To: Garrett Martin, Oregon Public Utilities Commission From: Eric Strid, Power Oregon Date: Oct. 28, 2020

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on OPUC's (draft 9-22) work plans re EO 20-04.

My first comment is a request for a little top-down planning so that agencies and sectors have at least some rough GHG targets. My second comment is a request for clarification of the targets for transportation electrification (Part 3) and a discussion of those targets.

I. EO 20-04 lacks sectoral guidance

EO 20-04 is unclear whether agencies are expected to target the overall GHG emission reduction goals in Paragraph 2 in each sector, or if the goals can be specific to each sector and if so, how the target reductions are distributed.

Sectoral differences

It is clear that decarbonization challenges and opportunities vary widely between sectors. I created this rough plot of the cost trajectories of various clean technologies to illustrate their relative maturity, costs, and thus the likely adoption years and timing of reduction contributions.



Figure 1. Approximate cost trajectories of various clean energy technologies (Strid 2017)

For example,

- Wind, solar, and battery storage for electricity generation are rapidly getting cheaper. Recent modeling for decarbonizing the US grid by <u>90% by 2035</u> illustrates savings for ratepayers plus dramatic reductions in social costs.
- Electric vehicles have proven to dramatically cut operating costs and will soon be cheaper to purchase. By 2025, mid-market electric cars will be cheaper to purchase and to operate, and automakers all see this coming. Automakers require massive investments in new battery and vehicle production lines, as Tesla, China, VW Group (and Daimler Trucks North America!) are pursuing.
- Manufacturing processes for producing zero-carbon aviation fuels or cement or steel, or for cleaning semiconductor equipment, are R&D projects. Regardless of carbon fees or usage mandates, the route to low-carbon cement is through years of R&D.
- The largest sectoral interaction is probably the grid load increase from electrifying vehicles, which is roughly 50% for Oregon.

Optimizing affordability

To optimize affordability, policies must facilitate and accelerate these technology cost trajectories—such as rebates or fees in the piloting/adoption phase to steer capital purchases, or public/private financing structures for rapidly ramping up deployments, or public R&D funding in the R&D phases. Each productization phase has different financial challenges.

One simplification is to note that conservation—using less energy by using existing options can achieve only incremental emission reductions. For example, cutting vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 10% by 2035 would be wonderful, but difficult statewide and it's not nearly enough. Training consumers to drive less, drive slower, or use less electricity has minor impacts and uncertain longevity.

Energy efficiency improvements, while very useful, are also stubbornly incremental. With the excellent help of ETO, the per capita usage of electricity by Oregonians decreased an average of 0.8% per year from 2001 to 2016. But a 0.8% annual improvement for 15 years achieves less than 12% reduction. Meanwhile, population growth from 2000 to 2015 increased by 16.6%, so total electric power generation increased over that period.

Thus, the EO 20-04 goal for 2035 implies that we must replace about half of Oregon's emitting infrastructure by 2035. While that seems daunting, consider that Oregon has been replacing about 5.3% of its light-duty vehicle (LDV) fleet every year (pre-COVID). If an increasing portion of those purchases switched to zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs), <u>ramping to 100% by 2025</u>, we'd achieve more than 66% LDV emission reductions by 2035. (This is indeed possible, as Norway is currently demonstrating. Norway has about the same population, average income, vehicle fleet and replacement rate, and land area as Oregon.) Thus LDVs have the potential to reduce emissions faster than the 2035 goal, to allow other sectors (like cement or steel or aviation) more years to develop the clean product maturity necessary before deployment.

Also note that emitting infrastructure is the root cause of emissions, and GHG emissions are a symptom. Factories continuously work to fix problems, but they start by identifying root causes and avoid fixing symptoms. Infrastructure purchases must be steered to clean, whether vehicles, buildings, factories, or power plants, to achieve the EO 20-04 goals and to afford the upgrades necessary.

A simple sectoral modeling spreadsheet (see attached SIP model BAU.xlsx)

Successful decarbonization strategies must work on all levels—the physical, economic, and policy levels. The physical level is by far the simplest, since the goals are specified by EO

20-04, the 2018 IPCC report, or other targets. Economically, the sectors with the most mature clean technologies can generally respond the fastest and with the most competitive costs. Regardless of the economic or social costs or the types of policies enacted, adding up the physical emissions is very simple and the dependable DEQ inventory by sector relates well to the sector-specific options.

The most affordable path to replacing infrastructure is to steer the ongoing new purchases to zero-emission technologies. The policy options include mandates, rebates, fees, or other policies. (For example, Norway uses both carrots and sticks to equalize the purchase prices of EVs with comparable gas/diesel vehicles.)

This simplified emissions planning tool treats each of the DEQ emission sectors as an infrastructure replacement process, wherein the sector emissions decrease proportionally with fleet replacements that are zero-carbon (whether vehicles, power plants, furnaces, etc.) The model inputs by year are simply the portion of infrastructure purchases that are zero-carbon ("% of sales" for each sector). That annual addition rate is accumulated as a "% of fleet" for that sector, which reduces the GHG emissions for that sector and is plotted. Because the electricity sector is regulated by OPUC to meet a Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), the electricity inputs are "% of fleet" by year. The "% of fleet" is normalized to 0% clean in 2016; thus describing only the emitting portion of the sector.

