

Kansas Energy Council November 12, 2008, Meeting Notes

KEC members attending:

Ken Frahm, Co-Chair	Galen Menard
Lt. Gov. Mark Parkinson, Co-Chair	<i>Jesse Romo (for Deb Miller)</i>
Luke Bell	Hans Nettelblad
Rex Buchanan	Adrian Polansky
Sarah Dean	Bill Riggins
Stephen Dillard	Mark Schreiber
Jay Emler	Bruce Snead
Steve Johnson	Josh Svaty
Jeff Kennedy	Michael Volker
David Kerr	Steve Weatherford
Stuart Lowry	Curt Wright

KEC Staff: Liz Brosius, Michael Deupree, Corey Mohn, Jennifer Knorr

Opening remarks, introductions

KEC Co-Chair Ken Frahm opened the meeting. Lt. Gov. Mark Parkinson began by stating that there have been many changes in the commodity markets since the KEC last met in August. He continued by saying that even with the current downward trend in commodity markets the fact that China, India, Brazil and Russia are going to buy large amounts of commodities remains unchanged, though the timeframe remains unclear.

Frahm followed up on Parkinson's comments, saying that although things have been getting better in terms of energy prices, odds are that prices will likely stay at current levels or head to higher levels rather than continue to fall.

Staff updates

KEC Director Liz Brosius provided a brief overview of the current planning schedule, noting that this is the third year the council has operated under this approach, in which they tackle only a few issues each year. She reminded them that the purpose of today's meeting is to zero in on the 15 policy options that were approved at the August 13 meeting, modifying as needed. During the December full council meeting, members will finalize the list of policy options to be included in the final report.

Corey Mohn, Department of Commerce provided a brief update on the Midwestern Greenhouse Gas Accord (which Kansas signed on to in November 2007), referencing the summary prepared by Ray Hammarlund, KCC Energy Programs Division Director, included in the meeting notebooks. Mohn noted that the Kansas delegates were trying to take a pragmatic approach. He highlighted some details that are beginning to take shape. Specifically, two target dates have been mentioned—2020 and 2050, with emission reduction amounts of 15% or 20% and 25%, respectively. He noted that these emission targets are lower than those discussed during initial conversations and represent the

MGA's focus on a realistic approach, with a procedure to make needed course corrections in the future.

Hans Nettleblad asked for clarification on the low target levels, noting the departure from the Kyoto Protocol levels. Mohn said that the MGA was trying to find a balance for all the states involved in the process.

Mohn said currently the group has focused on the electricity industry and large industrial users, with some talk of the transportation industry being phased in a later date. The accord will regulate all six major greenhouse gases in an upstream approach. Allowances will be established based on absolute emissions in order to encourage technological development which will make reductions easier in the future. Mohn also said that the issue of offsets is controversial, with some participants being skeptical about how real the potential benefits would be. The Kansas delegation continues to lobby for the inclusion of offsets on the order of 10% to 50%, as this would be a benefit to Kansas. In terms of a timeline for implementation, the modeling work is taking longer than expected, but once it is completed, the governors will review the results for policy review, likely sometime in mid-2009.

Michael Volker asked if the modeling in question was environmental modeling or economic modeling. Mohn said that the models would forecast the results of different scenarios involved in emissions reductions, and analyze how realistic the emission targets would be, as well as costs involved. Mohn and Brosius said they would get further information on the modeling approach and report back in December.

Stuart Lowry asked if there was any interaction between the MGA and Congress. Mohn responded by saying that most of the focus of the MGA so far has been on finding out the sort of policy options that make sense, though members are aware of national initiatives.

Other updates: Wind Working Group, KEEP advisory group

Parkinson began his overview of the various groups currently studying energy policy in Kansas, by noting that his general preference is to have fewer groups working in the same area and that organizations tend to take on lives of their own, once created. As an example, he alluded to the numerous entities within the state tasked with promoting economic development, even though economic development should be handled by the Department of Commerce.

