

Scenario Planning Work Group

Futures recommendations
and decision items for the SSC
December 13, 2010

SPWG Accomplishments

The SPWG has accomplished the following, in coordination with EISPC:

- Developed and applied Futures selection criteria
- Reached general consensus on 6 high-level Futures descriptions
 - Identified key assumptions/remaining questions where consensus not yet achieved within those Futures
- Developed 4 Futures options for SSC to consider as Futures 7 & 8
 - Conducted survey of SPWG members' preferences for those 4 Futures
- Developed lists of proposed sensitivities for the SSC to choose from
 - Identified commonalities between EISPC and SPWG recommended sensitivities

Key decision items for SSC

- Weigh in on remaining questions/areas where consensus not yet achieved in recommended Futures 1-6
- Decide which two Futures will be selected as Futures 7 & 8
- Provide feedback on which sensitivities will be run on each of the eight Futures
- Provide guidance on finalization and alignment with EISPC

Reminder –

The 6 recommended Futures are:

1. Business As Usual
2. Federal Carbon Constraint: National Implementation
3. Federal Carbon Constraint: State/Regional Implementation
4. Aggressive EE/DR/DG/Smart Grid
5. National RPS: Top-Down Implementation
6. National RPS: Regional Implementation

Reminder – The other Proposed Futures are:

Developed by SPWG

- A. Consumer Market Awareness and Activism/Free Market/Transmission Light (ranked 3rd in survey)
- B. Combined Federal Climate and Energy Policy (ranked 2nd in survey)

Developed by EISPC

- C. Nuclear Resurgence (ranked 1st in survey)
- D. Environmental Moderation (ranked 4th in survey)

Proposed Steps for Decision-making

Today: Get questions and proposals for modifications onto the table

- **Recommended Futures 1-6**

From each sector, on each Future:

- **Clarifications:** Do you understand it?
- **Remaining issues:** How would you prefer that each remaining issue (highlighted in descriptions) be resolved?
- **Other proposed modifications:** What, if any, other changes would you propose?

Proposed Steps for Decision-making

Today: Get questions and proposals for modifications onto the table

- **Proposed Futures A-D**

From each sector, on each Future

- **Clarifications:** Do you understand it?
- **Preferences:** Which two Futures should be selected as Futures 7 & 8?
- **Other proposed modifications:** What changes, if any, are needed in order for you to “live with” those Futures?

Proposed Steps for Decision-making

Today: Overview of sensitivities

- Quickly outline progress on selecting sensitivities

Proposed Steps for Decision-making

Break: Sector discussions

- Discuss proposals heard today and determine what members/sectors will support and/or what they can live with

Tonight: EISPC caucus

- Discuss proposals heard today and determine what members will support and/or what they can live with

Proposed Steps for Decision-making

Tomorrow:

- *SSC discussion and consensus
on 8 high-level Futures (and sensitivities)***

Six recommended Futures

1. Business As Usual
2. Federal Carbon Constraint: National Implementation
3. Federal Carbon Constraint: State/Regional Implementation
4. Aggressive EE/DR/DG/Smart Grid
5. National RPS: Top-Down Implementation
6. National RPS: Regional Implementation

Future 1: Business As Usual

Clarifications?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 1: Business As Usual

Pg. 1: Renewal of regs with sunsets/expiration dates – a) case-by-case OR b) all renewed or c) other?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 1: Business As Usual

Pg. 1: Objections to SPWG modifications of EISPC language on how growth rates will be determined and how EE/DR handled?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 1: Business As Usual

Other proposed modifications?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 2: Federal Carbon Constraint: National Implementation

Pg. 3. Handling of CCS – a) 2010 cost of CCS continues (not viable); OR b) CCS commercially viable after 2020?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 2: Federal Carbon Constraint: National Implementation

Other proposed modifications?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 3: Federal Carbon Constraint: State/Regional Implementation

Clarifications		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 3: Federal Carbon Constraint: State/Regional Implementation

Pg. 6: Imports of Canadian resources – a) should be capped; OR b) no cap?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 3: Federal Carbon Constraint: State/Regional Implementation

