



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF  
ENVIRONMENT, GREAT LAKES, AND ENERGY  
LANSING



LIESL EICHLER CLARK  
DIRECTOR

**UP ENERGY TASK FORCE MEETING**  
Constitution Hall – Lee Walker Conference Room  
525 W. Allegan Street  
Lansing, Michigan 48933  
January 7, 2020; 11 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **Attendees:**

Paul Ajegba  
Kris Bowman  
Dave Camps  
Liesl Clark  
Mike Furmanski  
Tom Harrell  
Jenn Hill  
Douglas Jester  
Michael Larson

Mike Nystrom  
Mike Prusi  
Tanya Paslawski  
Tony Retaskie  
Dan Scripps  
Chris Swartz  
Tonya Swenor  
Roman Sidortsov

### **Welcome, Introductions, Task Force Business**

Meeting commenced at 11:04 a.m.

Liesl Clark welcomed everyone. Task force members introduced themselves and roll call was conducted for task force members attending via phone.

Eric Pardini with Public Sector Consultants was introduced and spoke about the study they are conducting including data collection, scenarios, and alternatives. Their modeling effort will focus on calculating costs and being able to report out what the expected costs could be for various alternatives. Public Sector Consultants has attended and participated in several task force meetings and gathered information but hasn't yet had an opportunity to hear directly about what this group wants to see considered as far as the alternatives that are on the table and how the alternatives are crafted into scenarios that will go into the modeling exercise.

### **Alternatives**

The goal for alternatives is to determine where the sources are and how they are transported to Michigan.

Transportation alternatives were discussed. It was observed that assets that would be developed to support any one alternative could be used to support other alternatives.

Public Sector Consultants indicated that we know general capacity and price regarding rail transportation, but more information on rail is needed.

### **Scenarios**

Scenarios would look at what disruptions are most likely, and would consider short-term vs. long term disruptions. Public Sector Consultants provided a list of possible scenarios for the task force to consider, with the goal of selecting the most likely scenarios, and eliminating others. Multiple scenarios for disruption were discussed.

It was suggested that in organizing options according to scenarios, to organize the analysis, it will be important to organize by short-term, medium-term, long-term, planned, and unplanned, as was discussed at the December meeting.

### **Sensitivities**

Different sensitivities can be considered in the analysis, for example storage capacity.

Looking at storage other than Rapid River was discussed. The question was raised about who would own it and who would pay for it, or would Plains or NGL own the additional storage. One thought is that it would make sense that the recommendation would be to incentivize that activity (storage) to make it attractive. It was mentioned that for Ontonagon, Gogebic, Iron, Dickinson, Menominee counties, there could be an incentive for retailers to conduct additional storage. Especially if there are rail lines capable of hauling hazardous materials. It was also mentioned that a heavier incentive could be considered for the western UP because there is less storage there.

It was mentioned that Dynamic Risk has a good data set.

### **Public Comments**

Public comments were heard.

### **Next steps**

It was suggested that task force members go through the list and rate scenarios by priority levels of 1, 2, and 3. It was also suggested that the whole list be included in the report, but that the report explain the eliminated options and show the reasons.

Kris Bowman offered to share degree day information, which he has for every month back to 1962. Eric Pardini will follow up with Kris.

It was suggested that energy efficiency recommendations should be included in this propane report and also in the final report.

Public Sector Consultants stated that nothing from the scenario document was stricken, but they have an understanding of what the likely disruptions are that should be considered and can have options in first, second, and third priority levels and can look at the scenarios with a lens of short, medium, long, planned, and unplanned.

Meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

**\*Approved at February 7, 2020, UP Energy Task Force meeting.\***