Joining the ThinkTANCc

Using energy models to inform interstate policies

Drew Kristensen, Mark Officer, Elliot Tam
University of Puget Sound

April 28, 2018

1. Analysis
   - Problem at Hand
   - Energy Profiles
   - Modeling
   - Projection
2. Policy Decisions
   - Goals
   - Actions
3. Evaluation
   - Predictive Model
   - Ideal Model

Problem at Hand

The states of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California have decided to enact an interstate compact, shifting to renewable resources.
We at the ThinkTANCc have been tasked with creating a policy for each state to help them achieve the goals of the compact.

Energy Profiles

Energy Profiles - 2009				
	Arizona	California	New Mexico	Texas
Coal	160705.9	0.0	466100.4	455507.1
Gas	727	309834.9	1557687	8074816
Ethanol	1308.4	1177.5	654.2	3984.5
Crude Oil	266.8	1328165	354646.8	2646911
Nuclear	320723	332249.4	0	434065.1
Hydro	62730.9	272187.2	2644.6	10039.7
Solar	138.1	125443.2	0	0
Wind	288.4	56996.6	15096	195454.8
Renewable	88571.4	635062.4	33785.2	303697.1
Total	570994	2605312	2412219	11914997

All values given in Billions of BTUs, except for Ethanol, given in thousands of barrels.

Analysis: Texas

Analysis: Arizona

Analysis: New Mexico

Analysis: California

Ideal Model

Used the idea that our energy goal can be represented as

$$(1 - \text{percentage})^{\text{years}}$$

The goal for the TANCc

Actions: Texas

Actions: Arizona

Actions: New Mexico

Actions: California

Predictive Model :Strengths

Predictive Model:Weaknesses

Ideal Model:Strengths

Ideal Model:Weaknesses