Disclaimer: This spreadsheet is the architect's dull pencil for initial sketches. Any plan is better than no plan, because it can be analyzed and optimized. The inputs and outputs on this spreadsheet are purposely oversimplified, to focus on the large rocks in the box. It ignores conservation and efficiency contributions, as discussed above. It does not calculate any costs, although the infrastructure replacement inputs illustrate how much money is available to be steered (0 to 100% of current purchases), as opposed to additional funding (if "% of sales" is larger than 100%). It does not presume any policy structures. It ignores interactions between sectors, the largest being the increased grid load from electrification of transportation and the indirect electric vehicle emissions from electricity generation.

And those are just the major inaccuracies. But we're at the dull-pencil phase, and sharp pencils are only distracting in this phase.

The business-as-usual (BAU) numbers in the input cells are also subject to lots of differing forecasts and arguments. EV forecasts are particularly wide-ranging, but it's increasingly evident that EVs will be a large portion of global fleets by at least 2040, so the BAU should indicate significant GHG reductions from vehicles. Similarly, coal power plants are being shuttered because they're increasingly uneconomic, and gas peaker plants are being replaced by utility-scale batteries. Figure 2 is a screen capture of the spreadsheet with some BAU numbers, illustrating for this case a 25% reduction by 2035 due to existing policy and market forces.

So what is necessary to achieve the EO 20-04 reductions by 2035? Figure 3 illustrates the effects of changing the inputs for three sectors: 1) copying what Norway is doing for light-duty vehicles (this is aggressive), 2) assuming the same is possible 5 years later for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, and 3) adopting the <u>2035 Report</u> emissions trajectory for cleaning up the grid. This scenario achieves the EO 20-04 target; it does not indicate that the work is done, but it can provide guidance on useful directions to pursue.

A serious modeling tool that links specific policies to emission reductions and economic effects is the <u>Energy Policy Simulator</u> from Energy Innovations. This is open-source and online for the US, California, and other countries; an Oregon adaptation is under development with the Northwest Economic Research Center at PSU.