Pg. 8: Handling of CCS – a) 2010 cost of CCS continues (not viable); OR b) CCS commercially viable after 2020?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 3: Federal Carbon Constraint: State/Regional Implementation

Other proposed modifications?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 4: Aggressive EE/DR/DG/SG

Clarifications?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 4: Aggressive EE/DR/DG/SG

Pg. 11: Objections to SPWG's slight modification to EISPC language on preference for local generation and transmission?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 4: Aggressive EE/DR/DG/SG

Other proposed modifications?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 5: National RPS: Top-Down Implementation

Clarifications?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 5: National RPS: Top-Down Implementation

Pg. 14: RES/RPS level: a) 25%; OR b) 30%?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 5: National RPS: Top-Down Implementation

Pg. 14: Imports of Canadian resources – a) should be capped; OR b) no cap?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	27

Future 5: National RPS: Top-Down Implementation

Other proposed modifications?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 6: National RPS: Regional Implementation

Clarifications?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 6: National RPS: Regional Implementation

Pg. 17: RES/RPS level: a) 25%; OR b) 30%?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 6: National RPS: Regional Implementation

Pg. 17: Imports of Canadian resources – a) should be capped; OR b) no cap?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	31

Future 6: National RPS: Regional Implementation

Other proposed modifications?		
1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Futures 7 & 8: Rationale for inclusion

Future Name (in order of ranking from survey results)	Page Nos. in Futures description document	Rationale for inclusion
Nuclear Resurgence	pp. 28-29	
Combined Federal Climate and Energy Policy	Pp. 24-27	
Consumer Market Awareness and Activism/Free Market/Transmission Light	Pp. 21-23	
Environmental Moderation	Pp 31-32	

Futures 7 & 8: Clarifications?

Future Name (in order of ranking from survey results)	Page Nos. in Futures description document	Clarifications
Nuclear Resurgence	pp. 28-29	
Combined Federal Climate and Energy Policy	Pp. 24-27	
Consumer Market Awareness and Activism/Free Market/Transmission Light	Pp. 21-23	
Environmental Moderation	Pp 31-32	

Futures 7 & 8: Which two Futures do you prefer? Do you have any proposed changes?

A= Combined Fed. Climate & Energy Policy

B= Consumer mkt awareness & activism/FM/TL

C=Nuclear Resurgence

D= Environmental Moderation

Preferred Futures? Proposed modifications?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Sensitivities

- SPWG members suggested some possible sensitivities when they initially drafted Futures 1-6 and A-B
- EISPC reviewed these Futures and approved sensitivities for each one, as well as the two new Futures it approved (C&D).
 - Some of SPWG's suggested sensitivities approved, others not approved by EISPC
- SPWG had time to revisit the sensitivities lists for Futures 1-6 in light of EISPC's decisions, and came up with its own preferred list for each of those Futures
 - Some of EISPC's sensitivities accepted, others not accepted by SPWG
- Created a spreadsheet showing which sensitivities are preferred by SPWG or accepted by EISPC for each Future

Sensitivities

[go to sensitivities spreadsheet to show
which sensitivities were selected for each
Future]

Scenario Planning Work Group

Sensitivity Discussion Report

December 14, 2010

Key decision items for SSC

- Weigh in on remaining questions/areas where consensus not yet achieved in recommended Futures 1-6
- Decide which two Futures will be selected as Futures 7 & 8
- **Provide feedback on which sensitivities will be run on each of the eight Futures**
- Provide guidance on finalization and alignment with EISPC

Proposed Steps for Discussion

Today: Get questions and proposals for modifications onto the table

Discuss: Do you want to decide on sensitivities today or provide feedback?

- **Recommended Sensitivities for Futures**

From each sector, on each Future:

- **Clarifications:** Do you understand sensitivities?

- **Feedback**

- Do you generally agree with the recommendations?

- **Proposed modifications:** What, if any, other changes would you propose?