Parkinson identified six different entities currently looking into energy issues, some with explicit or implicit termination times. The work associated with the Midwestern Greenhouse Gas Accord, for example, will be completed in 2009. Parkinson said the main purpose of this effort is to develop a framework that will allow Kansas to not be unduly disadvantaged and to help MGA members develop expertise and knowledge in preparation for expected national policy. He said that it is unlikely that the region will impose a cap-and-trade policy, in the absence of a national policy.

The Kansas Energy and Environmental Policy (KEEP) advisory group was created by the Governor to uncover state-level opportunities (the “low-hanging fruit”) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. He said that through this very rigorous process (6 or 7 full meetings, with numerous technical working group meetings), the State will be presented a laundry list of policy recommendations, mostly requiring legislation, that will promote reductions in GHG. KEEP will deliver a preliminary report to the Governor by the start of the 2009 legislative session and will submit its final report by the start of the 2010 legislative session, at which time it will be dissolved.

The next group created by the Governor is the Wind Working Group (WWG), which is funded with federal dollars, and which meets 4 times a year. The WWG focuses on promoting further large-scale wind generation, figuring out issues associated with small-scale wind generation, and developing wind-related economic development (e.g., turbine manufacture). He said he believes the market will drive more manufacturing locating in Kansas, because of its great wind potential and central location. He said although people continue to cite the lack of net metering and RPS policies as evidence that Kansas is “unfriendly” to wind, he believes the state is overcoming this perception (and noted that net metering would likely be discussed once again in the upcoming legislative session). He said they would continue the WWG for another year.

The fourth group Parkinson highlighted is the KEC. He said the KEC has been in existence for several years and that he was interested in surveying the current members about what the current role of the Council and what do we do going forward?

Parkinson highlighted the fifth group, the interim legislative committee on energy and the environment, looking at these issues. Jay Emler noted that this committee will become a permanent committee. The sixth group is the KCC, which has several open dockets on energy conservation policies. Parkinson concluded by saying that he thinks the State has not done enough to promote energy conservation and efficiency and needs to figure out how to give utilities incentives to sell less energy.

Reports on past recommendations:

Midwest Energy’s How\$mart pilot program—Michael Volker, Director of Regulatory and Energy Services at Midwest Energy, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the new How\$mart program (available on the KEC web site, Meetings page, under the November 12, 2008 heading: <http://www.kec.kansas.gov/meetings.htm>). Volker noted that this was in keeping with the Council’s 2007 recommendation encouraging all utilities to adopt Pay-As-You-Save (PAYS) types of pilot programs (see Chapter 9, Section 9.2), in which energy conservation improvements are financed through customer utility bills. Volker said Midwest Energy’s objectives were to reduce utility bills, provide environmental stewardship, increase efficiency, and increase education. How\$mart covers improvements in the thermal shell, heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems, and other permanent equipment. Currently 84 projects have been completed, representing almost \$400,000 in efficiency improvements.

Parkinson asked how much HowSmart had been able to reduce energy usage, and Volker said the savings averages about 2,200 kWh per project, about 200 therms, or about 25% energy usage reduction per house. Parkinson asked how this relates to Summit Blue's energy efficiency potential study, which identified much smaller reductions. Volker said Midwest is picking off low-hanging fruit, and the program is not widespread as Midwest has only recently begun to advertise the program. Nettleblad asked if the program could be used to install solar panels on their roof. Volker said most photovoltaic cells are not currently cost effective, but if they were, the program would cover them, noting that the program will fund cost-effective improvements resulting in lower utility bills. He also explained that Midwest has partnered with the KEEP low-interest loan program operated by the Kansas Housing Resources Corporation to expand financing options for energy conservation improvements.

KEEP low-interest loan program—Christine Reimler, KHRC Homeownership Program Manager, gave a progress report on the Kansas Energy Efficiency Program (also called KEEP), the low-interest loan program for increasing energy efficiency. Reimler said applications have increased and that well over half of loans going to people at or below 120% of the poverty line and 25% going to those with median incomes.

