

Name: Student Example Period: 4 Date: 6/14/18

You are tasked to write an essay communicating the problem you are trying to solve with the 50 Year Energy Plan and evaluate your design solution against others.

There will be four (4) sections of your essay:

- 1. Exploring Our Engineering Challenge (Claim)
 - a. Introduce the problem you are trying to solve.
 - b. Describe what requirements must be met (the constraints) in order to successfully meet your goal.
 - c. Describe the criteria that will be used to judge the created solution.
 - d. Make a claim as to what you think is most important of the criteria and explain why.
 - e. Detail what may happen if a plan is not implemented

2. Evaluating Competing 50 Year Plans (Evidence)

- a. Your plan
 - i. Screenshot of your plan with a title
 - ii. Describe the strategy of your plan
 - iii. Describe the strengths and weaknesses of your plan
- b. Competing plan
 - i. Screenshot of a competing plan
 - ii. Describe the strategy of the competing plan
 - iii. Describe the strengths and weaknesses of the comp
- 3. Reasoning about the Best Design (Reasoning)
 - a. Restate which criteria you found most important and state which plan best fulfills that priority.
 - b. Describe the differences between your plan and the competitor's plan in terms of the criteria and strategy.
 - c. Conclude which plan you find better and ex
- 4. Limitations of your Plan
 - a. What challenges do you envision in implementing your solution? Have you made any assumptions?
 - b. What problems may still remain if your proposed plan is implemented?
 - c. What technological breakthroughs might change your plan design? How might it change?

We as the Energy Plan Commision seek to establish an effective 50 Year Energy Plan that will satisfy the requirements of the "Clean Electricity and Coal Transition Plan" to meet the needs of all Oregonians each decade. In order to evaluate a successful energy plan, our constraints must be to produce reliable energy to respond to the needs of Oregonians; fulfill the Oregon Law "Clean Electricity and Coal Transition Plan" with removal of coal power by 2035; stay within projected growth for each decade; and consider the economic aspects of energy usage. We will evaluate the energy sources based upon environmental impact and land use, such as waste production; climate and air quality impact, such as undesirable greenhouse gas emissions; and lifetime cost criteria. Keeping in mind that global warming caused by CO₂ leads to extreme weather events, worsens human health, and may lower crop production with irregular temperature patterns, our highest priority is to mitigate the negative climate and air quality impact from energy sources like coal. Otherwise, if we do not implement a successful plan, harmful effects on the environment, climate change, and air quality will be detrimental to the health and economic stability of future generations in and outside of Oregon.

My overall strategy for my 50 Year Energy Plan was to eliminate the use of coal and natural gas early on in order to reduce the negative effects of these sources on climate and air quality due to carbon dioxide emissions. In addition, I focused on maximizing my percent growth by investing in environmentally responsible and reliable resources like geothermal energy early on in order to fulfill Oregon's requirements in the long run. As a result of my strategy, one strength of my plan was that the climate and air quality impact consistently improved over time and the environmental and land use impact was excellent all throughout because I primarily invested in geothermal, wind, wave, and biomass energy. Another strength was that my plan removed the use of natural gas and its negative consequences due to possible leaks. On the other hand, one weakness was that my plan became more costly over time at 2.7 and also slightly less reliable at 3.8 in the end, which was a tradeoff for more environmentally responsible energy sources.

The main strategy of the competing 50 Year Energy Plan was to minimize the environmental and land use impact by investing in sources like geothermal and wind energy. It appears that the competing plan also emphasized staying cost effective because it invested in most of the cheaper energy sources. Some of the strengths of the competing plan was that environmental and land use impact stayed excellent and the reliability was at 4.0 in the end. However, one weakness was that in the 2010s and 2020s, the climate and air quality was extremely poor and that the climate and air quality did not improve past the 2040s, but stayed constant. Another weakness in this plan was that its third most used resource was natural gas, which disturbs land because it requires drilling wells and pipelines that may leak, explode, and release toxic chemicals into communities.

