

GENERATION PORTFOLIOS

State	Coal	Nat Gas	Nuclear	Wind	Hydro	Oil	Other	Notes
IL	47.1	3.7	47.8	0.3	0.1	0.1	1.0	Data from DOE-EIA
IN	69.2	20.6	8.5	0	.3	1.4		Landfill gas and wind projects approved. Percentages reflect generators owned by IN utilities regardless of where they are located
IA	76.5	6.2	9.1	5.5	1.9	0.5		Data from DOE-EIA
KY	92.3	1.2	0	0	2.6	3.4	0.5	Data from EIA
MAN								Survey forwarded to different agency
MI	60.2	10.0	25.8	2.2	1.4	0.4	1.0	
MN	62.1	4.8	24.8	5.7	1.1	0.9	0.6	
MO	76	4	17.5	0.5	2.0	0	0	IOU's only; includes out of state plants
MT		x		x				Buys most from Dakotas. Get % of fuel from MT
ND	81.8	small	0	7.7	10.5	0		75% is exported
OH	85.9	1.7	10.8	0	0.4	0.9	0.3	DOE-EIA
PA	51	12	34.5	0.1	small	small	small	
SD	34.8	1.7	0	0	63.2	0.2	0	
WI	68	8.3	18.7	0.6	3.0	0.3	1.1	

IN-STATE CARBON-REDUCTION OPTIONS

State	RPS?	Need Out-of-State Renewables?	EEPS?	In-State CCS?	In-State Electric Storage?	New Nuclear Allowed?
IL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unknown	No
IN	No	n.a.	No	Yes	No	Yes
IA	105MW	No	No, but goals	Possibly	No – but compressed air in future	Yes
KY	No	n.a.	No	Yes	No	Only if waste is solved
MAN						
MI	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes – 1872 MW	Yes
MN	Yes	No	Yes	No – ND, SD, Canada, IL	No	No
MO	Yes	Yes	No	Investigating	Yes – 440 MW	Yes
MT	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
ND	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
OH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes – 2700 MW	Yes
PA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Possibly	Yes	Only if coal couldn't be used
SD	Targets	No	No	Possibly	No	Yes
WI	Yes	Yes	No	No - IL	No	Only if waste is solved

COST-SHARING INITIAL POSITIONS

State	Change REC I?	Change RECB II?	Create RECB RPS?	Separate Method for Cross Border?	Notes
IL	Yes	Yes	No	No	There should be one cost-allocation methodology that should be based on the benefits received from a specific project. Allocate costs on zonal basis rather than sub-regional basis. “A full set of benefits metrics must be identified to properly allocate project costs.”
IN	No	Yes	No	No	RECB II: threshold test is unreasonably high. XBorder: consistent allocation methodologies if possible.
IA	Possibly	Yes	Possibly	Yes	RECB I: Not well suited to capture economic or public-policy-driven projects. RECB II: Current criteria warrants review. RECB RPS: Cost sharing of overlays to support RPS is important, be it within the evolving RECB formula or separately. Do more complex benefit assessment and more granular cost-allocation. Other Issues to Address: Subregional configurations used for cost allocation. SPP’s no-loser cost allocation approach. Periodic review of cost allocations. Hybrid cost recovery mechanisms. Likely impact of cost allocation options on certainty of cost recovery.
KY	No	No	No	No	Would not oppose re-evaluating RECB I and II, although RECB I should not support economic or public policy projects.
MAN					
MI	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	RECB II: Threshold may be too steep. RECB RPS: Allocating cost to load may result in inequity. XBorder: Methodologies should be similar.
MN	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	RECB I: Reliability/economic distinction not accurate. All contribute to reliability. RECB II: 20% postage stamp may be too low; beneficiary may be outside of MISO. RECB RPS: Using DC lines may help in identifying beneficiaries. XBorder: Must be able to address beneficiaries outside MISO. Periodic review of cost allocations.
MO	Yes	Yes	Possibly	Yes	RECB I: Restrict shared cost allocation to EHV and directly assigning lower voltage upgrades to the local zones. RECB II: Threshold too high; costs allocated don’t reflect benefits received; rather than

