

Per 6-29-04: Testimony of C.U.R.E. to EETF Steering Committee & Staff
on scope of 2004 work plan & report

From: Kristen Eide-Tollefson, for
Communities United for Responsible Energy
612-331-1430/ P.O. Box 130, Frontenac, MN 55026
ket@pro-ns.net or
bookhous@pro-ns.net

I appreciated the steering committee's response to my testimony – particularly my suggestion that the big wind, small wind frame is limiting & does not reflect innovations, particularly:

- 1.5MW turbines that make class 3 wind economic -- and potential for
- aggregation of projects, esp. at community level, to create economies of scale for installation and maintenance as well -- and system resources for the transmission &/or distribution grid. .

Combining technologies and resources: In addition I mentioned that combinations of renewable resources have a critical role to play in strategic development of MN's wind (and other native renewable) resources. This includes wind-gas, wind-biomass, wind-hydro. Wind-coal is presently a major contender, regionally, for market position and infrastructure/transmission access. Combining sources is a know strategy for dealing with intermittency issues, to create baseload and firm renewable alternatives. As a strategy it also mitigates dangers of over reliance on one energy resource, with resulting economic, efficiency, reliability & environmental benefits.

These combinations should be analyzed and compared, using the EETF guidelines in subdivision 7. Their respective technical requirements, efficiencies, and economics should be examined in the EETF report - along with the strategic role that combining resources and technologies could make to MN base, intermediate load & export potential. Economic advantages of combining peak and intermediate gas facilities with and wind are being studied/tested by GRE and Calpine in the Trimont & Mankato Energy projects.

Broad participation: The goal I advanced was the broadest possible participation in MN's renewable energy future – with associated social, economic and environmental benefits. Including business & financial communities, entrepreneurs, investors, rural communities, agricultural sector, schools etc. The Citizen's League 2003 report on Energy, its analysis, goals and recommendations - relevant to the EETF charge - should be reviewed & referenced.

Specifically, I recommended the following supplements and additions to the list of questions under discussion at the 6-29 meeting of the Steering Committee and Staff.

Question 4. Add or create separate question: *What is the range of **funding options and models** – that would enhance the broad business & economic development potential of renewable energy/wind, throughout the state ? How could these models be identified, analyzed, and implemented?*

Question 6. Add: *How does the potential for financial and project aggregation (of MWs) change the potential and terms of “small wind energy” development?*

Add question/s on dispersed, distributed wind: *Re: Subd. 3b, 4 –Specifically, how would dispersed and distributed renewable projects across the state affect reliability, security and constraint issues for MN load, and/or market export ? What kind of transmission/distribution system support would maximize potential benefits and minimize problems associated with distributed and dispersed generation?*

Add question (re: statement above on resource combinations): *What incentives or policies, and what technical information development, would support combining resources and technologies to capture environmental, energy efficiency, social and economic benefits?*

Final comment on questions: There seems to be some danger, in questions 7-10, of becoming drawn into the regional issues in a way that distracts from statutory goals of the report. The plan to set aside one particular meeting to explore these questions seems reasonable. Adding “in MN” to #11. would help to bring these issues back into the context of the report.

Question 11. Add “in Minnesota” to read: What role does MISO have that affects wind energy development *in Minnesota*, and what policies does it embrace?

Note: MISO is, in fact, challenged to try to integrate state policy priorities into its *transmission expansion agenda*. “The queue”is primary in determining which projects will be ‘deliverable’. This is important to know, as well, what specific initiatives and tools may affect this – who, specifically from MN, is involved in the MISO process and what advocacy and/or mediating roles they play.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the questions for the EETF report.

Kristen Eide-Tollefson