



**Energy Supply (ES)
Technical Work Group (TWG)**
Kansas Energy and Environmental Policy (KEEP) Advisory Group
Meeting #3: Conference Call Summary
September 4, 2008

Participants

TWG Participants

Monica Cameron, Diamond Solar Solutions
Tom DeBaun, Kansas Corporation
Commission (KCC)
Bill Eastman, Westar (*substitute for Brad Loveless*)
Tim Gelvin, Johnson County Community College
John Grimwade, Kansas City Power & Light
Ashok Gupta, Natural Resources Defense Council
Colin Hansen, Kansas Municipal Utility
Jeff Kennedy, Martin Pringle Law Firm
Jennifer Knorr, KS Governor's Office
(*substitute for Lt. Gov Mark Parkinson*)
Rep. Annie Kuether, KS House of Representatives
Stuart Lowry, Kansas Energy Cooperatives, Inc.
Wayne Penrod, Sunflower Electric Power Corporation

Mike Riedel, Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company
George Thullesen, Empire District Electric Company
Frank Wewers, KCC

Kansas State Government Participants

Shari Feist Albrecht, Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE)
Andy Hawkins, KDHE

CCS Staff

Rob Greenwood, Ross & Associates
Tim Larson, Ross & Associates
Amy Wheelless, Ross & Associates

Public Participants

Yvonne Cather, Sierra Club
Stephanie Cole, Sierra Club

Meeting Summary

Meeting Materials

All materials for the Energy Supply Technical Working Group (ES TWG) are available on the ES TWG website: <http://www.ksclimatechange.us/ee.cfm>. For this meeting, the following materials are available:

- Meeting Notice & Agenda
- Meeting Presentation
- Meeting #2 Summary
- Revised ES Catalog of State Policy Options

- Revised ES Option Descriptions

Welcome, Introductions and Approval of Meeting #2 Summary

The summary for Meeting #2 was approved by the TWG with no changes.

Recap of KEEP Meeting #2

Tim Larson, the CCS Facilitator who presented on the ES Options at KEEP Meeting #2, reviewed the changes to the catalog that were made during this meeting. Tracked versions of these documents are available on the ES TWG website:

- Revision tracked ES Catalog of Options:
<http://www.ksclimatechange.us/ewebeditpro/items/O1F19444.pdf>
- Revision tracked ES Option Descriptions:
<http://www.ksclimatechange.us/ewebeditpro/items/O1F19443.pdf>

Review of Process for Notional Rating and Balloting

Rob Greenwood, CCS Facilitator, briefly reviewed the schedule and process for developing and prioritizing the catalog of options. Between and during the next two meetings, the goal for the TWG is to select a set of prioritized options to present at the next KEEP meeting on December 9. This TWG will take the following steps over the coming months to reach this set of options:

- During this meeting, TWG members will talk about the three policy options that interest them most for the TWG to pursue for further analysis. This discussion will allow TWG members to better understand the perspectives of other members.
- After this call, Amy Wheelless will send out a Notional Rating Exercise, which TWG members will have two weeks to complete. This exercise asks members to look at each option in the ES TWG Catalog of Options and give a qualitative assessment of potential GHG emissions reductions and potential costs or cost savings associated with each policy option, and identify any key feasibility issues and externalities.
- Ross & Associates will collect and compile the completed Notional Rating Exercise, and will also make suggestions for any options that could be consolidated.
- The compiled results from the Notional Rating Exercise will be a resource for TWG members to consider as they move into the balloting stage of the options. During the balloting, each member can select ten of the options for high prioritization and make any additional comments about option consolidation. Members will have a week to ballot on the options.
- Once ballots are completed, Ross & Associates will compile the results into three tiers of options and send them out to the TWG to review prior to Meeting #4 on November 4.
- At Meeting #4, the TWG will review the prioritized options, refine and consolidate them and approve them to move forward for the KEEP meeting on December 9. On this call, the TWG will also review and suggested changes to the Draft Kansas Greenhouse Inventory and Forecast to present to the KEEP.
- The next KEEP meeting will be December 9 in Topeka, and is where the options that this TWG chooses for prioritization will be reviewed and approved, and where any changes and additions to the KS Draft Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Forecast will be reviewed and moved forward.

