

I appreciate the amount of work that has been done by the stakeholders and staff in determining the implementation of the CEP given the limited details provided in HB 2021. I am sorry that I haven't been able to give this the attention it deserves.

Here are couple of more general concerns:

### Electricity Service Providers

HB 2021 Sections 3 and 4 state that a CEP must be provided by “an electric company,” which includes both electric utilities and electric service providers, and must be acknowledged by the PUC. However, Section 17 States that the emissions targets do not apply to any electric company with fewer than 25,000 retail consumers in Oregon, which I means no CEP is required. The discussions I have seen so far seem to apply only to the the two large utilities. Are there any electricity service providers with 25,000 retail consumers in Oregon?

### Renewable Energy Credits (REC)

I have been confused about the rules for the use of RECs (and MTCs) to reduce reportable greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. This is especially a concern for compliance with HB 2021.

Section 1 specifies that “nonemitting electricity” means “electricity, including hydroelectricity, that is generated and may be stored in a manner that does not emit greenhouse gas into the atmosphere.”

Section 2 states that “It is the policy of the State of Oregon(1) That retail electricity providers rely on nonemitting electricity in accordance with the clean energy targets set forth in section 3 of this 2021 Act and eliminate greenhouse gas emissions associated with serving Oregon retail electricity consumers by 2040.”

It is ambiguous whether environmental attribute RECs from nonemitting electricity generated outside Oregon can be used for HB 2021 compliance. Even if acceptable, RECs for some renewables such as biofuels could be excluded because they are not nonemitting.

### CEP Roadmap Proposals

I did not review all the discussions, but here are a few comments. I realize that some of my comments may reflect my lack of expertise or understanding.

There are some Topics for which the Proposal might differ depending on whether the CEP is for an already-acknowledged IRP or one being submitted for acknowledgement with the IRP. See one example in my discussion of Topic #6.

- Topic #1, 3, 7, 8 Seem reasonable.
- Topic #2 Goals for all portfolios should only have to be included if the CEP is being acknowledged with the IRP.
- Topics #4, 5 Not reviewed

Topic #6      Considerations in CEP Acknowledgement

A member of the public should be able to understand the CEP without going to the IRP or DSP. Even if the CEP is incorporated in the IRP, it should be independently published and accessible even to someone who does not know the Docket number of the IRP.

HB 2021 does not require the CEP itself to show consistency with the IRP. This should be required of the CEP generator as part of the acknowledgement process for the CEP.

For the most part, the fact that the CEP is required to be compatible with the IRP should not be visible, except possibly in reference notes. For example, the fact that the preferred portfolio is in the IRP is irrelevant. It could be referenced as the “preferred portfolio” if the CEP is submitted with the IRP or “approved portfolio” if that portion of the IRP has been acknowledged.

I look forward to seeing the draft of the full document.

Kathy Moyd