As mentioned before, reducing negative climate and air quality impact was my top priority because many energy sources emit greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming. After carefully comparing the designs, I claim that my 50 Year Energy Plan accomplished the number one priority with the most amount of success. To support this, my plan did a better job addressing climate and air quality impact, which is shown with my better rating starting in the 2020s and continuing until the 2060s with a 1.4 versus the competing 1.6. I achieved this difference by eliminating natural gas early on and investing in more wave and biomass energy when compared to the competing plan. Another difference is that my plan more successfully executed the environmental and land use criterion with a 2.6 when compared to the competing plan's 2.7 because I invested in biomass, smart grid technology, and energy storage. It's important to notice that the strategy I used to reduce climate impact was interconnected with the environmental and land use criteria as most of the sources with less land use had less CO₂ emissions. Furthermore, even though the resulting startup and maintenance cost for my 50 Year Energy Plan and the competing plan were 2.7 and 2.5 respectively, it must be understood that the tradeoff for lower cost was between using cheap natural gas instead of more environmentally sustainable sources like biomass and wave energy. Ultimately, after thorough investigation, I conclude that my design successfully achieves our goal of a more environmentally and budget friendly and reliable energy plan for all Oregonians.

By analyzing my chosen 50 Year Energy Plan, I predict that it will be difficult to gain Oregon's public and legal approval for the huge shift from using coal and natural gas to geothermal and wave energy instead. For

example, according to the Oregon Department of Energy, Oregon has high marine energy potential, but must follow regulations in the Part 5 Territorial Sea Plan, as well as get a lease from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management for federal waters. As a result, it may take a lot of time for the government to allow implementation of a new wave energy project that is fundamental to my plan; but, I trust that it will be worthwhile. It will also be challenging to get approval for more nuclear energy since its radioactive waste can damage health. In addition, it may be challenging to find open land to build more wind farms in Oregon as the population grows. If we overcome these public and legal challenges, one key problem that may remain is that the expenses may continue to rise: however, it is critical to understand that the money saved by using more renewable and sustainable energy sources typically exceeds the initial startup and maintenance cost as time goes on. Another possible problem is that if it is used irresponsibly, geothermal energy may interfere with tectonically active plates and lower ground temperature. In addition, the overdue Cascadia earthquake would also present serious damage to all of Oregon's energy planning if it were to occur. Moreover, if technological breakthroughs lead to a reliable and cost effective way to store solar energy so more harvested sunlight can go to use throughout the day, my plan could invest in more solar energy and less geothermal energy in order to diversify my sources. Similarly, if scientists discover a way to eliminate the radioactive waste by-product from nuclear sources, my plan could also invest in more nuclear energy to boost its reliability. Additionally, if engineers find a way to improve the smart grid technology, my plan would be even more reliable due to its ability to reduce energy transmission loss.

As the Energy Plan Commision, it is our responsibility to find a solution to meet human energy demands while protecting the Earth and its inhabitants in the long run. After careful analysis, my 50 Year Energy Plan would satisfy the requirements of the "Clean Electricity and Coal Transition Plan" to meet the needs of all Oregonians each decade.