AutoSave	0FF	ະ ∿ ∽ ∿ ≧							🐴 SIP m	odel BAU	,							ď	R.
Home In	sert Draw	/ Page Layout	Formulas	Data	Review	View	Q Tell m	a)									e Share	Comments	5
V56	f > ×	fx																	۱.
A	8	C D	F G	н	-	7	K	W	z	0	٩	σ	æ	S	т	D	N	W	
		2	Nodel for Steer	ing Infrastr	ucture Purc	hases (SIP	_	Last rev	. 200829										
		Dbjective: For the major emission Portion of GHG emissions	n sectors, calculat green cells an	e clean-energ) e inputs	/ adoption rate GI	is that satisfy IG emissic	the state targ	ets or IPCC ti 1 (vs 2016;	repet of 45% e EO 20-04 ta	mission reduc rget is 50%	tion by 2030 below 2010	6 by 2035)							
	1	US OR HRC (EPA, (DEQ, energy		Avg lifetime of emitting	*														
	Sector	2018) 2016) (HMEP', 2016)	_	nfrastructure (yrs)	replaced annually	2020 21	25 20	0 203	2040	2045	2050								
	EO 20-04	6	raphed as					5	0.0%		18.2	**							
	Total trans	28.3% 38.7% 62.1%	rapned as					9/.RC			0.0	*							
		16.6% 21.3% 33.9% %	e sales	19.0	5.3%	8.0%	25.0% 5	0.0% 9	0.0% 100	0.0% 100.	0% 100.01	*		% GHG	Reductions	s (additive)			
		%	of fleet			1.3%	5.6% 1	5.5% 3	3.9% 51	.9% 85.	2% 100.09	%	0.0%						
		* 1	of OR reduction			0.3%	1.2%	3.3%	7.2% 1	2.5% 18.	1% 21.3	8 8	0 U%	/					
	VUHIVOW	6.6% 9.5% 28.2% %	apried as sales	12.0	8.3%	93.1.% 0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0% 61	.0% 80.	0% 100.0	5 * <mark>* *</mark>							
		~	of fleet			0.0%	2.1% 1	0.4% 2	7.1% 5	.0% 81.	3% 100.09	æ ×	0.0%						
		*	of OR reduction			0.0%	0.2%	1.0%	2.6%	.9% 7.	7% 9.5	~	• 0.0%	EO 20-04					
	-	10 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	raphed as	A 80	0 1921	99.7%	98.6%	5.7% 9	0.2% 8.	2.6% 74.	1% 69.2	*	•	IPCC 2018			/		
Transportatio	Kail	0.7% 1.6% 0.0% %	e sales	27.0	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 100 8.5% 2/	0.0% 100.	0.% 100.0	9 8	0.0%	LDVs	4				
		< 3 ^c	of OR reduction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1% (.3% 0.	6% 0.9	ت د ا	0.0%	VDV/HDV					
			raphed as			99.7%	98.6% \$	5.7% 9	0.1% 8:	.3% 73.	5% 68.3			Rail	8				
	Aviation	2.6% 3.5% 0.0% %	sales	10.0	10.0%	0.0%	1.0% 1	0.0% 5	0.0% 100	.0% 100.	0% 100.01	4	0.0%	Aviation					
		*	of fleet			0.0%	0.3%	3.0% 1	8.0% 5/	5% 100.	0% 100.0	~	0.0%	Electricity					
		*	of OR reduction			0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.6%	3.0% 3.	5% 3.5%) 2		Industry			/		
	Shipping	0.6% 0.0% 0.0% %	rapried as sales	25.0	4.0%	%0.0	0.0%	0.0% 10	0.0% 10	0.0% 100.	0% 100.01	۵ ۲	0.0%	Commercial					
		16	of fleet			0.0%	0.0%	1.0% 1	2.0% 33	0% 52.	0% 72.0	-	0.0%	Residential					
		*	of OR reduction			0.0%	%0.0	0.0%	0.0% (.0% 0.	0% 0.0	~		Agriculture					
		6	raphed as			99.7%	98.6% §	5.6% 8	9.5% 8/	.3% 70.	0% 64.7'	*	0.0%	3005	2020 203	0100	2046 2060		
Electricity	Electricity	27% 26.1% 29.6%		40.0	2.5%	0.001	and the second	and the second	apar a		10 00		0707	0707	CO7 0007	0407 0	0007 0407		
		8 8	of OB radiuction			0.0%	5.75% 18 2.3%	.75% 31 4 ov.	25% 3.	.5% 45. 1.8% 11	7% 60.07	<mark>8</mark> 3							
			raphed as			99.7%	96.3%	0.7% 8	1.3% 70	.5% 58.	2% 49.1	د ا ×	Notes: This is	a BAU example.	Superior cost str	uctures will drive v	arious zero-emission		
	Industry	22% 12.4% 2.2% %	sales	15.0	6.7%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0% 5	0.0% 8(.0% 90.	0% 95.0	*	adoptions, alt	nough the pace de	pends on cost c	rossovers and is v	ery uncertain.		
		*	of fleet			0.00%	1.7%	8.3% 2	1.7% 4:	1.3% 71.	7% 100.09	*							
		8	of OR reduction			0.0%	0.2%	1.0%	2.7%	.4% 8.	9% 12.4	*							
	1	5	raphed as			99.7%	96.1% 8	9.7% 7	8.6% 6/	6.1% 49.	3% 36.7	*						_	
Categories	Commercial	7% 6.1% 3.3% %	sales	14.0	7.1%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.0% 100.	0% 100.0	<mark>*</mark> 2							
electricity bu	-	~ 2	of OR radiuction			0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	16%	1.4% 63.	5% 100.0	2 3							
with natural g	as)	5	raphed as			99.7%	96.0% 8	9.1% 7	7.0% 6	.8% 43.	8% 30.5	*							
	Residential	6% 7.3% 2.6% %	e sales	14.0	7.1%	0.0%	10.0% 3	0.0% 7	0.0% 9(.0% 100.	0% 100.01	%							
		*	of fleet			0.0%	1.8%	8.9% 2	5.8% 5/	.4% 89.	3% 100.0	*							
		*	of OR reduction			0.0%	0.1%	0.6%	1.9%	.0% 6.	5% 7.3	*							
		6	raphed as			99.7%	95.9% 8	8.5% 7	5.0% 57	.7% 37.	4% 23.3	%							
	Agriculture	10% 9.7% 0.0% %	sales	ВП		* /10/ 00/	10 VII 1	A 001	100 V	A0/ 400	10 VVV	2							
		< 3	of OB roduction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		007 007	1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 100	8 2							
			raphed as			%0.0 80.7%	95.9% 8	8.5% 7	5.0% 5	.7% 37.	4% 23.3								
					-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_						
	andmo	Choosing Infection	IIC ala		-								l						
	allinpar				+ 2														
Ready																		%06 +	

Figure 2. Screen shot of the model with some business-as-usual assumptions.