Paul Johnson, audience, asked if KEEP has been promoted in utility bill inserts, and Reimler said Westar had included information in their bills, as well as another utility in south-east Kansas. Brosius asked Reimler how much of the \$2 million appropriation had been loaned out; Reimler said about \$600,000 had been loaned to date. Maril Hazlitt, audience, asked if they knew how many people inquire about the loans through Sunflower Bank and then decide not to apply? Reimler said she would see what she could find out and report back. In response to another question, Reimler explained that Sunflower Bank was still the sole bank participating in the program.

Energy conservation education funding—Shari Wilson, Statewide Partnerships and Planning Director at the Kansas Association for Conservation and Environmental Education (KACEE), said that KACEE had been working with KEC staff and hoped to secure a funding source fairly soon. She provided information about a new program, the Kansas Green Schools Program, which is funded through KDHE and helps schools with resource conservation (water, energy) and recycling efforts and provides an opportunity to include energy conservation education. She said there appears to be a lot of interest: KACEE had received 150 applications in the last two months, mostly from schools located in the eastern half of the state.

Sarah Dean asked if there was the possibility KACEE could work with the WWG to incorporate small wind generation for schools. Wilson answered that KACEE has worked with some schools that are pursuing small wind generation, but leaves these sorts of decisions up to the individual schools.

Model energy efficiency codes for voluntary adoption—Brosius summarized where things stand with last year's recommendation that the KCC Energy Programs Division implement a program to develop a model energy efficiency code for voluntary adoption

by local units of government. Brosius noted that a small group, including representatives from the League of Kansas Municipalities, homebuilders, and realtors, had a conference call in August and will be meeting on November 24th to refine plans. Brosius said that she hoped Hammarlund would be able to provide more information during the December KEC meeting.

[Break]

Public comment on preliminary policy recommendations

Frahm gave a quick overview of the KEC's public comment process, including the two public hearings in Hays and Wichita. He referred to the summary prepared by staff and highlighted elements of that summary (included in meeting notebooks) for each of the 15 preliminary policy recommendations. Brosius noted that the staff summary provided a pretty good quantitative snapshot and a somewhat less robust qualitative summary; she encouraged members to refer to compiled comments for more details. Dean noted that several letters had been received which offered comments on all the policies.

Preliminary policy recommendations: review, modify plan drafts (recommendations and background information)

Before beginning the discussion of the individual proposals, Frahm asked Brosius to explain the current documents and review what they'd be voting on today. Brosius reminded the group that the final product—the Kansas Energy Report 2009—will contain not only the recommendations the KEC approves in December, but also background information related to the energy and environmental issues in the current outline. She pointed out that the background information in the KEC's web-based report (formerly called a "plan") could be updated as needed, whereas the recommendations developed during each year's planning cycle remain unchanged.

As for the documents being reviewed today, draft versions of background information is presented for the sections on greenhouse gas emissions and electricity; these sections include the relevant preliminary policy recommendations. The other recommendations are presented in the same format in which they went out for public comment. Frahm encouraged members who had not yet had a chance to read the revised documents to read the background information and send comments to Brosius.

Following a brief discussion to clarify that the vote today was not the final vote, Frahm opened the discussion of the recommendations in the order presented in the meeting notebook.

Section 2.3, Policy and Program Recommendations

1. If a cap-and-trade policy or carbon tax is passed, it should be done at the federal level.—Frahm asked for discussion on the first recommendation in Section 2.3 (p. 10). It was suggested that the Dingle-Boucher proposal be added to the list of major proposals being considered by Congress. Frahm called for a vote; the recommendation was approved 19 to 1. Dean commented that she voted against the recommendation as it limited all future policies to merely the federal government.

2. Endorse policies that promote declines in greenhouse gas emissions, not policies that merely shift emissions within or between regions.—Dean said she was confused about whether or not this recommendation included policies at the federal level. Brosius said she thought this recommendation was intended as a broad guideline for state policies. Dean commented that the wording of the recommendation was too broad and could be interpreted many different ways.

