RRSE.doc.-6

The Power Scorecard

Sam Swanson
Director, Renewable Energy Technology Analysis Project
Pace Law School Energy Project

30-Aug-04 1

Introduction

- the Power Scorecard
  - Purpose
  - Conceptual approach
  - Operation
- Sam Swanson
  - Power Scorecard Project Director
  - Senior Policy Advisor at Pace Law School Energy Project (1995- present)
  - New York Public Service Commission staff 1971-1995 – Deputy Director Energy Efficiency & Environment 1991-1995
  - NARUC Staff Subcommittee on Energy Conservation Chairman 1984-87

30-Aug-04 2

Power Scorecard

- developed by
  - Pace Law School Energy Project
  - five major environmental organizations in US
- development funded by
  - U.S. Department of Energy
  - Energy Foundation & other private foundations
  - Environmental organization sponsors

30-Aug-04 3

Topics of Discussion

- Power Scorecard – why created?
- Experience rating products & technologies
- Balancing complexity & simplicity

30-Aug-04 4

Power Scorecard- why created?

- To provide objective means to discern real environmental differences in "green" product choices
- To help consumers using retail choice to find & choose clean products in competitive markets

30-Aug-04 5

Power Scorecard Experience

- Scope
  - Launched in September 2000
  - Experience in California, Texas, Pennsylvania, New Jersey (& several mid-Atlantic states) – NY later in 2004
  - Local sponsors in each state

30-Aug-04 6

What does scoring show?

- Distinguishes relative impacts
  - Compares different technologies
  - Compares different uses of the same technology – e.g., low vs high emission rates
  - Scoring benchmarked at zero, four and ten

30-Aug-04 7

Power Scorecard Experience

- Scoring Quality
  - Requires major differences in environmental impact to produce significant rating differences
  - Technology differences most important – but other differences can be very significant
  - Scoring criteria can/will evolve as new technologies, knowledge & metrics emerge – e.g.,
    - **farm digester methane**
    - **considering new metric for particulates and VOCs (volatile organic compounds)**
    - **investigating waste to energy rating criteria**

30-Aug-04 8

How does it compare?

- Green-e – a certification program, serves different role in market
- Scientific Certification – much more detailed and costly to administer
- Massachusetts Technology Collaborative – adapting Power Scorecard framework to its needs/wants

30-Aug-04

9

Power Scorecard- Balances Complexity & Simplicity

- Two competing objectives
  1. **Getting the environmental impact right**
  2. **Keeping it simple, in line with available information & our ability to process it**
- Addresses eight environmental issues using related metrics
  - **Provides approximate measures of impact**
- Internet based delivery
  - www.powerscorecard.org

30-Aug-04

10

Striking the Balance

- Addressing on-site land impacts
  - A simple metric – size of project footprint per unit of output
  - Problem #1 – it does not distinguish between facilities with long lasting difficult to reverse impacts and easy to reverse impacts
    - **e.g., solar, wind, biomass vs nuclear, coal, oil**
    - **Solution: simple permanency multiplier**

30-Aug-04 11

Striking the Balance

- Addressing on-site land impacts
  - An improved metric – size of project footprint per unit of output with a permanency multiplier
  - Problem #2 – for wind it does not address the differences between good and poor wind sites
    - **e.g., poor management of erosion, protection/restoration of high value ecosystem**
    - **Solution: separate "Criteria for Site Scoring Wind Projects" (attachment C to Power Scorecard Methodology Report)**

30-Aug-04 12

The Balance is dynamic . . .

- Use the eight environmental issues as a foundation –
- Assess regularly whether ratings capture fairly the major impacts

Few major problems so far

. . . but still a work in progress

30-Aug-04 13