My 50 Year Energy Plan

			M	ly 50 Y	lear Energ	y Plan	1						
		- 3	20106	2-3	20206	5	20306	20406		20506		2	000 s
% Energy No (% of current en			100	105		110		115		120		125	
Expected % 0 (% chang			20										
field and	er.	See.	% Growth	16	% Growth	16	% Growth	1. 16	% Growth	%	% Growth	16	% Growth
Hydro (already									1.0.0				
Land Use 4 Air DO2	2 Cost 2	43	0	43	0	43	0	43	0	43	a	43	0
Relability 4 Max %	43 Max Rate 0		_	-	_	-	-	-	-		-	_	
Land Use 2 Air CO2	5 Cost 1	34	-13	21	-11	10	-10	0	0	0	0	O.	ó
Reliability 5 Max %	34 Max Rate 0	-	-12						, i				
Natural G	as .												
Land Use 2 Air OO2	4 Cost 1	12	-9	з	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reliability 5 Max %	30 Max Rate 6	1.1	1000	100				1.1.1.1.1			10		
Nuclea		13	222	1.5	103	1		1000		3	18	20	
Land Use 3 Air CO2 Reliability 5 Max %	1 Cost 4 100 Max Rate 2	3	-2	1	2	з	0	3	0	3	0	3	Q
Blomas	Parente Standarbornt Carl						-	-	-	-	-		
Land Use 1 Air OO2	2 Cost 3	3	2	: 5	2	.7	2	. 9	0	9	0	9	0
Reliability 3 Max %	12 Max Rate 2	1000	1.77.17	100	CONTROL		100	1.0023.000				.75	
Wind									1				
Land Use 2 Air CO2	1 Cost 3	5	4	9	- 4	13	3	16	0	16	4	20	0
Relability 2 Max %	30 Max Rate 4			-			-	_					
Land Use 2 Air OO2	1 Cost 2	0	в	8	8	16	8	24	5	29	1	30	0
Relability 5 Max %	30 Max Rate 8					10	0	. 24	0	- 40			
Solar													
Land Use 2 Air CO2	1 Cost 4	0	4	4	- t -	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	ũ
Reliability 2 Max %	30 Max Rate 6						-		-	_	-		
Land Use 2 Air OD2	10.0	2	10	-	0	40	20	10		-	2	10	1
Land Use 2 Air OO2 Reliability 4 Max %	1 Cost 5 30 Max Rate 10	0	10	10		10	0	10	0	10	0	10	1
8mart Grid Teo									-		-		
Land Use 1 Air OO2	1 Cost 5	0	2	2	+	з	0	3	0	3	0	з	2
Reliability 5 Max %	12 Max Rate 2		0.944	1		State of		1 Tarres					
Energy Sto	rage		-	105	0788		224	10.565		325	12	33	0.00
Land Use 1 Air CO2 Reliability 5 Max %	1 Cost 5 20 Max Rate 2	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	2	2
"Note: Large	The second secon	100		107		111		115		120		125	
Hydro and Coal	Energy Needs Check	of	C	of	O	of	O	of	B	of	O	of	C
do not contribute	CHIDGK	100	2	105	2	110	~	115	2	120	~	125	~
		20	4	15	A	14	1	5	1	5	2	5	4
2009-2011	% Growth Check	10	Ô	of 45	Ô	to an	Ô	to to	Ô	to	0	of	Ô
values came from 2009-2011 average energy 2009-2011 average energy 2009-2011	Reliability Check	20	2000	15		-15		10	and the second second	10		5	
percentages C	Soore must be	4.4	Ô	4.0	Ô	3.9	0	3.8	O	3.9	0	3.8	0
	above 3		2		2		2		2		2	10100	2
	Environmental	7.92	-	100		1200	-	12.05		144		1220	
Criteria	Climate Impact /	2.9	0	2.8		2.7	0	2.7		2.6	0	2.6	
ite	Air Quality	3.2	H	2.4	0	1.8	C	1.5		1.4		1.4	
5	Start Up Cost /	1		~ ~	0	54	0	12.20	0	-	0	122	0
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Maintenance	1.7	0	2.4	6	2,6		2.7	1	2,7		2.7	

Competing 50 Year Energy Plan

			Comp	eting s	50 Year Er	iergy l	Plan						
		6	20106	3	20206	1	20306	_	2040 s		20506	2	060s
% Energy No (% of current en			100	105		110		115		120		125	
Expected % 0 (% chang			20										
		N.**	% Growth	%	% Growth	1	% Growth	No.	% Growth	16	% Growth	N.	% Growth
Hydro (already													
Land Use 4 Air OO2 Reliability 4 Max %	2 Cost 2 43 Max Rate 0	43	O	43	0	43	Q	43	0	43	a	43	0
Coal	6 6										1		
Land Use 2 Air CO2	5 Cost 1	34	-12	22	-12	10	-10	0	0	0	Ø	0	0
Rošabilky 5 Max %	34 Max Rate 0	-											
Natural C		12	-3	9	1122	9	20	9	14		12	12	1020
Land Use 2 Air CO2 Reliability 5 Max %	4 Cost 1 30 Max Rate 6	12	2	9	0	. 9	0		1	10	0	10	0
Nuolea													
Land Use 3 Air CO2	1 Cost 4	з	2	5	2	7	0	7	0	7	1	в	D
Reliability 5 Max %	100 Max Rate 2			1									
Blomas		- 32	120	13	1985	1		1000	1.0	3	18	20	
Land Use 1 Air CO2 Reliability 3 Max %	2 Cost 3 12 Max Rate 2	3	a	3	0	з	0	3	0	3	0	3	Q
Wind	La mess russe a	-				-		-	-	-	-	-	
Land Use 2 Air CO2	1 Cost 3	5	- 4	.9	4	13	3	16	0	16	2	18	0
Reliability 2 Max %	30 Max Rate 4		1007031	100	10040					200			
Geothern	nal								1				
Land Use 2 Air CO2	1 Cost 2	0	8	8	8	16	8	24	4	28	2	30	0
Relability 5 Max %	30 Max Rate 8			_			_	_	-				
Solar	d Card A		1.4.1	-						-		-	
Land Use 2 Air CO2 Reliability 2 Max %	1 Cost 4 30 Max Rate 6	0	6	6	0	6	1	7	0	73	α	7	0
Wave	and the state of the			-				-	-				
Land Use 2 Air CO2	1 Cost 5	0	з	3	0	в	0	3	0	3	a	3	0
Reliability 4 Max %	30 Max Rate 10						-			_			
8mart Grid Teo	hnology		20220	1.2								- 245	
Land Use 1 Air OO2	1 Cost 5	0	a	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
Reliability 5 Max % Energy Sto	12 Max Rate 2	_				-		-	-	-	-	-	
Land Use 1 Air CO2	1 Cost 5	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	o	2	0
Reliability 5 Max %	20 Max Rate 2	1	2504	198	07283	-	- 44	1000		, R4	100	- 243	1259.0
"Note: Large	Energy Manual 1	100		108		110		115		120		125	
Hydro and Coal do not contribute	Energy Needs Check	of	O	of	O	to	O	at	O	of	O	of	C
do not contribute to % growth "Note: 2010s		100	-	105		110	_	115	_	120		125	
"Note: 2010s values came from	N Constitution	20	0	14	2	15	A	5	A	5	A	0	2
values came from 2009-2011 average energy source percentages	% Growth Check	of 20	U	of 15	Ø	of 15	0	of 10	Ø	of 10	0	of 5	ß
source	Reliability Check	20		110	1000	The second	1	10	-	114			1.44
percentages C	800re must be	4.4	Ô	4.1	Ô	4.0	0	3.9	Ô	4.0	O	4.0	Ô
	above 3												
σ	Environmental Impact / Land Use	2.9		2.9		2.8		2.8		2.7		2.7	
Criteria	Climate Impact/ Air Quality	3.2	8	2.6		2.0	0	1.6		1.6		1.5	
5	Start Up Cost/				0		0		(00)		(na)		(00)
	Maintenance	1.7	1985	2.2		2.3		2.5	(Č	2.5	()	2.5	y