Galen Menard said that letters should be sent to the State's congressional delegation as well as the Kansas legislature, which has the power to involve Kansas in regional accords. Dean questioned having the KEC send a letter to the Congressional delegation, given that its Executive Order directs it to make recommendations to the Governor, Legislature, and the KCC. Frahm commented that he didn't think the Governor's executive order prohibited the KEC from doing so.

Nettleblad asked whether this policy guidance would even be applicable in the future (if there were federal policy). Frahm said the MGA accord is not mentioned in the policy, and that it is his view that this policy merely states something the council as a whole believes. Volker said the policy just reinforces to the Legislature the types of policies the Council would and would not like to see implemented.

Frahm asked whether the recommendation needed to be amended to include language directing that a letter be sent to the state legislature? Emler said the intent should be to get everyone involved, every level of government—the Congressional level, the Governor, and the Kansas Legislature needs to get involved in this issues. Emler noted that the KEC recommendations are already sent to the Governor and the Legislature, and that the addition of language included in the proposal to send the recommendation to the Kansas' congressional delegation gets the U.S. Congress involved. Brosius said staff would revise the information under "Responsible parties," and the Council would have a chance to further review and modify at the December meeting.

Frahm called for a vote without amendments, and this recommendation was approved 19 to 1.

3. Urge Congressional delegation to include agricultural sequestration as an offset in any federal cap-and-trade policy.— Adrian Polansky motioned for this recommendation to be voted on as written, which Stuart Lowery seconded. The recommendation was approved by a large majority (1 opposed).

Section 8.4, Policy and Program Recommendations

1. Encourage federal funding of research and development of generation technologies that can provide base-load power while achieving reduced CO₂ emissions.—Frahm opened the discussion, and there was a general discussion of whether wind energy can provide base-load power and would thus be excluded from this funding. Lowry noted that beyond looking for ways to reduce greenhouse gases, Kansas also needs to find ways to meet electricity needs for future citizens. Emler suggested the insertion of the word "all"

before the word “generation,” and Rex Buchanan moved that the recommendation be approved as amended, which Lowry seconded. The recommendation, as amended (“Encourage federal funding of research and development of all generation technologies that can provide base-load power while achieving reduced CO₂ emissions”) was approved unanimously.

2. Encourage the Kansas Bioscience Authority to allocate some of their funds to research and development related to biomass-fueled electric generation, including the analysis of carbon footprint.—Parkinson motioned that this recommendation be voted on without additional comments, which Lowry second. Recommendation was approved by large majority (1 opposed).

3. Endorse collaborative development of advanced generation technologies in Kansas that can provide base-load power while reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Such collaboration could be between Kansas utilities, between Kansas utilities and regional utilities, or between Kansas utilities and other investors.—Nettleblad asked that there be a clarification of exactly what “base-load power” means, as there are disagreements as to whether wind generation provides base-load power. Brosius noted that a definition of base-load was included in the footnote of the current draft. Parkinson made the point that the purpose of this policy is to encourage collaboration between utilities; he mentioned that in Kansas there are currently some utilities that have excess capacity, and other utilities which are lacking capacity. Parkinson indicated that with additional cooperation between utilities, the building of new power plants can be delayed.

Frahm called for a vote, and the recommendation was approved by a majority (2 opposed).

Additional Preliminary Policy Recommendations (numbered as they were on public comment documents)

5. In addition to demand-side management, the Kansas Legislature and KCC should encourage utility investments in base-load generation plants’ energy conservation and efficiency and carbon capture experiments and technologies.—Frahm asked Brosius to explain the staff suggestions regarding the current wording of this proposal. Brosius pointed out that the opening phrase suggests that the Council had previously recommended that investments in DSM be “encouraged,” which they had not done; she also reminded the Council that the KCC was currently developing its policy with respect to utility-sponsored energy efficiency programs. She also suggested that the proposal be broken into two separate recommendations, one targeting investments in the efficiency of generating units, the other carbon capture experiments and technologies.

