

February 20, 2015 – Clean Power Plan stakeholder meeting in-session notes

Notes were taken during the objective scoping exercise in order to provide information to webinar participants. The table below provides a summary of the tallies for the overall topics, after which tallies of voting are provided in parenthesis after each objective/subtopic (some participants voted for an overall objective, while others voted for specific subtopics).

Overall objectives/topic headings	Tally (including subtopics*)
Cost	31
Environmental results/integrity/public health/climate	29
System impacts/reliability/economic dispatch	19
Fuel diversity/RE/EE	19
RE/EE <i>[as a topic separate from fuel diversity]</i>	12
Flexibility/certainty for regulated entities	11
Unique state circumstances	15
Federal vs. state control	2
Multijurisdiction/regional/issues at the seams	16
Effect on jobs/economy	18
Administration	2
Ease of implementation – make as simple as possible	2

* See below for detailed tally of subtopics

Possible objectives/topics

- Cost (3)
 - Customers (5)
 - Managing/protecting stranded assets (3)
 - Total cost (not just individual elements) (2)
 - Ratepayer(electricity bill) impacts (impacts = rates and use) need to be as small as possible (5)
 - Minimize energy burden as a percentage of income (2)
 - How much has already been spent in the state to achieve carbon reductions? (1)
 - Cost recovery on investments already made/safeguard utility cost recovery (1)
 - Don't just consider rate impacts at expense of other costs (e.g., environmental costs of failure to achieve goals?)
 - Current versus future costs: e.g. RE does not have fuel cost after initial capital investment (2)
 - Benefits (1)
 - Extra consideration paid to bills of low income consumers (small increases have disproportionate effects); social cost of carbon has disproportionately lower benefit to low income persons (1)
 - Consideration of energy-intensive trade customers (2)
 - Impacts of MN rates versus adjacent/regional states for competitiveness (1)
 - Cost-effectiveness (2)

- Environmental results/integrity/public health/climate (4)
 - Enable state to achieve GHG goals (11)
 - Enforceable achievement of our target
 - Carbon reductions (3)
 - Natural gas leaks
 - Don't shift pollutants to other media (air to water or waste) (3)
 - Don't be bound by EPA's target – go more stringent if it works for us (6)
 - Consider other health-related effects (2)
 - Consider ancillary benefits that result from the plan (co-benefits) – other pollutants reduced, social benefits

- System impacts/reliability/economic dispatch (10)
 - Value of reliability (4)
 - Energy security (NERC compliance, national security issues, protect the system) (2)
 - Avoid noncompliance through units going offline post 2030 (2)
 - Understand electric infrastructure impact resulting from moving away from a purely economic dispatch approach (1)

- Fuel diversity/RE/EE (3)
 - Use the state plan to identify/remove barriers to development of fuel diversity, RE, EE (2)
 - Prioritize clean energy over fossil fuel compliance (9)
 - Don't just replace fossil fuels with other problematic sources
 - Distributed generation targeted to resilience (4)
 - Think of full portfolio of options for ratepayer and non-ratepayer (1)

- RE/EE (2)
 - (both RE/EE) Move forward with what has already worked – pushing those resources (9)
 - Maintain flexibility to use different approaches, though
 - (primarily EE) recognize marginal cost of incremental EE (possibly also RE)
 - Get credit for all RE under RPS
 - Make sure we don't double count (EE & RE)
 - (EE) allow utility and non utility scale EE programs to be used for compliance (1)
 - (RE and EE) Require robust measurement (EMV)
 - (EE) Not all increases in energy consumption are bad (to incentivize businesses to locate in MN – stimulate the economy; or perhaps to expand/electrify transit system)
 - Recognize complexity of carbon-shifting

- Flexibility/certainty for regulated entities (4)
 - Flexibility is necessary (7)
 - Adequate time for compliance, make changes needed
 - Ability to update the plan as changes are made
 - Consider that different regulated entities are situated differently (when allocating responsibilities/requirements for our target)
 - Consider/accommodate munis, coops, etc... no IRPs/rate regulation
 - Look beyond building blocks for compliance (think outside the blocks)
 - Consider non-utility opportunities for reductions in state plan/capture electric generator emission reductions however they occur
 - Consider carbon-shifting transport by fuel (EVs, etc...) – recognize complexity

- Unique state circumstances (2)
 - MN leadership on this issue should be recognized in plan, draw more investments (5)
 - Don't lose the gains MN has already made on renewables – build on them
 - Get credit for MN leadership/gains already made/actions already taken, especially since 2005 (1)
 - Continue to build on MN's unique progress in clean energy job creation (4)
 - Don't make it worse (not all renewables are low carbon) (2)
 - Mining industry, forest industry – unique to MN (1)

- Federal vs state control (1)
 - State should control its own destiny (1)
 - Recognize that if MN gets a "FIP" other states may not (plans may not align)
 - Good option but don't rule out a FIP until we see it and see what it says
 - Ensure state plan/final rule enables variety of actors to participate

- Multijurisdiction/regional/issues at the seams (5)
 - Allow flexibility for regulated entities/utilities who serve multiple jurisdictions (4)
 - Ensuring MN's concerns/priorities are addressed in multijurisdictional plan (2)
 - Whatever the approach, consider seams effects (1)
 - Consider providing for ownership rights/across jurisdictional lines (2)
 - Keep options open/evaluate
 - Be multi-jurisdictional ready/trading-ready (1)
 - Consider reciprocity
 - Maintain integrity (who oversees a regional program – enforceability, accountability, etc...) (1)

- Effect on jobs/economy (4)
 - Low income programs, worker transition programs, affected community support (1)
 - Maximize job creation at family sustaining wages
 - Work to minimize impact on job loss (job retention) } (10)
 - Continued assessment of job situation throughout implementation (2)
 - Energy-intensive trades – burden to remain internationally competitive
 - Businesses seeking clean energy resources – answer new requests (1)
 - Not all increases in consumption are bad (new industry, EVs, etc...)

- Administration (2)
 - Use existing infrastructure (M-RETS, IRP process, etc...)
 - Ease of implementation – make as simple as possible (2)