100%	100%
Jim Bridger 2	577.9	84%	485.4	10570	1.120	100%	100%
Jim Bridger 3	577.9	84%	485.4	10570	1.120	100%	100%
Jim Bridger 4	584.0	84%	490.6	10570	1.120	100%	100%
North Valmy 1	254.3	84%	213.6	10450	1.108	50%	50%
North Valmy 2	267.0	84%	224.3	10450	1.108	50%	50%
Steam Plant 2 (retired)	2.0					0%	100%

- At 84% capacity factor, the Council's Carbon Footprint Paper estimates regional coal plant carbon emission would be 16.6% higher than the Regional Portfolio Model (58.9 vs 50.5 M tons)
- Note that Centralia is an Independent Power Producer

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Transfer Cost Effects

- Some carbon control policies rely on taxes that would be collected somewhere along the fuel stream (production, conversion, use)
- The identity of winners and losers, and whether these costs should be considered "real", depends on what happens to those tax revenues
- Regional Portfolio Model produces costs and risks both with and without the carbon penalty cost
- While the costs and rates would differ significantly, preliminary studies suggest the plan selection *would be the same irrespective* of the treatment of these costs.

Issue Studies

- Carbon control and climate change
  - Cost, risk, and carbon emission considerations in plan selection
  - Displacement by renewables and conservation
  - Reduction through dispatch penalties
  - Direct curtailment of coal-fired power production
  - The effects of climate change on energy production and requirement
- The economic consequences of the Regional Portfolio Standards
- Conservation implementation rate
- Breaching the lower Snake dams

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Displacement By Renewables and Conservation

- How effective is the RPS in reducing carbon emissions?
- Can the region meet carbon emission targets through RPS resources and conservation alone?

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Displacement By Renewables and Conservation



Source: "Studies\L811\L811 Extractions\Qtrly Rates, CO2, and others - LR+LC\ L811x1_LR.xls", worksheet "Data (6)"; no imp/exp adjustment, includes standard year and regional resource definition adjustments

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Carbon-constrained, Least-cost Plan

Discretionary demand response: none

100 Lost opportunity conservation cost-effectiveness threshold, premium over market ($2006/MWh)

2390 Lost opportunity conservation by end of study (MWa)*

100 Discretionary conservation cost-effectiveness threshold, premium over market ($2006/MWh)

3049 Discretionary conservation by end of study (MWa) assuming 160MWa/year limit

5439 Total conservation (MWa)

Cumulative MW, by earliest date to begin construction

	Dec-10	Dec-13	Dec-15	Dec-17	Dec-19	Dec-23	Dec-25
CCCT	0	0	0	**756**	**1512**	**3780**	**3780**
SCCT	0	0	**170**	**340**	**340**	**340**	**340**
Geothermal	0	0	**630**	**630**	**630**	**630**	**840**
Woody Biomass	0	0	0	0	0	**850**	**850**
Advanced Nuclear	0	0	0	0	**2200**	**2200**	**2200**
Eastern MT Wind	**4500**	**4500**	**4500**	**4500**	**4500**	**4500**	**4500**
and the *larger* of							
Wind	**3500**	**3500**	**5500**	**5500**	**5500**	**5500**	**5500**
RPS* req	0	**26**	**972**	**1842**	**2628**	**4979**	**5388**

Source: Schedules for plan resources.xls

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Carbon-constrained, Least-cost Plan



Source: Data conversion workbook 011 L810c.xls

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Displacement Conclusions

- Displacement does not guarantee carbon reduction
- Electricity price – properly speaking, the relationship between electricity price, fuel price, and carbon dispatch penalty – will trump displacement

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Reduction through Dispatch Penalties

- fixed $100/ton CO2 tax in all futures



Source: "Plan 6\Studies\L810\L810a $100 per ton carbon penalty\Extraction for carbon effect\L810a.xls" , worksheet "Data (3)"

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Curtailment Of Existing Coal-fired Power Production



Northwest Power and Conservation Council

The Effects Of Climate Change

- Hydro generation
- Loads
- This study is outstanding, but we believe we have in hand the necessary data.

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Issue Studies

- Carbon control and climate change
  - Cost, risk, and carbon emission considerations in plan selection
  - Displacement by renewables and conservation
  - Reduction through dispatch penalties
  - Direct curtailment of coal-fired power production
  - The effects of climate change on energy production and requirement
- The economic consequences of the Regional Portfolio Standards

Regional Portfolio Standards

- What should the region have done in the absence of RPS requirements?
- Are the RPS requirements expensive relative to the "no-RPS" alternative?
- How effective is the RPS approach in reducing carbon emissions?

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

RPS Conclusions

- In the absence of the RPS requirement, the region probably should have acquired about the same amount of renewables as the RPS statues require.
- Matching the schedule of renewable construction to economic requirements might have saved some money, but probably not much.
- Constructing renewables and other non-carbon producing resources is necessary but not, in itself, sufficient to guarantee reduced CO_2 emission rate.

Summary

- Changes in assumptions and data
- Plans on the efficient frontier
- Interpreting a plan
- Issue Studies
  - Carbon control and climate change
  - The economic effects of the Regional Portfolio Standards

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Conclusions

- Conservation dominates the Least-Risk and Least-Cost plans
- The Least-Risk and Least-Cost plans appear to be adequate from an energy and a peak contribution perspective
- The recommendation has considered the possibilities of breaching the Lower Snake River dams. We hope soon to have a study that assesses the likely change in loads and hydrogeneration that scientists believe might result from climate change.

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Conclusions

- The Least-Risk plan reduces expected carbon emission rates, but significant risk remains that regional coal plants would continue emitting carbon at nearly the same rates
- Investment in renewables and energy efficiency, coupled with arrangements for the direct curtailment of the six coal plants in the region, offer the surest, lowest risk solution to meeting regional carbon emission standards
- If we curtail coal-fired generation too abruptly, we limit our options for replacing the energy. If we have to replace this energy with gas-fired generation, for example, our possible reductions would be cut by half. Curtailment must be tempered by prudence and our assessment of potential for carbon-free sources of energy.

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

End