Frahm suggested that the proposal be amended to remove the wording of the recommendation up to the first comma. Volker commented that it would be hypocritical for the KCC to encourage the development of technologies without providing some capital financing options. Josh Svaty moved that the recommendation be voted on with amendments (including separating it into two recommendations), which Jeff Kennedy seconded. Mark Schreiber asked that the words “energy conservation and” be replaced

with “operating” to clarify the proposal. Frahm asked Brosius to provide revised draft wording for the December 10th meeting. The recommendation was approved 18 to 0, with one member abstaining.

7. Reduce maximum speed limit from 70 to 65 mph on Kansas Highways.—Frahm opened the discussion, which he noted had received great public and media attention. Bruce Snead commented that these policies came out of the Greenhouse Gas Policy Committee, and that there was a clear presentation of the pros and cons of such recommendations. Parkinson moved for this and the two related recommendations [*8. Increase fines for speeding by 50%. 9. Reduce “exemption” for speeding violations to 5 mph over limit.*] to be dropped from consideration. The motion passed by a large majority (1 opposed).

10. Undertake statewide initiative (public-private sector) to encourage more energy-efficient driving.—Parkinson commented that the reality of the current state budget is that additional programs will not be possible. Nettleblad mentioned that voting against this recommendation would not be voting against currently existing programs such as the tax credit given for hybrids. Snead asked if there are any manifestations of H.R. 2594, the Safe and Fuel Efficient Driving Act of 2007, in Kansas. Brosius said she didn’t know. A motion to drop the recommendation from discussion was made, which was approved unanimously.

[Lunch break]

11. Establish minimum energy efficiency standard for all majority State-funded new construction (standards under consideration include LEED Platinum, 20% above IECC 2006).—John Easter, Director of Midwest State Government Affairs & Grassroots for the American Chemistry Council (ACC), noted that energy efficiency in buildings should be a priority for all states, and that the American Chemistry Council agrees with Kansas’ desire to set a state-wide standard for new public buildings. Regarding the standard, he explained that the ACC recommends using ASHRAE 90.1 2004 + 30%, while then allowing individual contractors the flexibility to choose private rating systems such as LEED, Energy Star, Green Globe, as appropriate. He said that IECC 2006 and ASHRAE 2004 are roughly the same (IECC includes standards for residential structures in addition to commercial structures), and so the ACC’s recommendation amounts to a 10% difference from IECC + 20%.

Nettelblad clarified that he originally suggested LEED because it covered site selection, recycled materials, construction waste management, in addition to energy efficiency. He also said that LEED has a clarification that the proposed changes will be for the life of the building, which is lacking in many other standards. He noted that in terms of energy efficiency, the ASHRAE standards are the most aggressive within the industry.

Kennedy asked if this recommendation should apply to building renovations as well. Nettleblad said he thought it should, provided there were exceptions based on the size of the intended renovation.

Steve Dillard said there should be an inclusion of a cost effectiveness standard, suggesting that it might not be cost effective to build some structures to the energy efficiency standard. Jesse Romo asked if this recommendation would include non-occupied buildings, to which Nettleblad commented that he didn't see why inclusion of non-occupied buildings would be necessary. Frahm commented that he believed he remembered some past concern with including renovations within such an energy efficiency policy. Brosius pointed out that the Facility Conservation Improvement Program currently targets existing public buildings.

Curt Wright mentioned the Governor's previous Executive Directive (07-373), and said he thought it covered energy efficiency in existing public buildings. Nettelblad commented that it did, but that an executive directive would expire with a new administration. Dean added that if this recommendation is voted forward, they could revisit issues involving viability and renovations during the December 10th meeting.

Motion to move this recommendation to a vote was made, and it was approved unanimously.