SPWG Discussion

- Identified areas of agreement
 - SPWG and EISPC appear to agree on most of sensitivities that should be run
- Discussed “common” sensitivities
 - Common across all futures
- Non-EISPC consensus – common sensitivities
 - Reserve one sensitivity for transmission transfer limits although it may not be needed
 - High and low load growth
 - High and low gas prices

Forty-five Sensitivities Considered

Revised transfer capability	Increased economic activity
High load growth	Decreased economic activity
Low load growth	Lower DR/EE performance
High gas prices	Low cost of renewable resources
Low gas prices	High cost of renewable resources
No new non-carbon EPA regs	Increased deployment of flexible resources (DR, storage)
Achievable state EE/RPS reqs	Low fuel prices
Higher PHEV levels	High fuel prices
Lower PHEV levels	Original BAU transmission limits (if "BAU prime" selected as starting point)
Interregional fee/dispatch barriers removed	Specific technological advancements
Regulatory lag - no new gen or transmission	High cost of offshore wind
Increased generation costs	High cost of DG
Higher carbon costs	Higher RPS -- up for 40%
Lower carbon costs	Water availability/shortage limits some technologies in some regions
Limited new/upgraded nuclear	High uranium/disposal costs
Lower carbon reductions prior to 2030, higher in later years	Remove nuclear plants without loan guarantees
CCS never commercially viable	Restrictions on Canadian hydro
Lower nuclear capital costs	Assume transport rule goes into effect as-is
Reduced carbon reduction targets	Offshore wind at mid-range cost
Additional 1% mandated energy consumption reductions	Higher cost of EE/DR
Mid-range costs for DR, EE, smart grid, storage/DG	Modify some EPA regs
Increased base load growth	Lower beginning carbon costs; higher toward end of period
Increased imported Canadian hydro	

Future 1: Business As Usual

Areas of agreement	
<p>Sensitivities <i>XY = approved by EISPC and SPWG</i> <i>X = approved by EISPC</i> <i>Y = suggested by SPWG</i></p>	1. BAU
Revised transfer capability	XY
High load growth	XY
Low load growth	XY
High gas prices	XY
Low gas prices	Y
No new non-carbon EPA regs	XY
Achievable state EE/RPS reqs	XY
Higher PHEV levels	XY
Interregional fee/dispatch barriers removed	XY
Regulatory lag - no new generation or transmission	X
Increased generation costs	XY

Future 1: Business As Usual Clarifications?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 1: Business As Usual Modifications?

		Add?	Remove?
1	Canada		
2	End Users		
3	Generation Owners		
4	NGOs		
5	Other Suppliers		
6	Public Power/TDU		
7	States		
8	Transmission Owners		

Future 2: Federal Carbon Constraint: National Implementation

Areas of agreement	
<i>Sensitivities</i> <i>XY = approved by EISPC and SPWG</i> <i>X = approved by EISPC</i> <i>Y = suggested by SPWG</i>	<i>2. Federal Carbon Constraint -- Nat'l Implementation</i>
Revised transfer capability	Y
High load growth	XY
Low load growth	XY
High gas prices	XY
Low gas prices	XY
Higher carbon costs	XY
Lower carbon costs	XY
Limited new/upgraded nuclear	X
Lower carbon reductions prior to 2030, higher	X
CCS never commercially viable	X
Reduced carbon reduction targets	XY
Low cost of renewable resources	XY
High cost of renewable resources	XY

SPWG point of disagreement: some members thought Reduced carbon reduction targets were repetitive with low carbon costs and should be bottom priority

Future 2: Federal Carbon Constraint: National Implementation Clarifications?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 2: Federal Carbon Constraint: National Implementation Modifications?

		Add?	Remove?
1	Canada		
2	End Users		
3	Generation Owners		
4	NGOs		
5	Other Suppliers		
6	Public Power/TDU		
7	States		
8	Transmission Owners		

Future 3: Federal Carbon Constraint: State/Regional Implementation

Areas of agreement	
<p>Sensitivities XY = approved by EISPC and SPWG X = approved by EISPC Y = suggested by SPWG</p>	<p>3. Federal Carbon Constraint -- State/Regional Implementation</p>
Revised transfer capability	Y
High load growth	XY
Low load growth	XY
High gas prices	XY
Low gas prices	XY
Higher carbon costs	XY
Lower carbon costs	XY
Limited new/upgraded nuclear	XY
Lower carbon reductions prior to 2030, higher in later years	X
Increased imported Canadian hydro	Y
Low cost of renewable resources	XY
High cost of renewable resources	XY

SPWG disagreement: some members thought we should include increased imported Canadian hydro as a sensitivity and eliminate revised transfer capability sensitivity

Future 3: Federal Carbon Constraint: State/Regional Implementation Clarifications?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 3: Federal Carbon Constraint: State/Regional Implementation Modifications?