TWG members raised the following questions and comments during this time:

- A TWG member wondered how any new options that come up in the interim would be incorporated into the catalog and analysis. If members think of new policy option ideas that are not already covered in the catalog, the idea should be circulated around to other TWG members to determine whether it should be included.
- Other TWG members expressed comfort with the process as it is laid out, so long as process and content information continues to be clearly presented.

Catalog of Potential ES Sector Policy Options

During this time, TWG members described options in the ES catalog that were of greatest interest to them. The following numbered list summarizes each member's comments:

1. Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) (ES-2.1); energy efficiency incentives (ES-3.2 and 3.3); and transmissions upgrades (ES-7.1). All of these options are well-developed and affect emissions in the near term.
2. Renewable energy incentives, such as an RPS or other barrier removal, focusing on wind (ES-2.1 or 2.2); new nuclear capacity (ES-4.1); and carbon capture, as it affects emissions in the long term (ES-6.2).
3. RPS or other renewable energy barrier removal, focusing on wind (ES-2.1 and 2.2); co-location of energy producing facilities (ES-2.6); and research and development on carbon sequestration technologies (ES-6.2).
4. Co-location of energy producing facilities (ES-2.6); and new nuclear capacity and other advanced fossil fuel technology (ES-4.1 and 4.2). The TWG member considers that these areas are where the largest impacts on greenhouse gas emissions can be found.
5. Electricity reduction is important, but providing reliable generation is as well. Based on that goal, the TWG member is interested in new nuclear capacity and other advanced fossil fuel technology (ES-4.1 and 4.2); and increased research and development for new technologies (ES-1.6).
6. RPS in conjunction with technology focused incentives for renewable energy (ES-2.1 and 2.7); increased research and development for carbon sequestration (ES-6.2); and new and renewed nuclear capacity (ES-4.1 and 4.2).
7. New nuclear capacity (ES-4.2); research and development for carbon sequestration (ES-6.2); and use of compressed air energy storage systems, as its use might make wind energy even more reliable and flexible for utilities (ES-3.7).
8. Use energy efficiency as a resource (ES-3); increased funding and incentives for distributed generation technologies, such as solar and wind (ES-2); and increased research and development for carbon capture (ES-6.2).
9. Barrier removal for increased energy efficiency measures (ES-3.1, 3.2 and 3.3); renewable energy incentives and funding, with the exception of small wind, which tends to be less cost effective; and more research, incentives and barrier removal for advanced fossil fuel and carbon capture technologies (ES-4.1 and 6.1).
10. Energy efficiency incentives from utilities (ES-3.2); renewable energy incentives and barrier removal, such as RPS (ES-2.1 and 2.2); and workforce development around energy supply (ES-8.2).
11. RPS and renewable energy portfolio standard (ES-2.1 and 2.2); and energy efficiency portfolio standard (ES-3.1).

12. Energy efficiency portfolio standard (ES-3.1); and transmission systems upgrades (ES-7.1).

TWG members reacted to the overall interest of the group, noting that consensus is already forming around many of the options. A TWG member pointed out that, for any option, but particularly ones such as “New Nuclear Capacity”, education to the public will also be necessary. Following this initial reaction from members, TWG members discussed resources that may be helpful for the Notional Rating Exercise.

- [TWG member observations](#) on the options from the first two calls of this group:
- The EPRI report, [“The Power to Reduce CO₂ Emissions”](#),
- The McKinsey report, [“Reducing U.S. GHG Emissions: How much and at what cost?”](#)

Next Steps

- After this call, Amy Wheelless will send out a Notional Rating Exercise. TWG members will have until September 19 to complete and return it for compilation.
- After the Notional Rating Exercise is complete, TWG members will begin balloting on the options. Further instructions will follow about this process.

Public Comments and Announcements

Yvonne Cather, Sierra Club, provided some comment on the options and discussions during this call:

- Organizations like Sierra Club can help get information about new policies and programs out to the public, so this group should consider using these types of community organizations for education and outreach.
- Energy efficiency policies are important, as the public can easily understand and implement actions and feel that they are making a real impact on climate change

Yvonne also raised a question about how members of the public or of other Kansas TWGs should submit comment on options and priorities. Members of the public are welcome to submit comment at the end of public meetings or through email to the facilitators. Comments that are relevant to the TWG work will be passed along to be considered by TWG members.

The next meetings of the ES TWG is Tuesday, November 4 from 2-4pm CT. Materials for this meeting will be available on the website prior to the meeting. Members of the public can listen-in to all ES TWG meetings by calling (800) 704-9804, passcode 489 418.