

**Summary**  
**Scenario Task Force Call #5**  
**August 22, 2011, 12-2 PM EDT**

Attending: Ryan Kind, Wil Burns, Maryam Sharif, Will Kaul (alternate for Stu Nachmias), Mark Volpe, Rob Sinclair, Marya White (alternate for both Doug Nazarian and Rob Berntsen), Jim Volz, Stan Hadley, Dave Whiteley, Flora Flygt, John Buechler.  
Keystone: Margaret Pinard, Caitlin Connelly

1. SSC and Task Force Updates
  - SSC webinar Sept. 9, 2-4 PM EDT
  - Scenario Task Force in-person meeting Sept. 12, 10 AM- 6 PM EDT
2. Scenario proposal template – Caitlin Connelly introduced the draft Proposal Template, its purpose, and how sectors should make use of the document in their discussions, then asked for feedback on the form and improvements.
  - Maryam Sharif asked how to represent generation and load categories for BAU as an example. The most expedient notation would be to put in the sensitivity run (FxSy) which contains the appropriate assumption, with a tweak (e.g. WI generation moved) specified as well.
  - Ryan Kind thought that the template was missing the plausibility of a scenario, but agreed that comments pertaining to plausibility could go in the justification category. Marya White pointed out that plausibility was very important to the States, and agreed with the method stated.
  - Ryan also thought it worthwhile to consider both the plausibility of individual variables and of the set of variables together. Keystone will try to modify the justification question to accommodate this. Wil Burns pointed out that as plausibility was not agreed upon as the most important variable, it shouldn't be singled out for extra consideration.
  - Members had questions about the sequence for the proposal templates, and Caitlin clarified that first Keystone will take feedback to tweak the format, then sectors will draft their proposals by 9/9 or 9/12, discussing them in a group as soon as possible (SSC webinar or STF in-person meeting), with the goal of getting as close to possible to a recommendation from the STF by end of the 9/12 meeting.
  - The TO sector would be more comfortable developing a proposal as a sector and bringing it to the TF for discussion, but the NGO sector indicated a desire to be looser and come up with proposal together. As there are pros and cons to both, the sectors will proceed as they deem appropriate in order to achieve the goal of having a sector sponsored proposal to discuss the Task Force members as soon as possible.
3. Clustering analysis
  - Stan Hadley reviewed with the TF the clustering charts/graphs – (slightly *revised versions*), which include the newly completed NEEM runs, updates on several of the variables, and an additional graph or two by stakeholder request.
  - Two major criteria appear to be the level of transmission coordination (national v regional) and environmental policy (delayed start, RPS, CES, etc)
  - Stan plans to have total cost as a variable, with EE, DR, integration cost, high-level costs, etc, but that information is still trickling in.

- There was some discussion about using 2035 or 2030 to calculate average costs, with Stan agreeing to a change to 2030.
  - There was discussion on how to show expansion between regions, with Stan suggesting an added variable of ‘transmission capacity added.’
  - Most useful charts seemed to be the ones comparing total cost vs CO2 emissions *reductions*, so this will be modified for the next call. Also, to narrow down the number of charts and points, it may be better to use BAU or hard-limit of each future, then add on sensitivities that others nominate, such as the hardened limits cases, high gas runs, and the CES runs. Zooming in on the ranges for these graphs will also be done.
  - Rob Sinclair pointed out that cost efficiency is the most important factor, and suggested a way to take out clusters in the middle range of the main variables discussed, since they are ‘sub-optimal.’
  - Stan mentioned that in general, worrying about comparability is not a luxury we have with only 3 cases. Rather, this TF should spread cases for more variety and useful information. Second, since we don’t have cost information for EE, Stan would tend to go with the BAU approach. Third, if the TF is interested in having a high-growth scenario, it will have to tweak the load in one of the cases, and it could be any of them.
  - Flora Flygt pointed out that a tighter cluster is better, and a more dispersed is worse for the purposes of our cluster analysis. Because the TF will need to evaluate the clusters based on more than that one variable, there may need to be some multiple layers of graphs to see which sensitivity runs are best represent all of the main criteria already highlighted.
4. Update on MWG’s cost analyses
    - The estimate for having both the EE/DR/DG from the MWG and the high-level transmission cost data from EIPC is another week or more.
  5. Some TF members mentioned that the Chairs putting out strawman proposals has been very helpful, and would be very appropriate in this case as well.
6. **Next steps**
    - Based on TF members’ availability and desire for another call, Keystone will send a Doodle poll for another STF call on Wed. 31<sup>st</sup>.