		Add?	Remove?
1	Canada		
2	End Users		
3	Generation Owners		
4	NGOs		
5	Other Suppliers		
6	Public Power/TDU		
7	States		
8	Transmission Owners		

Future 4: Aggressive EE/DR/DG/ Smart Grid

Areas of agreement	
<i>Sensitivities</i> <i>XY = approved by EISPC and SPWG</i> <i>X = approved by EISPC</i> <i>Y = suggested by SPWG</i>	<i>4. Aggressive EE/DR/DG Smart Grid</i>
Revised transfer capability	XY
High load growth	XY
Low load growth	Y
High gas prices	XY
Low gas prices	Y
Higher PHEV levels	XY
Additional 1% mandated energy consumption reductions	X
Mid-range costs for DR, EE, smart grid, storage/DG	XY
Increased base load growth	X
Increased imported Canadian hydro	X
Increased economic activity	Y
Lower DR/EE performance	Y

Future 4: Aggressive EE/DR/DG/ Smart Grid Clarifications?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 4: Aggressive EE/DR/DG/ Smart Grid Modifications?

		Add?	Remove?
1	Canada		
2	End Users		
3	Generation Owners		
4	NGOs		
5	Other Suppliers		
6	Public Power/TDU		
7	States		
8	Transmission Owners		

Future 5: Federal RPS- National Implementation

Areas of agreement	
<i>Sensitivities</i> <i>XY = approved by EISPC and SPWG</i> <i>X = approved by EISPC</i> <i>Y = suggested by SPWG</i>	<i>5. Federal RPS -- National Implementation</i>
Revised transfer capability	Y
High load growth	XY
Low load growth	Y
High gas prices	XY
Low gas prices	XY
No new non-carbon EPA regs	X
Higher PHEV levels	Y
Low cost of renewable resources	XY
High cost of renewable resources	XY
Increased deployment of flexible resources (DR, storage)	XY

Future 5: Federal RPS- National Implementation Clarifications?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 5: Federal RPS- National Implementation Modifications?

		Add?	Remove?
1	Canada		
2	End Users		
3	Generation Owners		
4	NGOs		
5	Other Suppliers		
6	Public Power/TDU		
7	States		
8	Transmission Owners		

Future 6: Federal RPS – State/Regional Implementation

Areas of agreement	
<p><i>Sensitivities</i> <i>XY = approved by EISPC and SPWG</i> <i>X = approved by EISPC</i> <i>Y = suggested by SPWG</i></p>	<p><i>6. Federal RPS -- State/regional Implementation</i></p>
Revised transfer capability	Y
High load growth	XY
Low load growth	XY
High gas prices	XY
Low gas prices	XY
No new non-carbon EPA regs	X
Increased imported Canadian hydro	Y
Low cost of renewable resources	XY
High cost of renewable resources	XY
Increased deployment of flexible resources (DR, storage)	XY
Original BAU transmission limits (if "BAU prime" selected as starting point)	XY

SPWG disagreement: some members thought we should include increased imported Canadian hydro as a sensitivity and eliminate revised transfer capability sensitivity

Future 6: Clarifications?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future 6: Modifications?

