From:
 James, Eve A L (BPA) - PG-5

 Sent:
 Monday, May 23, 2022 8:00 AM

To: Koehler,Birgit G (BPA) - PG-5; Pruder Scruggs,Kathryn M (BPA) - E-4

Subject: RE: technical version of results, and some Birgit notes

## Deliberative, FOIA Exempt

Thanks Birgit- I think having the public slide deck the same for CEQ and public is a good idea. The full technical report will be posted at some point for those wanting more detail. Katie and I have a meeting later today after the E3 meeting. Also, Doug Johnson said he is available to help with messaging and help with planning the public rollout so once Katie and I get a first pass put together we can loop him in as well.

From: Koehler, Birgit G (BPA) - PG-5 < bgkoehler@bpa.gov>

Sent: Monday, May 23, 2022 7:53 AM

To: Pruder Scruggs, Kathryn M (BPA) - E-4 < <a href="mailto:kpruder@bpa.gov">kpruder@bpa.gov</a>

Cc: James, Eve A L (BPA) - PG-5 < eajames@bpa.gov>

Subject: technical version of results, and some Birgit notes

## Deliberative, FOIA Exempt

Hey Katie,

I'm not sure you need their technical version after all, but here you have it just in case. Includes technical version of results, e.g.

And I'm attaching the scatter-shot ideas that I was starting to assemble that might help you build this up.

## Eve,

I'm not quite sure what to make of the E3 slides that show that replacement resources are less MW than the 3,500 MW of the LSN. Maybe it's OK, because we can still say that it seems odd to get rid of perfectly good generation.

Katie and I just spent an hour talking through the E3 ppt. I was more alarmed on Friday than I am this morning having taking a closer look. But I just walked through it once, and didn't know what to make of some of it on the first pass. I suggested that Katie talk with you too to get your impressions.

Katie will probably make a new PPT (without fancy background or font), using screen shots of E3's graphics unless they send us a ppt. But then E3 can use Katie's to go back and modify their own, giving it the E3 look.

Will we use this for CEQ&DOE as well as for the public? The former is the high priority, so that's all I've focused on. Katie rightly pointed out that it would be idea to have it suitable for both, so I'd try to make that appropriate. The public audience probably would have more technical folks than CEQ, but we may not want to give them more details than what we give CEQ.

Birgit