1st Iteration of My 50 Year Energy Plan

2nd Iteration of My 50 Year Energy Plan													
			20106	20206			20306	20406		20506		20606	
% Energy Needed (% of current energy use)		100		105		110		115		120		125	
Expected % Growth (% change)		20		15		15		10			10	5	
(va craziĝa)		%** % Growth		% % Growth		15 % Growth		%	% Growth	%	% Growth	8	% Growth
Hydro (already)	Maxed)											~	
Land Use 4 Air CO2	2 Cost 2	43	0	43	0	43	0	43	0	43	0	43	0
Reliability 4 Max %	43 Max Rate 0												
Coal													
Land Use 2 Air CO2 Reliability 5 Max %	5 Cost 1 34 Max Rate 0	34	-12	22	-11	-11	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Ga	_	12	-2	10	-2	8	-1	7	-4	3	-3	0	0
Land Use 2 Air OO2 Reliability 5 Max %	4 Cost 1 30 Max Rate 6	12	~4	10	-2	8	-1		-4	3	-3	u	0
Nuclear	and man reads												
Land Use 3 Air CO2	1 Cost 4	3	0	3	0	3	-1	2	0	2	0	2	0
Reliability 5 Max %	100 Max Rate 2												
Biomass													
Land Use 1 Air CO2	2 Cost 3	3	0	з	0	з	0	3	0	3	0	3	0
Reliability 3 Max %	12 Max Rate 2												
Wind													
Land Use 2 Air CO2 Reliability 2 Max %	1 Cost 3 30 Max Rate 4	5	4	9	3	12	4	16	2	18	1	19	0
Geotherma													
Land Use 2 Air OO2	1 Cost 2	0	7	7	6	13	4	17	6	23	7	30	0
Reliability 5 Max %	30 Max Rate 8		· · ·	1					Ŭ		· '		
8olar													
Land Use 2 Air CO2	1 Cost 4	0	2	2	2	4	з	7	0	7	0	7	0
Reliability 2 Max %	30 Max Rate 6												
Wave													
Land Use 2 Air CO2 Reliability 4 Max %	1 Cost 5	0	5	5	2	7	2	9	0	9	0	9	1
Reliability 4 Max % 8mart Grid Teoh													
Land Use 1 Air CO2	1 Cost 5	0	2	2	2	4	2	6	o	6	0	6	2
Reliability 5 Max %	12 Max Rate 2		-	-	-	-	-		, v				-
Energy Store	900												
Land Use 1 Air CO2	1 Cost 5	0	2	2	2	4	2	6	0	6	0	6	2
Reliability 5 Max %	20 Max Rate 2												
"Note: Large Hydro and Coal	Energy Needs	100	2	108	0	112	0	116	0	120	0	125	2
do not contribute	Check	to	്	to	Ů	to	ഗ	to .	ம	to tab	Ů	to t	്
to % growth "Note: 2010s		100		105		110		115		120		125	
values came from	% Growth Check	of	Ô	15 of	Ô	15 of	ഗ	4 of	ŝ	of	ம	of	ഹ
- 2009-2011 55 average energy	A Ground I Grieger	20	U	15	U	15	U	10	U	10	U	5	L)
source	Reliability Check												
percentages O	800re must be	4.4	ഗ	4.2	ഗ	4.1	ഗ	3.9	ŵ	3.9	ഗ	3.9	ഗ
	above S												
	Environmental Impact / Land Use	2.9		2.8		2.7		2.7	<u></u>	2.6		2.6	
	Climate Impact /	2.5		2.0		2.1		2.1		2.0	-	2.0	
Criteria	Air Quality	3.2		2.6		2.1	9	1.6		1.5	•	1.4	0
0	Start Up Cost / Maintenance	1.7		2.2	\odot	2.5	0	2.8	\odot	2.8	\odot	2.8	
	Maintenance	1.1		2.6		2.0		2.0		2.0		2.0	-