Out Tent	out Total T	Home Insert Draw Page T50 T50	Layout Formulas Layout Formulas P F G F Model for Ste Mod	Data Review H H I I enhg Infrastructure P Arg lactime Arg lactime Arg lactime (yrg) a comulative infrastructure republiced (yrg) a comulative (yrg) a comulative (yrg	View Urorchases (SIP rates that satisfy GHG emissio	Q Tell me								A Share	
A C	$ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $	ISO X X X A B C C A B C C A B C C A B C C A B C C A B C C A B C C A B C C A B C C B C C C B C C C C B C C C C B C C C C B C C C C B C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	F G Model for Ste Model for Ste Model for Ste Mentor Model for Ste Model for Ste Model for Ste Montor R HR0 preen cels R HR0 graphed as 2016 graphed as preen cels R 2016 graphed as 27 33.9% % asles 27 39.% % asles 27 % of freet % of freet % of Or% % asles % of Reet % of Or% % asles % of Sea	H ering Infrastructure P asia consensory adoption asia consensory adoption asia conserver of Anglietime % (yrs) asia (yrs) asia (yrs) asia (yrs) a 37%	J Urchases (SIP rates that satisfy GHG emissio									1	Comments
N I C 0 C 0	N N C <thc< th=""> <thc< th=""> <thc< th=""></thc<></thc<></thc<>	A B C C Relative For Collective For Sector Collective For Collective For Collective Sector Collective Collective Sector Collective Collective Collective Sector Collective Collective Collective Sector Collective Collec	D E F G the major enrisions sectors, callot effect missions Model of FS State State R HRC R HRC State R HRC R State State R HRC State State State 2016 HEBP, 2016 State State State 2016 State State State State 2017 State State State	A contract of the contract of	urchases (SIP) urchases (SIP) rates that satisfy GHG emissio										*
		Relative For Pertinend 60, (USA, 00 (USA, 00 (USA, 00 (USA, 01 (USA, 0	Model for State the major entries in sectors, cells: 60 entries in sectors, cells: 61 HERP, parallel 61 HERP, parallel 2016 grant and sectors, cells: 2016 graphed as 37 33.9 M, k alles 37 39.9 M, k alles 37 30.9 M, k alles 37 30.9 M, k alles 36 of Reducting 56 of Reducting 56 of Reducting 57 of Reducting 56 of Reducting 56 of Reducting 57 of Reducting 58 of Reducting 59	India Caranterization of the anti-anti-adoption are spotsed and point are spotsed and the antibility of a system of o	urchases (SIP) rates that satisfy GHG emissio	T C	M	z	0	P	R	S	TU	~	W
Image: marked base of the ma	Image: bound building Image: bound bound building Image: bound bound building Image: bound bound bound building Image: bound bou	Rector CEPA CO <	R HRC (a) (HERP, 2016) (HERP, 2016) 2016) (HERP, 2016) (HERP, 2016) 2015) (Parphed as 2016) (Parphed as 2016) 2016) (HERP, 2016) (Herb 2016) 2017 33.9 (K, sales 5 of freet 5 of freet 5 of freet 6 of freet 6 of freet 5 of freet 6 of freet 6 of freet 6 of freet 6 of freet 6 of freet 7 of freet 6 of freet 7 of freet 6 of freet 7 of freet 6 of freet 7 of freet 6 of freet 6 of freet 6 of freet 7 of freet 6 of freet 7 of	Ag atterine 4 Ag atterine 4 infrastructure (picod (yrs) 53% 12.0 5.3% 12.0 5.3% 10.0 5.3% 10.0 10.0%		the state target n reduction	Last rev. 20 s or IPCC target vs 2016; EO 3	0829 of 45% emission 20-04 target i	reduction by s 50% belov	2030 v 2016 by 20	35)				
Image:	Image:	EC 29-64 EC 29-64 ICO2 015 EC 2015 36.0% 31 ILDVa 56.0% 3 31 MOVHDV 6.0% 3 31 Aviation 2.0% 3 32 Electricity 2.6% 3 32 Electricity 2.6% 3 32 Electricity 2.6% 3 3 Electricity 2.6% 3 3 Electricity 2.6% 3 3 Electricity 2.6% 3 3	Completed as 23% graphed as 23% graphed as 23% 3% 33.9% % asles % of freet 5% 20.2% % asles % of freet 6% 0.0% % asles 6% 0.0% % asles 6% 0.0% % asles	n 12.0 5.3% 12.0 5.3% n 12.0 5.3% n 10.0 10.0%	2020 20	25 2030	2035	2040	2045	2050					
Multi in min min min min min min min min min	With m Other With m With m </td <td>Total trans. 28.3% 38 LUNs 6.0% 31 LUNs 6.0% 3 MOVHDV 6.0% 3 Move 0.7% 1 Aniation 2.6% 3 Electricity 0.0% 0 Electricity 2.6% 3 Electricity 2.6% 3</td> <td>TYP E2.1% Partyrine color 33.9% % sales % % of OR reduction % % of Rest % %<td>n 12.0 6.3% 12.0 8.3% n 27.0 3.7% n 10.0%</td><td></td><td></td><td>50.0%</td><td></td><td></td><td>18.2%</td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td></td></td>	Total trans. 28.3% 38 LUNs 6.0% 31 LUNs 6.0% 3 MOVHDV 6.0% 3 Move 0.7% 1 Aniation 2.6% 3 Electricity 0.0% 0 Electricity 2.6% 3	TYP E2.1% Partyrine color 33.9% % sales % % of OR reduction % % of Rest % % <td>n 12.0 6.3% 12.0 8.3% n 27.0 3.7% n 10.0%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>50.0%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>18.2%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td>	n 12.0 6.3% 12.0 8.3% n 27.0 3.7% n 10.0%			50.0%			18.2%			-	-	