12. Encourage State agencies and managers to develop guidelines for telecommuting for appropriate state employees, giving broad discretion to managers on how such an option would be applied.— Kerr suggested that the recommendation be approved with one amendment: replacing “managers” with “agencies” in the final phrase. Kennedy seconded the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously. [*Encourage State agencies and managers to develop guidelines for telecommuting for appropriate state employees, giving broad discretion to agencies on how such an option would be applied.*]

15. The State of Kansas should adopt a goal of increasing energy efficiency such that the rate of growth in electricity peak demand and total energy is 50% less than it would have been absent the energy efficiency initiative.—Mark Schreiber commented that the language of this recommendation was unclear. Dean asked that the information in footnote 3 clarify that the preliminary data was submitted by individual utilities. There was some discussion of why the projected demand growth for Kansas (1.5% to 2.0%) was higher than the national average (1.1%).

Dean asked who would be responsible for validating whether or not utilities were in compliance? Emler said he thought this recommendation was similar to resolutions that the Legislature sends off to the federal government, which have no direct effect on law. Parkinson said that this recommendation can be used to simply add the KEC's weight behind any discussion. Snead further said that such a policy could be applied at the KCC as they deal with conservation programs that may come forward in the future.

Schreiber made a motion to bring this recommendation to a vote, which Snead seconded. Recommendation was approved unanimously.

Priorities for 2009

Frahm referenced the list of potential priorities for 2009 (in meeting notebooks), which were compiled by staff. He said the list was in no way exhaustive and would not be finalized until the December 10th meeting. Buchanan asked if it would be possible to vote by proxy for the December 10th meeting, and Brosius said the current policy was that you had to be present to vote, though email voting for priorities had been done in the past.

Parkinson asked that two more potential priorities be added to the list: (1) engage in a comprehensive analysis of how to provide incentives to regulated utilities to enact energy efficiency and conservation, and (2) evaluate transmission. Emler commented that he didn't see any benefit for the KEC to look at transmission, given the current work of the Kansas Electrical Transmission Agency (KETA); he continued that this was the first year he had ever seen two companies competing to build transmission in the same location. Parkinson withdrew his second suggestion.

Bill Riggins said that KCPL is currently putting energy efficiency on an equal playing field with new generation in order to encourage investment from the shareholder's perspective. Brosius asked how KCPL's current efforts are different from the bill KCPL and others proposed during last year's session, and Riggins answered that KCPL's current efforts are similar to the bill offered last year, but with the addition that energy efficiency is being treated as an asset; for a utility to implement energy efficiency on a large-enough scale to avoid new capacity, compensation would be needed. Parkinson added that by giving incentives to utilities to implement energy efficiency, it would essentially be equivalent to having built a 500-MW virtual power plant through conservation.

Frahm asked Brosius to briefly review the listed potential priorities. Schreiber asked if there was not already a group charged with reviewing water issues. Polansky clarified that the Kansas Water Authority, administered by the Kansas Water Office, was established 20 years ago and currently discusses the overlap of water issues, energy issues, and agricultural issues.

Parkinson said it was his belief that staff had the resources to address two major areas. Brosius stated that in the past the council has done three or four, and that the ability to tackle more areas depends on the issue at hand and how active the committees are. Parkinson then commented that one of the most significant things that will be happening in the energy sector will occur in January when the Environmental Protection Agency either does or does not declare CO₂ a pollutant. Parkinson then asked if it would be possible to leave a slot open until January for the council to potentially investigate any ramifications of such a measure. Brosius reminded the Council that a year ago they'd discussed modifying the process to allow the flexibility to respond to issues that need a faster turn-around.

Dean commented that because of the fast growing nature of wind the Council should keep on top of wind, even if the council does not define what to do with respect to wind energy. Parkinson stated that with the WWG and the fact that the KEC is limited in the

number of issues it can tackle at one time, wind energy shouldn't be made a big issue for the KEC to study. Frahm asked that members "vote" in a non-binding survey on their top three issues by writing them on the flip chart during the break..

