



Clean Power Plan Update February 22, 2016 Public Meeting

Chris Colclasure
Deputy Director
Air Pollution Control Division



COLORADO
Department of Public
Health & Environment

Overview

- Stakeholder process so far
- Supreme Court order staying Clean Power Plan
- Discussion of how CDPHE should proceed during the CPP stay

Stakeholder Input: Public Meetings

- APCD's Public Meetings on CPP
 - 9/25/15: Denver
 - 11/9/15: Durango
 - 1/14/16: Commerce City
 - 1/27/16: Brush
- Colorado Energy Office
 - 10/23/15: energy efficiency workshop
- PUC Commissioners' Information Meetings
 - 12/10/15: Constructive Opportunities & the CPP
 - 2/25/16: Renewable Energy and Transmission

Stakeholder Input: Comments Received

- 96 individual comments
 - Oral and written comments during public meetings
 - Individual emails
- ~ 500 comments via mass email campaigns in general support of CPP

Stakeholder Input: Public Comment Themes

- Colorado should adopt a strong state plan to reduce climate change and improve health and the environment.
- Go beyond the goals for carbon reduction in the CPP.
- Colorado should oppose EPA's Clean Power Plan.
- Colorado should collaborate with all parties and the public.
- Colorado should reach out to low income and rural communities.
- Consider the economic impact on rate payers and consumers.

Stakeholder Input: Public Comment Themes (cont.)

- Consider reliability of electrical grid.
- Colorado has already made significant reductions and is on track to meet its goal.
- Consider the potential for job losses and job gains.
- Rely more on renewable energy, less on fossil fuels.
- Incorporate demand side management and energy efficiency practices.
- Utilize more solar and more distributed energy systems.
- Proceed, or not, during the stay.

Order Staying Clean Power Plan

- Supreme Court stayed CPP on Feb. 9
- 5-4 decision, rationale not stated
- Not a ruling on the merits
- D.C. Circuit panel decision ~ Fall 2016
- Parties may seek review by full D.C. Circuit or appeal directly to Supreme Court
- Supreme Court decision ~ 2017-2019

Impact of Stay

- No September 2016 initial submittal
- CPP deadlines and requirements uncertain
- Climate change remains a critical issue
- CDPHE will continue planning in a measured way to reduce power sector CO₂ emissions
- Prudent to put Colorado in best position given uncertainty
- CDPHE is identifying actions that have benefits regardless of litigation outcome

Topics for Discussion of How to Proceed During Stay

- Stakeholder engagement
 - APCD meetings and CEO workgroup
- Modeling
 - APCD information request
- Colorado Climate Plan
- Not drafting full state plan
- Soliciting comment on other actions

Stakeholder Engagement

- APCD public meetings
 - 3/23/16: Pueblo - TBD
 - 4/12/16: Craig - TBD
 - Refine meeting dates, topics, and format
- CEO energy efficiency workgroup
 - Not limited to CPP
 - Amount of emission reductions
 - EM&V
 - Costs

Western States CPP Evaluation Model

- Center for the New Energy Economy (CNEE) contracted with Energy Strategies for a western states model
- Gap analysis tool to evaluate CPP compliance measures
 - MS Excel Spreadsheet-based modeling platform
- Phase 1: five states (CO, MT, NM, UT & WY)
 - Available at <http://www.westernstatecppmodeling.org/>
- Phase 2: seven more states (AZ, ID, ND, NV, OR, SD & WA)
 - Available March 2016
- APCD is using Energy Strategies tool

APCD Request for Modeling Information

- Asked stakeholders to identify, by March 11
 - Compliance scenarios for gap analysis
 - Preferences on production cost modeling tools
 - Categories of data needed for production cost modeling
- Asked stakeholders to identify, by April 15
 - Values and assumptions for data inputs
- Some responses already received
- APCD still desires this information

Questions and Answers

Followed by

Public Comment