Option Option<	Option Image: space	IDVs 16.6% 21 M2VHDV 6.6% 9 M2VHDV 6.6% 9 M20VHDV 5.6% 3 Aviation 2.6% 3 Bechricity 2.6% 3 Electricity 2.6% 3 Bechricity 2.6% 3 Electricity 2.6% 3 Electricity 2.6% 3 Electricity 2.6% 3 Electricity 2.7% 35 Electricity 2.2% 1	3% 33.9/L \$ a sales 5% 28.9/L \$ a of Reset 5% 28.2/L \$ a of Reset 5% 28.2/L \$ a of Reset 5% 0.0/L \$ a sales 6% 0.0/L \$ a sales 5% 0.0/L \$ a sales 6% 0.0/L \$ a sales 5% 0.0/L \$ a sales	19.0 5.3% 12.0 8.3% n 27.0 3.7% n 10.0%		,	97.6			e/ 0.0					
Image: provide state stat	Image: constrained by the co	MIDVIHIDV 6.6% 9 Transportation 0.7% 1 Aviation 2.6% 3 Electricity 2.6% 3 Electricity 2.6% 3 Electricity 2.6% 3 Electricity 2.6% 3	% of OR reduction	m 12.0 8.3% 27.0 3.7% 10.0 10.0%	8.0% 10	0.0% 100. 5.5% 41	0% 100.0%	100.0% 04.4%	100.0%	100.0%	100.05/	% енс к	(eductions (additive)		
Notice Notice<	encit rest rest <t< td=""><td>MDVHDV 6.6% 9 Transportation 0.7% 1 Aviation 2.6% 3 Aviation 2.6% 3 Bisericity 2.6% 3 Electricity 2.6% 3 Plactricity 2.6% 3 Plactricity 2.6% 3</td><td>SM 28.2% 5.8med as (5% 28.2% % same as % of filtert % of filtert % of ONK % allers % of Reduction % of Reduction % of ONK % allers % of ONK % allers</td><td>12.0 8.3%</td><td>0.3%</td><td>3.3% 8.</td><td>9% 14.5%</td><td>20.1%</td><td>21.3%</td><td>21.3%</td><td>% 0.001</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	MDVHDV 6.6% 9 Transportation 0.7% 1 Aviation 2.6% 3 Aviation 2.6% 3 Bisericity 2.6% 3 Electricity 2.6% 3 Plactricity 2.6% 3 Plactricity 2.6% 3	SM 28.2% 5.8med as (5% 28.2% % same as % of filtert % of filtert % of ONK % allers % of Reduction % of Reduction % of ONK % allers	12.0 8.3%	0.3%	3.3% 8.	9% 14.5%	20.1%	21.3%	21.3%	% 0.001				
Image: biology of the biolog	Image: line biology of the line biology of	Tremportation 0.7% 1 Tremportation 0.7% 1 Aviation 2.5% 3 Elsericity 2.5% 25 Elsericity 2.5% 25	6% 0.0% % allers % of field % of field % of field % of 0.0% % allers % of eductic % of 0.0% % allers % of 0.0% % of 0.0% % allers % of 0.0%	л 27.0 3.7% ло 10.0%	3 %1.66	6.7% 91.	1% 85.5%	19.9%	100.0%	78.7%	90.0%				
Image: bioletic	Image: biole in the interval of the int	Transportation Rail 0.7% 1 Aviation 2.5% 3 3 Aviation 2.5% 3 3 Elsericity 0.5% 25% 2 Elsericity 2.5% 25% 25% 2	% of OR reduction % of OR reduction % of OR reduction % of OR reduction	M 27.0 3.7% M 10.0 10.0%	0.0%	0.4% 41.	7% 83.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%				
Internetively Imin	Image: black	Rail 0.7% 1 Transportation 0.0% 0 0 Aviation 2.0% 3 1 Shipping 0.0% 0 0 1 Electricity 2.7% 26 2 2 Electricity 2.0% 2 2 2 2	eff 0 % % anises % of fixed % of fixed % of fixed % of 0 % % satisfies % of fixed % of 0 % % satisfies % of other % of 0 % % satisfies % of other % of 0 % % satisfies % of 0 % eductified % of 0 % % satisfies % of 0 % eductified 0 % of 0 % % satisfies % of 0 % % satisfies	27.0 3.7%	0.0%	1.0% 4. 4.7% 87	0% 7.9%	9.5%	9.5% 60.2%	9.5%	70.0%	O 20-04			
Transmitter	Transmitter Transmitter <thtransmitter< th=""> <thtransmitter< th=""></thtransmitter<></thtransmitter<>	Transportation Aviation 2.6% 3 Aviation 2.6% 3 Stypeing 0.0% 0 Electricity 2.7% 26 Industry 2.7% 12	% of faeet % of CR reduction graphed as % of CR reduction % of CR reduction % of faeet % of CR reduction	n 10.0	0.0%	0.0% 10.	0% 50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	60.0%	CC 2018			
Image: bioletic	Image: constraint of the	Aviation 2.6% 3 Aviation 2.6% 3 Shipping 0.6% 0 Electricity Electricity 27% 26 Industry 22% 1	% 0 0K 00 0K 00 0K 00 0K 0 0K 0K <td>00 10.0 10.0%</td> <td>0.0%</td> <td>0.0% 0.0</td> <td>9% 6.5%</td> <td>20.4%</td> <td>38.9%</td> <td>57.4%</td> <td></td> <td>DVS</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	00 10.0 10.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0.0	9% 6.5%	20.4%	38.9%	57.4%		DVS			
Maine Tr. 3 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 2 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1	Mation Circle Option Circle Option Option<	Aviation 2.0% 3 Bityping 0.6% 0 Electricity Electricity 27% 26 Flectricity Electricity 27% 26	.5% 0.0% % sales % of fleet % of OR reductio graphed as .0% % sales	10.0 10.0%	%0.0	6.7% 87.	0% 0.1% 1% 77.5%	70.1%	0.6%	0.8%	20.0%	ail			