2nd Iteration of My 50 Year Energy Plan

		:	2nd Iterati	on of	My 50 Yea	r Ener	gy Plan						
			20106		20206		0006		20406		20506	050¢ 2080	
% Energy No (% of current ene			100	105		110		115		120		125	
Expected % Growth (% change)		20		15		15		10		10		5	
		S	% Growth	- %	% Growth	- %	% Growth	- %	% Growth	- %	% Growth	~%	% Growth
Hydro (already Land Use 4 Air OD2	2 Cost 2	43	0	43	o	43	0	43	o	43	0	43	0
Reliability 4 Max % Coal	43 Max Rate 0												
Land Use 2 Air OO2 Reliability 5 Max %	5 Cost 1 34 Max Rate 0	34	-12	22	-11	-11	-11	0	o	0	0	0	0
Natural G		12	-2	10	-2	8			-4	3	-3	0	0
Land Use 2 Air CO2 Reliability 5 Max %	4 Cost 1 30 Max Rate 6	12	~4	10	~4	8	-1	7	-4	3	-3	U	U
Land Use 3 Air OO2 Reliability 5 Max %	1 Cost 4	з	o	з	o	з	-1	2	o	2	o	2	0
Reliability 5 Max % Biomase								<u> </u>					
Land Use 1 Air CO2 Reliability 3 Max %	2 Cost 3	з	0	3	0	3	0	3	o	3	0	з	0
Wind													
Land Use 2 Air OO2 Reliability 2 Max %	1 Cost 3 30 Max Rate 4	5	4	9	з	12	4	16	2	18	- 1	19	0
Geotherm													
Land Use 2 Air OO2 Reliability 5 Max %	1 Cost 2 30 Max Rate 8	0	7	7	6	13	4	17	6	23	7	30	0
8olar	1 Cost 4	-		_									
Land Use 2 Air OO2 Reliability 2 Max %	30 Max Rate 6	0	2	2	2	4	3	7	0	7	0	7	0
Land Use 2 Air OO2 Reliability 4 Max %	1 Cost 5 30 Max Rate 10	0	5	5	2	7	2	9	o	9	0	9	1
8mart Grid Teol	hnology												
Land Use 1 Air OO2 Reliability 5 Max %	1 Cost 5 12 Max Rate 2	0	2	2	2	4	2	6	0	6	0	6	2
Land Use 1 Air OO2 Reliability 5 Max %	1 Cost 5	o	2	2	2	4	2	6	o	6	o	6	2
"Note: Large	zu max Plate 2	100		108		112		116		120		125	
Hydro and Coal	Energy Needs Check	of 100	്	of 105	ம	of 110	ഗ	of 115	ல	of 120	്	of 125	ഗ്
"Note: 2010s		20		15	•	15		4		5		5	
do not contribute to % growth "Note: 2010s values came from 2009-2011 average energy source percentages	% Growth Check	of 20	്	of 15	ŵ	of 15	്	of 10	Ċ	of 10	ů	of 5	്
source B	Reliability Check Score must be	4.4	ഗ	4.2	ഹ	4.1	ß	3.9	ß	3.9	ß	3.9	ሰ
	above 3 Environmental		-		~		2		~		-		-
eria	Impaot / Land Use Climate Impact /	2.9	-	2.8		2.7		2.7		2.6		2.6	
Chiteria	Air Quality 8tart Up Cost /	3.2		2.6		2.1		1.6		1.5		1.4	
U	Maintenance	1.7	9	2.2	9	2.5	9	2.8	9	2.8	9	2.8	9