## **SB 1440 Implementation**

**December 6, 2019** 





SB 1440 is intended to explore how California's gas delivery system can support the cost-effective reduction of SLCPs and  $CO_2$  through the delivery of biomethane.





How might we consider "cost effectiveness" for short-lived climate pollutant reduction/ GHG reduction as we're considering developing renewable gas procurement targets/ goals?



What does "cost effective" short-lived climate pollutant reduction/ GHG reduction mean? How should we be thinking about this question? How might we have considered this question historically vs now in a rapidly changing climate?

3

How might we consider procurement targets or goal development?



How might we consider achieving these targets or goals? What procurement strategy might we consider and why?



Any RNG procurement goal or target should be cost-effective and complement existing programs. However, defining cost-effectiveness can prove challenging.

- By which end-use sectors?

Avoided Cost Category	Unit	Res / C&I / Ag	Transportation	Electric
Natural gas commodity cost	\$/MMBtu			
Cap-and-Trade compliance obligation	\$/MT CO <sub>2</sub>			
Upstream Methane Emissions	$MT CH_4$			
<b>RECs (for CO<sub>2</sub> benefit)</b>	\$/MWh			
LCFS (for $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ benefit)	\$/MT CO <sub>2</sub> e			
SLCP abatement cost*	\$/MT CH <sub>4</sub>		TBD	
Social cost of carbon	\$/MT CO <sub>2</sub>			
Social cost of methane	\$/MT CH <sub>4</sub>			



A hybrid approach to goal or target-setting will likely be needed.

Top Down



**Bottom Up** 

Example	California "needs" X amount of biomethane

Example There is X amount of biomethane available for California's consumption

- Modeling of pathways to meet California's decarbonization objectives
- Forecasts of supply potential
- Forecasts of commodity costs
- Customer affordability



While a volumetric or percentage-based goal or target simplifies procurement, some consideration for changes in throughput will be needed.

Metric for Goal or Target	Benefits	Challenges
<b>Volumetric</b> BCF / year	<ul> <li>Simplifies procurement activities</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Only indirectly connected to GHG and SLCP reductions</li> <li>Does not adjust as throughput declines, potentially increasing customer bills/rates</li> </ul>
<b>Percentage</b> % of throughput	<ul> <li>Reflects differences among gas suppliers' throughput</li> <li>Adjusts as throughput declines</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Could pose a risk of over procurement if throughput declines are greater than predicted</li> </ul>
Carbon intensity ton CO <sub>2</sub> / MMBtu	<ul> <li>Could better accommodate eventual inclusion of hydrogen in the procurement program</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Difficult for procurement planning</li> <li>Could create a "moving target" as direct regulations evolve</li> <li>Unclear who would determine the GHG reductions associated with a potential contract</li> </ul>
<b>GHG emissions</b> ton CO <sub>2</sub>	<ul> <li>Aligns with objective of SB 1440</li> <li>Ensures demonstrable progress towards the state's GHG (and SLCP) reduction goals</li> <li>Could better accommodate eventual inclusion of hydrogen in the procurement program</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Difficult for procurement planning</li> <li>Could create a "moving target" as direct regulations evolve</li> <li>Unclear who would determine the GHG reductions associated with a potential contract</li> </ul>



Lessons learned from past procurement programs should guide the formulation of an RNG procurement goal or target.



Need for rules-based cost containment mechanism



3

One inclusive low carbon fuel program; not carve outs