					focus on short-term projects, use RECB II to address EHV overlay. RECB RPS: Only if we can't accommodate moving wind under RECB II. XBorder: Must address exports outside of MISO.
MT	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	RECB I & II: Montana will likely be assessed costs but will not receive benefits from "any transmission project...to serve load in eastern Montana". RECB RPS: Shouldn't have to pay for another state's RPS.
ND	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	RECB RPS: Local load shouldn't pay for transmitting power long distances.
OH	Yes	Yes	No?	No?	For projects 345 kv and above, the mode for developing costs shall be a "beneficiary pays" methodology. Projects should be shared based on who benefits.
PA	?	?	?	?	Commission hasn't yet taken action on these items.
SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Maybe	RECB I & II: Cost sharing must be "expanded across the system if the market is to grow." RECB RPS: Use it to incentivize a robust market for generation.
WI	No	Yes	No	Maybe	RECB I is working fine but would be open to a new type of metric.

NEGOTIATORS/STAFF

State	Commissioner Negotiators	Staff Negotiators	Support Staff	Other State Agencies that Must be Involved
IL	Bob Lieberman	Randy Rismiller	Randy Rismiller Bill VanderLaan Mark Hanson Nick Bowden Sean Brady	None
IN	Greg Server	Beth Roads Dave Johnston Bob Pauley	Beth Roads Dave Johnston Bob Pauley	None
IA	Darrell Hanson	Chancy Bittner		Advisory role – Office of Consumer Advocate
KY	David Armstrong	William Bowker	Jeff Johnson	Kentucky Electric Generation and Transmission Siting Board
MAN				
MI	Monica Martinez	Angie Butcher	Wanda Jones Cathy Cole	Michigan Planning Consortium will determine if there needs to be others represented
MN	None	Burl Haar – MPUC Marya White - OES		Office of Energy Security
MO		Mike Proctor		None
MT	Greg Jergeson		Brian Dekiep Steve Cameron	DEQ – “is in charge of siting transmission”
ND	Tony Clark	Jerry Lein		None
OH	Valerie Lemmie		Fred Heizer Jason Cross Jon Whitis Don Howard Dan Shields Kim Wissman	Ohio Power Siting Board “may choose to be represented in addition to PUCO”
PA		Jim Melia John Levin		None
SD	Gary Hanson	Greg Rislov		South Dakota Energy Infrastructure Authority “has some authority to assist transmission development....However...not involved in siting authority.” Hunter Roberts is their rep.
WI	None	Dennis Koepke Don Neumeyer	Randy Pilo	None

Table 5.6.B. Average Retail Price of Electricity to Ultimate Customers by End-Use Sector, by State,

Year-to-Date through September 2008 and 2007

(Cents per Kilowatthour)

Census Division and State	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007
MISO States						
Illinois	10.71	10.33	8.79	9.01	NM	6.02
Indiana	8.66	8.06	7.62	7.16	5.42	4.98
Michigan	10.86	10.34	9.41	8.98	6.87	6.52
Ohio	10.09	9.59	9.15	8.64	6.16	5.78
Wisconsin	11.39	10.72	9.19	8.64	6.5	6.18
Iowa	9.6	9.41	7.26	7.19	4.92	4.86
Minnesota	9.57	9.02	7.86	7.47	6	5.78
Missouri	7.99	7.72	6.67	6.45	5	4.88
Nebraska	7.87	7.67	6.59	6.36	5.14	4.76
North Dakota	7.48	7.27	6.72	6.49	5.54	5.23
South Dakota	8.19	7.99	6.79	6.53	5.3	5.07
Kentucky	7.64	7.11	7.1	6.62	4.78	4.54
Montana	9.15	8.75	8.47	7.98	6.46	5.63
U.S. Total	11.29	10.65	10.31	9.68	6.99	6.38

Source: DOE-EIA