		Add?	Remove?
1	Canada		
2	End Users		
3	Generation Owners		
4	NGOs		
5	Other Suppliers		
6	Public Power/TDU		
7	States		
8	Transmission Owners		

Future A: Consumer Market Awareness and Activism/Free Market/Transmission Light

Areas of tentative agreement	
Sensitivities <i>XY = approved by EISPC and suggested by SPWG</i> <i>X = approved by EISPC</i> <i>Y = suggested by SPWG</i>	A. Consumer Market Awareness and Activism/Free Market/Transmission Light
High gas prices	X
Low gas prices	X
Lower carbon costs	Y
Lower nuclear capital costs	X
Decreased economic activity	XY
Low cost of renewable resources	XY
Low fuel prices	Y
High fuel prices	Y
Original BAU transmission limits (if "BAU prime" selected as starting point)	Y
Specific technological advancements	Y
High cost of offshore wind	XY
High cost of DG	XY
Higher cost of EE/DR	X

Bright green shading indicates where EISPC and SPWG appear to have tentative agreement

Future A: Consumer Market Awareness and Activism/Free Market/Transmission Light Clarifications?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future A: Consumer Market Awareness and Activism/Free Market/Transmission Light Modifications?

		Add?	Remove?
1	Canada		
2	End Users		
3	Generation Owners		
4	NGOs		
5	Other Suppliers		
6	Public Power/TDU		
7	States		
8	Transmission Owners		

Future B: Combined Federal Climate and Energy Policy Future

Areas of tentative agreement	
Sensitivities <i>XY = approved by EISPC and SPWG</i> <i>X = approved by EISPC</i> <i>Y = suggested by SPWG</i>	B. Combined Federal Climate and Energy Policy Future
Revised transfer capability	X
High load growth	X
Low load growth	X
High gas prices	Y
Low gas prices	Y
Higher PHEV levels	Y(or)
Lower PHEV levels	Y
Higher carbon costs	X
Lower carbon reductions prior to 2030, higher in later years	XY
Lower nuclear capital costs	X
Increased economic activity	Y
Decreased economic activity	Y
Specific technological advancements	Y
Higher RPS -- up for 40%	Y
Water availability/shortage limits some technologies in some regions	Y
Lower beginning carbon costs; higher toward end of period	X

Bright green shading indicates where EISPC and SPWG appear to have tentative agreement

Future B: Combined Federal Climate and Energy Policy Future Clarifications?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future B: Combined Federal Climate and Energy Policy Future Modifications?

		Add?	Remove?
1	Canada		
2	End Users		
3	Generation Owners		
4	NGOs		
5	Other Suppliers		
6	Public Power/TDU		
7	States		
8	Transmission Owners		

Future C: Nuclear Resurgence

Areas of tentative agreement	
Sensitivities <i>XY = approved by EISPC and SPWG</i> <i>X = approved by EISPC</i> <i>Y = suggested by SPWG</i>	C. Nuclear Resurgence
High load growth	X
Low gas prices	X
Higher carbon costs	X
Low fuel prices	X
High uranium/disposal costs	X
Remove nuclear plants without loan guarantees	X
Restrictions on Canadian hydro	X

Bright green shading indicates where EISPC and SPWG appear to have tentative agreement

Future C: Nuclear Resurgence Clarifications?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future C: Nuclear Resurgence Modifications?

		Add?	Remove?
1	Canada		
2	End Users		
3	Generation Owners		
4	NGOs		
5	Other Suppliers		
6	Public Power/TDU		
7	States		
8	Transmission Owners		

Future D: Environmental Moderation

Areas of tentative agreement	
<p>Sensitivities <i>XY = approved by EISPC and SPWG</i> <i>X = approved by EISPC</i> <i>Y = suggested by SPWG</i></p>	<p>D. Environmental Moderation</p>
Higher carbon costs	X
Increased economic activity	X
High cost of renewable resources	X
Assume transport rule goes into effect as-is	X
Offshore wind at mid-range cost	X
Higher cost of EE/DR	X
Modify some EPA regs	X

Bright green shading indicates where EISPC and SPWG appear to have tentative agreement

Future D: Environmental Moderation Clarifications?

1	Canada	
2	End Users	
3	Generation Owners	
4	NGOs	
5	Other Suppliers	
6	Public Power/TDU	
7	States	
8	Transmission Owners	

Future D: Environmental Moderation Modifications?

		Add?	Remove?
1	Canada		
2	End Users		
3	Generation Owners		
4	NGOs		
5	Other Suppliers		
6	Public Power/TDU		
7	States		
8	Transmission Owners		