

## Statement of Need Input from June 29 Stakeholder Meeting

### Introduction

- Avoid conclusory statements “provides the strongest’. Instead use “goal” “target” “aims to achieve” language.
- Change resiliency to resilience.
- Section b part I, 3, should include “security”, “etc” = other potential threats
- Identify key interim dates for emission reduction targets.
- Paragraph 3 – State that the modeling should provide an initial perspective on resource pathways to achieve a zero carbon grid by 2040.
- Section A, sentence 1 and paragraph 3 need to be reconciled.
- Sentence 2 in paragraph 3 is more aligned with what this plan provides.

### Vision & Goals

- ii, 2, b. add “pollution” to Climate Change Impact.
- How will planning reserve margin apply vs. LOLP by portfolio?
- Either avoid concepts that cannot be quantified in modeling, scenarios or scoring of bids – or identify some concepts as only conceptual or external to the modeling/RFP process.
- Replace “life cycle impacts” with “extraction, use and disposal” not just recycling/disposal.

### Decision Points and Pathways

- Community education – Not education but need for a consistent reliable, perhaps “neutral” source of information on the process of moving off fossil fuels with centralized power generation into a world of multiple source generation need electricity demand. Doing all this while PNM continues to serve customers reliability.
- Will stakeholders and PRC be evaluating solicitation bid documents and bid scoring plan?
- Why is “maximizing investment opportunity” a goal? For whom? How about maximizing competitive RFP opportunities, fair competition and evaluation of bids?
- Add evaluation of the land use and community impacts.
- Identify interim and 2040 key emission reduction dates.
- Tradeoffs between zero carbon grid and ability to respond to catastrophic events.
- Unintended consequences/negative impacts of 2040 zero carbon grid.

### Resources

- Fix, define or delete “not for electric”
- Summarize the primary scenarios and sensitivities considered prior to the selection of the preferred portfolio.
- Include a table of the MW and \$ associated with those scenarios.
- Provide a summary of the load impacts for the preferred portfolio (e.g., TOU, DERs, EE).

### Potential New Resources

- Avoid prescribing specific resource acquisitions by MW or type, or tech-specific RFP. Instead rely on actual bids in an all-source RFP.
- What are the differences between “candidate resource” and “potential new resources”?
- What does “no new gas of any kind” mean? No new natural gas? Or nothing other in gaseous form? (Note: only referring to natural gas)
- Statement of need should come after PNM discusses candidate resources and description of modeling.

#### Additional Comments

- I am concerned that part of the SoN need document that was shown and passed out, was removed, because it was assumed that PNM was exclusively qualified in this area (statement of condition). How was this assumption made? It also removes the thoughts of other IRP stakeholders in this area.
- How are objectives handled?
- How will scenarios generated?
- How planning horizon is determined