

Alterations to Texas' Renewable Portfolio Standard

SB 435 by Sen. Ellis
SB 541 by Sen. Watson
SB 1419 by Sen. Lucio

SB 436 by Sen. Ellis
SB 620 by Sen. Shapleigh
SB 1423 by Sen. Huffman

Proposals

- SB 435 would require installation of generation capacity from renewable energy technologies that is capable of producing at least 3,000 MW of electricity during peak loads by 2020. The bill creates a peak load renewable energy credits trading program.
- SB 436 would require installation of generation capacity from renewable energy technologies that is capable of producing at least 3,000 MW of base load electricity during by 2020. The bill creates a base load renewable energy credits trading program.
- SB 541 would alter the state's renewable portfolio standard (RPS) to require installation of 10,000 MW of renewable capacity by 2025, and requires installation of at least 3,000 MW of non-wind renewable technology by 2020. The bill would require the Public Utility Commission of Texas (PUC) to develop a "Made in Texas" incentive for renewable energy credits.
- SB 620 would revise the state's RPS to require 6,880 MW of total renewable generation by 2015 and target 11,000 MW by 2025. The PUC would revise its target for non-wind renewable technology from 500 MW to 1,500 MW by 2015.
- SB 1419 would alter the state's RPS by changing the current "target" of 10,000 MW in installed renewable capacity by 2025 to a "goal" of 10,000 MW by 2020. The bill requires at least 4,000 MW of that goal to be met with technology other than "high-capacity wind energy," and sets interim goals. The PUC would be required to set an alternative compliance payment to meet the non-wind RPS goal.
- SB 1423 would alter the state's RPS by changing the current "target" of 10,000 MW in installed renewable capacity by 2025 to a "goal." The bill requires at least 3,000 MW of that goal to be met with technology other than wind energy.

AECT Position

- AECT member companies support the implementation of alternative energy technologies as they become economically viable and in demand by customers. Allowing market participants the flexibility to meet customer demand is the best process for supporting new technologies.
- Customers who seek to use these technologies should be allowed the opportunity to weigh the benefits versus the costs and choose accordingly, but those customers should not be able to shift costs to other customers.
- Alternative energy resource development must be closely coordinated with the utilities whose job it is to provide electric service to customers. This is particularly important with new technologies designed to interconnect with the current electric system.
- Mandates of experimental or developing technologies can add costs to the market, which are ultimately borne by customers.
- AECT remains committed to a long-term transition to future energy solutions, but our state must do so in a manner that is rational, measured and does not impose an unreasonable financial burden on customers or market participants.