Image: constraint of the	Image: constrained by the co	Electricity Electricity 27% 26 Industry 22% 12	% of fleet % of OR reductio graphed as .0% 0.0% % sales		0.0%	1.0% 10.	0% 50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	40.0%	viation			
Image:	Image: constant	Bistericity 27% 26 Electricity 27% 26 Industry 22% 12	graphed as		0.0% 0.0%	0.3% 3.	0% 18.0%	55.5%	100.0%	100.0%	30.0%	lectricity			
Spectral Origination (1) Origination (1) <thorigination (1) Origination (1) <thorigination (1) Origination (1)<td>Support Constrained of the state <thconstrained of the state <thconstrained of the state<!--</td--><td>Electricity Electricity 27% 26 Industry 22% 12</td><td>.0% 0.0% % sales</td><td></td><td>99.7%</td><td>5.7% 87.</td><td>176 0.076 0% 76.8%</td><td>68.1%</td><td>5.0%</td><td>5.2% 64.7%</td><td>20.0%</td><td>Idustry</td><td> /</td><td>1</td><td></td></thconstrained </thconstrained </td></thorigination </thorigination 	Support Constrained of the state Constrained of the state <thconstrained of the state <thconstrained of the state<!--</td--><td>Electricity Electricity 27% 26 Industry 22% 12</td><td>.0% 0.0% % sales</td><td></td><td>99.7%</td><td>5.7% 87.</td><td>176 0.076 0% 76.8%</td><td>68.1%</td><td>5.0%</td><td>5.2% 64.7%</td><td>20.0%</td><td>Idustry</td><td> /</td><td>1</td><td></td></thconstrained </thconstrained 	Electricity Electricity 27% 26 Industry 22% 12	.0% 0.0% % sales		99.7%	5.7% 87.	176 0.076 0% 76.8%	68.1%	5.0%	5.2% 64.7%	20.0%	Idustry	/	1	
Retrictly X of free OCX	Bretricity We define 000	Electricity 22% 26 Industry 22% 12		25.0 4.0%	0.0%	0.0% 10.	0% 100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		ommerciai esidential	/	/	
Beneficity Image Beneficity	Electricity Dimensional control	Electricity 27% 26 Industry 22% 12 Industry 22% 12	% of fleet % of OR reductio		0.0%	0.0% 1.	0% 12.0% 0% 0.0%	32.0%	52.0% 0.0%	72.0%	10.0%	griculture			
Rentricity Ziv. 35(k) 2(k) Str. (k) 2(k) Inthand	Retriction 2% 4% 1% 2% 4% 1%	Electricity Electricity 27% 26 Industry 22% 12	graphed as		39.7%	5.7% 87.	0% 76.8%	68.1%	65.0%	64.7%	0.0%	1000			
And the first S of the neutron OPE OPE </td <td>Image: Set of medication Constrained <thconstrained< th=""> Constrained</thconstrained<></td> <td>Industry 22% 12</td> <td>1.1% 29.6%</td> <td>40.0 2.5%</td> <td>0.046</td> <td>DANK ET C</td> <td>net on net</td> <td>OK ML</td> <td>100 04</td> <td>100 046</td> <td>7070</td> <td>07 0707</td> <td>2040 2040 2040</td> <td>0007</td> <td></td>	Image: Set of medication Constrained Constrained <thconstrained< th=""> Constrained</thconstrained<>	Industry 22% 12	1.1% 29.6%	40.0 2.5%	0.046	DANK ET C	net on net	OK ML	100 04	100 046	7070	07 0707	2040 2040 2040	0007	
Imatery 22% 22% 22% 22% 22% 22% 23% 36% BOID This case explores the sectoral adoption modes the sectoral adoption modes. Notes: Note	Indurty Zink Link Display Biolity Zink Link Display Biolity Zink Link Display Biolity Zink Link Display <	Industry 22% 12	% of OR reductio		%0.0 %0.0	6.0% 14.	9% 23.5%	24.8%	26.1%	26.1%					
Relearly interview 22% 12.4% 22% 12.4% 22% 4 state (1 + 1 + 1 / 2	Industry Zinc, Zinc, <thzinc,< th=""> Zinc, Zinc, <</thzinc,<>	Industry 22% 12	graphed as		3 %2.66	9.7% 72	2% 53.4%	43.3%	38.9%	38.6%	Notes: This ca	e explores the sec	toral adoptions necessary to achieve the	2035 goal of	
All of the function ONE OPE	Consistent % of CR relation COR		.4% 2.2% % sales % of fleet	15.0 6.7%	0.0%	0.0% 30. 1 7% 8	0% 50.0% 3% 21.7%	80.0% 43.3%	90.0% 71.7%	95.0%	EO 20-04. I ne 2025. The MD/	/HDV rate is about	is set to Norway's EV trajectory for 100% (5 vears behind LDVs. The electricity deca	sales by arbonization	
Commercial Tit Correction Correction Continuence Continuence <thcontinuence< th=""> Continuence <thconte<< td=""><td>Characterial TX 60% 50% <th< td=""><td></td><td>% of OR reductio</td><td>us us</td><td>0.0%</td><td>0.2% 1.</td><td>0% 2.7%</td><td>5.4%</td><td>8.9%</td><td>12.4%</td><td>rate is that of th</td><td>e "net zero emissio</td><td>ons" scenario in the Energy Innovation mod</td><td>del for the</td><td></td></th<></td></thconte<<></thcontinuence<>	Characterial TX 60% 50% <th< td=""><td></td><td>% of OR reductio</td><td>us us</td><td>0.0%</td><td>0.2% 1.</td><td>0% 2.7%</td><td>5.4%</td><td>8.9%</td><td>12.4%</td><td>rate is that of th</td><td>e "net zero emissio</td><td>ons" scenario in the Energy Innovation mod</td><td>del for the</td><td></td></th<>		% of OR reductio	us us	0.0%	0.2% 1.	0% 2.7%	5.4%	8.9%	12.4%	rate is that of th	e "net zero emissio	ons" scenario in the Energy Innovation mod	del for the	
