Paul Acchione, P. Eng., B.A.Sc., M. Eng. Chair - OSPE Energy Task Force Management Consultant - MIDAC Corp.

January 19, 2012





# **Terminology and Acknowledgement**

- ♦ Grid the IESO managed resources only
- Emissions CO<sub>2</sub> emissions only
- $\diamond$  Normal operating period emissions, not life cycle emissions
- ♦ Not including emergencies and contingencies
- Not including export support to adjoining grids
- The generation and customer demand data was obtained from the IESO website (http://www.ieso.ca)
- Electricity production cost data was obtained from the Projected Costs of Generating Electricity, 2010 Edition, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- CO<sub>2</sub> Emission data was obtained from the Natural Resources Canada, website, RETScreen Clean Energy Project Analysis Software, http:// canmetenergy-canmetenergie.nrcan-rncan.gc.ca/eng/ software\_tools/retscreen.html





# Is a Zero CO<sub>2</sub> Emission Grid A Realistic Goal ?

in 2010, 79% of the 142 TWh of electrical energy in the IESO managed grid came from zero CO<sub>2</sub> emitting generation resources:

♦ Nuclear: 55%

♦ Hydraulic: 20%

 $\diamond$  Other Renewables - wind, solar, bio-energy: 4%

 $\diamond$  in 2010, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were about:

♦ 973 g/kWh for coal

♦ 398 g/kWh for gas

ightarrow 134 g/kWh for the overall IESO administered electrical grid

the 2010 Ontario Long Term Energy Plan calls for 92% of electricity to come from zero CO<sub>2</sub> emitting sources by 2030

 $\diamond$  today we will look at how to get that extra 8%?





## Is a Zero CO<sub>2</sub> Emission Grid A Realistic Goal ?

♦ to see the difficulties involved you need to look at the electrical demand profile over the whole year
 ♦ spring and autumn are low demand periods
 ♦ evenings and weekends are low demand periods
 ♦ hot summer days create the highest demand
 ♦ let's look at the highest and lowest demand days





### Highest and Lowest Demand Days in 2011







# Our Challenges

Nuclear has limited maneuvering capability
 Hydraulic has limited maneuvering capability
 Hydraulic has limited storage capability
 Solar is not available at night and on over-cast days
 Wind is not dependable and needs a backup
 Renewable bio-energy is limited by bio-waste volumes
 Seasonal storage is expensive (about 27 cents/kWh not including the cost of the primary energy source)





## **Additional Challenges**

- When we maneuver (dispatch) generating facilities their capacity factor drop and their cost per unit of energy output rises.
- Solar and wind are the most sensitive to dispatching
  Gas fired generation is the least sensitive to dispatching but it has significant CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of about 398 g/kWh at 45% thermal cycle efficiency





#### Impact of Dispatching on Levelized Cost of Electricity







## Strategies to Achieve Zero CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions

♦ Option A - More Renewables with Storage:

♦ Nuclear operates as a base load resource

Storage is used to make solar and wind dependable so they can supply peak demand both daily and seasonally

 $\diamond$  Daily storage can be close to wind and solar plants

- Seasonal storage is provided centrally at new pumped storage facilities
- Maneuverable bio-energy reduces storage requirements
- Gas generation is retained for emergencies and contingencies (outages, de-ratings, unexpected demand)





## Strategies to Achieve Zero CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions

♦ Option A - More Renewables with Storage:

- $\diamond$  Wind operates at its full 25% design capacity factor
- $\diamond$  Solar operates at its full 15% design capacity factor
- ♦ An additional 5,500 MW of wind turbines to fill storage and 5,500 MW of peak capacity storage would be required to meet summer peak demand and displace gas for the low growth planning scenario (150 TWh in 2030)
- Storage (a blend of daily and seasonal) is assumed to cost
  2.5x the cost of wind turbines
- $\diamond$  Electrical energy price component of rates will rise <u>31%</u>





## Strategies to Achieve Zero CO, Emissions



## Strategies to Achieve Zero CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions

Option B - More Maneuverable Nuclear Electrical Output

An additional 5,000 MW of nuclear capacity would be required to meet summer peak demand and displace gas for the low growth planning scenario (150 TWh in 2030)

 $\diamond$  Nuclear would load cycle at night and weekends

 $\diamond$  Hydraulic, bio-energy and nuclear would back up wind/solar

- Gas generation is retained for emergencies and contingencies (outages, de-ratings, unexpected demand)
- $\diamond$  Wind operates at its full 25% design capacity factor
- $\diamond$  Solar operates at its full 15% design capacity factor





## Strategies to Achieve Zero CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions

Option B - More Maneuverable Nuclear Electrical Output

- New nuclear assumed to cost 9 cents/kWh assuming a base load operation and 5% financial discount rate
- Simulation analysis is required to get accurate costs because wind and solar generation vary day-to-day
- We can get an approximate cost based on annual energy production and summer peak capacity requirements
- Nuclear would operate at 14% lower capacity factor
- Nuclear energy cost would rise approximately 29% and electrical energy price component of rates will rise <u>14%</u>





#### Strategies to Achieve Zero CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions



## Summary/Conclusions

The phase out of coal generation in Ontario will reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by about 59% for the electrical grid

Further reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will require additional investments that will raise the electrical energy price component of rates a further:

**31**% using storage and wind turbines (option A), or

♦ 14% using nuclear maneuvering (option B)

Detailed simulation and cost studies are required to obtain accurate cost estimates

Nuclear maneuvering offers the lowest cost path to eliminate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for grid electricity production

Nuclear is also relatively immune to the impact of climate change if jurisdictions do not reduce emissions sufficiently



