

**Summary of Scenario Planning WG Call #13**  
**Tuesday, Nov. 30, 2010, 1:30 p.m. EST**

**Official/designated WG members in attendance:** Ellen Vancko, Seth Kaplan, Dave Boguslawski, Matt Lacey, Michael Goggin, Steve Gaw, Mark Volpe, Bob Stein, Herb Healy (alt. for Marie Pieniazek), Dan Hartman, Gabe Stern, Tim Noeldner, Diane Barney, Gregory Carmean  
Erin Hogan (MWG)  
Denis Bergeron, Wil Burns, Greg Smith (RUWG)  
Flora Flygt (EIPC Liaison), David Whiteley (EIPC) and Caitlin Connelly (Keystone)

**1. Discussion of RUWG recommendations on baseline infrastructure**

- The RUWG members outlined the different proposals under consideration by the SPWG.
  - Proposal A (EISPC) – Accept only facilities categorized as both “planned” AND “reliability” between 2010-2015. Exclude all facilities with in-service dates between 2015-2020. Allow any facilities to be added back or removed through petition process based on criterion of “reasonably certain to be built.”
  - Proposal B – Accept all projects from Roll-Up between 2015-2020. Accept only those categorized as BOTH “planned” AND “reliability” between 2015-2020.
- The SPWG members asked questions and discussed the proposals but did not issue a formal position on them.
- RUWG members and Keystone will work on providing clearer comparisons of these criteria and the actual results from applying these criteria to the list of projects in the Roll-Up.
- The RUWG will be holding a call **Friday 11/3 at 12 p.m. Eastern** to finalize their recommendation. A webinar will be set up to accompany the call, so participants can view changes to the recommendation document in real time. SPWG members are invited to attend or to send comments to Keystone in advance of the call.

**2. Continued discussion of EISPC’s proposed changes to the Futures descriptions**

- WG members continued to discuss the changes EISPC proposed to the six Futures that both EISPC and the SPWG recommend to the SSC. A summary of the SPWG decisions on those items can be found in Appendix A, attached.
- Keystone will work on incorporating the SPWG’s decisions into the Futures descriptions, and will highlight areas where consensus was not yet reached, and will send these revised Futures descriptions to the SPWG for review before sending them to the SSC.

**3. Discussion of remaining four Futures**

- The group also discussed briefly the four remaining futures, of which two will move forward.

- SPWG members “sponsored” the 1) Consumer Activism and Awareness/Transmission Light/Free Market and 2) Combined Federal Climate & Energy Policy Futures.
- EISPC approved the 3) Nuclear Resurgence and 4) Environmental Moderation Futures.
- In order to provide guidance to the SSC on which two Futures should be chosen, Keystone will create a survey where SPWG members can rank their preferred Futures. This survey data will be communicated to the SSC in advance of the upcoming meeting.

**3. Other next steps**

- Keystone will work with any SPWG volunteers to formulate the group’s recommendations and presentation to the SSC.

Appendix A: Summary of EIPC and EISPC Futures Recommendations

	<b>SPWG Futures Recommendations (# in EISPC document)</b>	<b>EISPC Futures Recommendations (# in EISPC document)</b>	<b>Discussion items (specification # in EISPC document)</b>	<b>SPWG action on EISPC proposed language and rationale</b>
1	Business as Usual (1)	Business as Usual (1)	Load growth rates (5)	<b>Modified</b> – agree that PA data should be used; moderated language around States’ ability to adjust numbers
			EE & DR (6)	<b>Modified</b> – concern that different PAs handle EE/DR differently, infeasible to require consistency
			Policy/reg sunsets (11)	<b>Modified</b> – current policies should modeled as they are written – if written to expire, should expire
2	Federal Carbon Constraint: Nat’l Implementation (2)	Carbon Reduction (2)	Modeling CO2 costs/ achieve goals (1)	<b>No objection/Adopted</b>
			CCS viability/cost (3)	<b>Some objection</b> – No consensus by group about future CCS availability and cost
			Canadian imports (10)	<b>No objection/Adopted</b>
			Low/no CO2 generation incentives (11)	<b>No objection/Adopted</b>
3	Federal Carbon Constraint: State and Regional Implementation (10)	Carbon Reduction: State/Regional Implementation (10)	No mandated state CO2 auctions (1)	<b>No objection/Adopted</b>
			Model using carbon cost (2)	<b>No objection/Adopted</b>
			Specified CCS penetration (3)	<b>Some objection</b> – No consensus by group due to differing views on feasibility of CCS – issue flagged
			Load growth (6)	<b>No objection/adopted</b>
			Inflation rate (7)	<b>No objection/adopted</b>
			PHEV/EV levels – let model choose? (9)	<b>No objection/adopted</b>

			Switching to gas/wind – let model choose (13)	<b>No objection/adopted</b>
4	EE/DR/DG/Smart Grid (5)	Aggressive EE/DR/DG/Smart Grid (5)	Energy consumption reduction rate/load growth (2/7)	<b>No objection/adopted</b>
			Canadian imports (17)	<b>Modified:</b> Agree in principle with EISPC language: “Preference for “shorter” or more local transmission over longer-haul transmission. May include Canadian imports.”
			Load shape (8/12)	<b>No objection</b> – include in modeling questions
			Coal prices (10)	<b>No objection/adopted</b>
			% energy requirements met by DG (14)	<b>No objection/adopted</b> – add DG modeling to “modeling questions”
			Local resource preference (16)	<b>Modified:</b> Agree in principle with EISPC language. “Preference for local resources. May include offshore wind.”
			Low storage tech costs (6)	<b>No objection/adopted</b>
5	National RPS: Top-Down Implementation (3)	RPS (3)	Target – 25% vs. 30% (1)	<b>Objected</b> -- SPWG prefers 30% due to desire to push to outer bounds of plausibility & be consistent w/ proposed policies
			Renewables definition (2)	<b>No objection/adopted</b>
			Tax credits for new renewables (3)	<b>No objection/adopted</b>
6	National RPS: State and Regional Implementation (11)	RPS: State/Regional Implementation (11)	Target – 25% vs. 30% (1)	<b>Objected</b> -- SPWG prefers 30% due to desire to push to outer bounds of plausibility & be consistent w/ proposed policies
			Renewables definition (2)	<b>No objection/adopted</b>
			Tax credits for new renewables (3)	<b>No objection/adopted</b>

