

MTEP Futures Workshop Feedback Request (20191017)

The OMS TPWG appreciates MISO's MTEP Futures Strawman presented at the MTEP Futures Workshop on October 17th, and as detailed below, the TPWG asks for this proposal to be further developed and made available to stakeholders well in advance of the December 5th workshop.

While the TPWG believes that three futures could be appropriate, particularly in light of MISO's intention to model all three for each LRZ and region-wide, MISO should provide more detail on the analyses and studies that led to the formation of these specific futures, how they were formed, and how the various uncertainty variables interconnect with each other. An expanded narrative for each future and additional information for each assumption contained therein would be helpful. For example, what does MISO mean by, and how should one differentiate between, *electrification* and *deep electrification*? Are the terms tied to different penetration levels of electric vehicles within the MISO footprint, or some other metric? Can MISO provide the background assumptions or analysis and data that suggests energy demand within the MISO footprint may rise 40% and 70% in the *electrification* and *deep electrification* assumptions, respectively? Are the terms tied to different penetration levels of electric vehicles within the MISO footprint, or some other metric? What sector conversions are included in these scenarios (residential electrification ((heating, water heaters), commercial and industrial buildings, industrial uses, electrical vehicle fleets?) What are the assumptions surrounding and technological potential of integrating vehicles into the grid?

MISO should also provide additional information on how MISO plans to model specific inputs in light of potential regional differences. For example, assuming *electrification* and *deep electrification* are tied to different levels of electric vehicle penetration, it is unlikely that said penetration levels will increase uniformly across the footprint. Therefore, the TPWG would like begin discussions with MISO regarding what information MISO needs from each state, how it plans to collect this information, and how it plans to standardize similar data presented in various forms from different states.

The TPWG is supportive of the EGEAS Study Area proposal. However, the TPWG would like additional information on how the LRZ-specific assumptions would apply for each resource and whether MISO would allow states to offer policy direction to ensure the accuracy of assumed resource additions and retirements. With regards to the External Areas proposal the TPWG asks that MISO remain cognizant of the fact that it may need to reach out to individual utilities to get its required information in non-RTO planning regions.

The TPWG does not believe it has enough information concerning the new and updated resources, load and load-modifications, and siting sections of the proposal and asks MISO to provide additional information well in advance of the December 5th workshop.

As there is a limited amount of time remaining to discuss, clarify and settle the remaining issues discussed above, and as the November MTEP Futures workshop was cancelled, the TPWG looks forward to receiving a more detailed proposal well in advance of the December 5th workshop.