Algoriestic vertication Discretion Discretion <thdiscretion< th=""> Discretion</thdiscretion<>	Relativity but electricity but electricity but but nutrati algo 0, Relativity but electricity but electr	Commercedial	graphed as	100 m	3 %2.66	9.5% 71.	1% 50.7%	37.9%	30.0%	26.2%	US. (90% by 2	35 report at https://	(www.2035report.com) With the large emis	ssion	
electricity but itin nutrie gas) % of OR reduction 00% 0.1% 0.0% 1.6% 3.4% 5.% 6.1% Relidential % 7.3% 2.6% 80.4% 0.0% 1.6% 3.1% 0.0% 1.6% 3.1% Relidential % 7.3% 2.6% 80.4% 0.6% 1.9% 2.6% 80.4% 0.0% Relidential % 7.3% 2.6% 80.4% 0.0% 1.9% 2.6% 80.4% 0.0% Agriculture 10% 9.7% 0.0% 1.9% 0.0% 1.9% 0.0%	electricity but intinuities gas, Beldential S of OR reduction 00% 0.1% 0.0% 1.6% 3.4% 5.5% 6.1% Reidential EX 7.3% 2.6% 8.9% 7.6% 8.1% 0.0% 1.6% 3.4% 5.1% 0.0% Reidential EX 7.3% 2.6% 8.9% 0.0% 8.9% 0.0% Reidential EX 7.3% 2.6% 8.9% 0.0% 1.9% 8.6% 1.9% 0.0% Reidential EX 8.3% 6.6% 1.9% 8.6% 0.0%	Categories commercial 7% b (without	.17% 3.37% % Sales % of fleet	14.0 1.1%	0.0%	1.8% 8.	9% 26.8%	55.4%	89.3%	100.0%	only 75% of the	reductions that IPC	CC has called for by 2030.	act lieves	
Relidential Sk. 7.3% 2.6% 8.9.7% 0.0% 1.40 7.1% 0.0%	Relidential Sk. 7.3% 2.6% 8.97% 6.9.7% 7.3.% 9.9.7% 6.9.7% 7.3.% 9.9.7% 6.9.7% 7.3.% 9.9.7% 9.0.7% 9.0.7% 9.0.7% 9.0.7% 9.0.7% 9.0.7% 9.0.7% 9.0.7% 9.0.7% 9.0.7% 9.0.7% 9.0.7% 9.0.7%	electricity but	% of OR reductio	u la	0.0%	0.1% 0.	5% 1.6%	3.4%	5.5%	6.1%					
Reserver 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.00 <th< td=""><td>Mericania Constrained <thconstrained< th=""> <thconstrained< th=""> <</thconstrained<></thconstrained<></td><td></td><td>graphed as</td><td>107 L V 7 7</td><td>88.7%</td><td>8.4% 70.</td><td>6% 49.0%</td><td>34.5%</td><td>24.5%</td><td>20.1%</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	Mericania Constrained Constrained <thconstrained< th=""> <thconstrained< th=""> <</thconstrained<></thconstrained<>		graphed as	107 L V 7 7	88.7%	8.4% 70.	6% 49.0%	34.5%	24.5%	20.1%					
Notice Notice 0.0% 0.1% 0.6% 1.9% 6.6% 7.3% Apriculture 10% 9.7% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 1.1% 2.3% Apriculture 10% 9.7% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 1.1% 2.9% Apriculture 10% 9.7% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Apriculture 10% 9.7% 0.0% 100.0%	Noticitiential % of OR reduction 00% 0.1% 0.6% 1.9% 6.5% 7.3% Aprilative 10% 3.7% 0.0% 0.1% 0.6% 1.9% 6.5% 7.3% Aprilative 10% 3.7% 0.0%			9/11/ N.M.	0.0%	1.8% 8.	9% 26.8%	55.4%	89.3%	100.0%					
Agriculture 10% 3.7% 0.0% 8.9.7% 69.3% 69.3% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 11.1% 20.5% 10.0 ½ 100.0%	Apriculture 10% 3.7% 0.0% search as mained as		% of OR reductio	0	0.0%	0.1% 0.	6% 1.9%	4.0%	6.5%	7.3%					
Aprenue Constrained Constrained <thconstrained< th=""> <thconstrained< th=""> <th< td=""><td>Aprentication April 1000% April 1000%</td><td>C 2005</td><td>graphed as</td><td>5</td><td>89.7%</td><td>9.3% 69.</td><td>9% 47.1%</td><td>30.5%</td><td>18.1%</td><td>12.8%</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<></thconstrained<></thconstrained<>	Aprentication April 1000%	C 2005	graphed as	5	89.7%	9.3% 69.	9% 47.1%	30.5%	18.1%	12.8%					
% of OK reduction 0.0% <td>Readme Start 0.0%</td> <td></td> <td>work of flant</td> <td>PI</td> <td>100.0% 10</td> <td>0.0% 100</td> <td>0% 100.0%</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Readme Start 0.0%		work of flant	PI	100.0% 10	0.0% 100	0% 100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
Preadmed as 99.7% 89.3% 63.9% 47.1% 20.5% 18.1% 12.8% Readme US plans compared +	Readme Stering infrastructure US plans compared 97.1%, 20.5%, 18.1%, 12.8%, 12.8% Readme Stering infrastructure US plans compared +		% of OR reductio	u l	0.0%	0.0% 0.0	%0.0 %0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%					
Readme US plans compared +	 Readme Steering infrastructure US plans compared Headwith 		graphed as		39.7%	9.3% 69	9% 47.1%	30.5%	18.1%	12.8%					
Readme Steering Infrastructure US plans compared +	 Readme Steering Infrastructure US plans compared + Ready III + 90% 					_	_			-	-			T	
	Image: Second	Readme Steering Ir	Ifrastructure US p	ans compared	+										
		- -			-									(