[Break]

Energy research at Regent's institutions

Rex Buchanan passed out a summary of the meeting with energy researchers from KU, KSU, and WSU, noting that there is a lot of ongoing research relating to biofuels and electrical systems. Buchanan said one of the insights from the meeting was that researchers weren't necessarily aware of the research going on at other institutions and suggested there may be some value in facilitating information sharing between researchers in the future. Brosius noted that it also was clear that the Council would benefit from hearing about ongoing research at the Regents institutions, as in the next presentation about energy research at WSU.

WSU energy research

Ward Jewell, Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at WSU, concurred that if the Council could help coordinate the sharing of information between universities, that would be helpful. Jewell gave a PowerPoint presentation entitled "Energy Research at Wichita State University" (available on the KEC web site, Meetings page, under the November 12, 2008 heading: <http://www.kec.kansas.gov/meetings.htm>).

He explained that WSU is one of 13 universities involved in Power Systems Engineering Research Center (PSERC), which is supported by the electrical industry and allows students to conduct research related to the electrical grid. Jewell said most of the energy research being done at WSU can be broken down into research related to the electrical grid and fuels. The research related to the electrical grid includes a range of issues related to wind energy: variability, monitoring, control, life-cycle analysis, reliability, maintainability, manufacturability, and durability; it also includes other grid issues such as optimal resources, smart grid, distributed resources, energy storage, and line routing. As for fuel-related research, Jewell highlighted work related to oil and gas exploration and development and biofuels. He said the Business School is conducting feasibility analyses of different energy systems. He highlighted work of two graduate students: the first related to the CO₂ emissions reductions associated wind generation in California, the second looking at the impact of CO₂ prices on costs of generation.

Parkinson asked if there has been progress on electrical storage (which would assist development of wind and solar energy). Jewell said he thought prospects for improving battery storage were good, and that storage would become more competitive as base electricity rates increased. In response to a question from the audience, Jewell acknowledged there had been some discussions between WSU and the aerospace industry regarding research into new composites for wind turbines.

Chart book, electricity tables

Brosius reviewed the status of the two tables prepared for the Electricity Committee—the summary of current electric generation, which she said she considered completed, and the summary of capacity and peak load forecasts, which was close to being final. KEC research assistant Michael Deupree outlined the updates to the capacity and peak load forecasts since the August meeting, noting the revised front matter on page 1 and the addition of data that was missing.

Nettleblad asked how one could determine the amount of capacity within each utility that is provided by wind generation. Brosius answered that this information was not shown. Parkinson added that this information would be insignificant, as all wind generation in Kansas together provides less than 100 MW of summer capacity. Deupree then presented individual utility charts that staff has been creating at the request of the Lt. Governor.

Schreiber restated Westar's concerns about using 20-year forecasts, saying that they were akin to crystal ball gazing, and that they had provided forecasts that only went out 10 years. Deupree explained that in those cases in which utilities had not provided 20-year forecasts, staff had extended the forecasts provided from the data the utilities provided. Nettleblad commented that the front page only listed approximately 90 MW of wind capacity, and asked where the additional 900 MW were? Deupree and Parkinson explained that there is a difference between nameplate capacity and summer (or peak) capacity, and that Southwest Power Pool has specific criteria on how summer capacity is calculated. Frahm thanked the utilities for their assistance, and noted their willingness to share information, which many businesses might consider confidential.

Other business, announcements

Buchanan announced the informational meeting on geological sequestration of CO₂ on December 16, 8:30 to noon, Kansas Association of School Boards, Topeka, which is jointly sponsored by the Kansas Geological Survey, the KCC, and Westar Energy. Brosius said she would send the meeting announcement to the KEC email lists. For the next meeting, Brosius asked everyone to bring their calendars in order to set dates for next year's meetings. She also noted that the KCC Energy Programs Division would be moving in the next couple of days to their new offices at 1300 Arrowhead Road; and that email and phone service may be disrupted. Parkinson thanked Lowry and Snead for their work chairing this year's committees. Parkinson also announced that staff would be sending the Council an evaluation form in order for the Co-Chairs to receive honest feedback regarding the KEC. Frahm thanked everyone for coming and the meeting was adjourned.

Adjourn