Figure 3. Screen shot of the model with aggressive adoptions of clean vehicles and electricity.

II.

Comments on Part 3 (Transportation Electrification)

The % of sales and % of fleet targets in SB 1044 (2019) describe two different trajectories

EO 20-04 directs DEQ, OPUC, and DAS to the EV targets in SB 1044, but the targets in SB 1044 describe two significantly different EV adoption curves. Figure 4 illustrates these.





Figure 4. (Top) Three potential EV adoption cases, emulating Norway in violet, China (close to the % of fleet targets in SB1044) in red, and the % of sales targets in SB1044 in green. From <u>Nov. 2019 Strid Energy Report</u>.

(Bottom) A basic comparison of annual savings from electrifying Oregon's 170,000 new vehicles per year for three cases: Norway's pace, China's pace, and the SB 1044 % of sales target. This models EV purchase price trends for a medium-segment electric vehicle, and fuel costs at \$3 per gallon or \$0.10 per kWh for electric fuel. Not included are infrastructure costs, savings on vehicle maintenance, savings on social costs of toxic or climate emissions, or economic benefits of keeping energy spending local or increased resilience in emergencies.

The % of fleet targets in SB 1044 correspond to accelerating Oregonians saving around \$1 billion annually more than the SB 1044 % of sales numbers, after 2030. Neither achieves the EO 20-04 2035 goal or the IPCC 2030 target (a bit more aggressive than EO 20-04), but Norway's trajectory does.

Market forces will decarbonize most vehicles by 2040

I managed a company through decades of Moore's Law technology disruptions. The EV transition is a classic technology disruption, where the market share of all suppliers is reset to zero. Wall Street is already betting on the winners, with Tesla and various Chinese suppliers pouring in resources and VW Group claiming to outspend all of them. VW is promising to build 20 million EVs annually by 2028 (the red line), which is about 20% of global new car sales. Tesla is planning on building 20 million vehicles a year, and China already builds more EVs than any other country. Automakers who are late will not survive—thus, the green line is unlikely.

Business-as-usual (BAU) for EVs is arguably the red line in Figure 4, because that is the likely global EV adoption average. Oregon could pursue a faster pace, more like Norway's, which also accelerates savings on operating costs.

Oregon GHG planning should embrace the uncertainties in EV forecasts, but also the certainties—all automakers will electrify or die. Gas stations will be scarce by 2050. Vehicle BAU emissions will decrease, and it's the largest sector. If the red line is BAU, what should a state target? Adoptions faster than the global average? Faster adoptions to save more money?

Utilities must plan for the red line or faster

Electric infrastructure planning needs to step up to the likely BAU, plus contingency plans for faster growth. Even the green trajectory is higher than Navigant's High case in PGE's 2019 IRP.

We must plan for EV chargers at all residences and plenty of fast-charging networks. Building codes should adopt EV-ready requirements ASAP.

Thank you for your efforts on these critical issues.

Eric Strid