

PUNCH LIST - EPE 2025 IRP Facilitated Stakeholder Process

| Request | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>1. DoD/FEA would like to work with EPE to get concerns addressed (Emmanuel requested that EPE's key accounts dept follow up with Kyle Smith directly). Resources we would like to provide to meet the needs that the greater system has. Would like to understand the parameters. (Kyle Smith, workshop #4, 4/23/25)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resiliency assets that can provide services to the system • Transmission constraints | <p>☑ EPE's Manager of Key Accounts contacted Kyle Smith directly on April 28, 2025, to discuss the items listed above. EPE's Manager of Key Accounts is working with DoD/FEA representatives on various generation and transmission opportunities.</p> |
| <p>2. LOLPs, ELCC values and updated L&R tables (Orland Whitney email, 5/6/2025)</p> | <p>☑ ELCC values for gas, wind, storage and solar were provided during Workshop #4, see slides 23-25. .</p> |
| <p>3. Earlier, it was mentioned that one of EPE's early solar facilities will be reaching retirement age in a few years. Is it possible that solar facilities may still be effective and useful at the end of their projected service lives and will still be cost-effective and useful even after they have been fully depreciated? (Don Kurtz, workshop #4, 4/23/25)</p> | <p>☑ EPE has only one solar PPA scheduled to expire in 2030. This PPA would be eligible to bid in to EPE's next RFP to evaluate whether is cost effective.</p> |
| <p>4. More robust programming on C&I demand response. (Steve Fischmann, 5/6/2025 Demand Side Resources Office Hour)</p> | <p>☑ E3 has contacted Mr. Fischmann and the DER working group. Additionally, E3 and Gridworks have emailed Mr. Fischmann. E3 provided a recommendation on this modeling approach and did not receive any objections to their recommendation on this approach from Mr. Fischmann as of June 12, 2025. The scenarios and sensitivities have been discussed and EPE is proceeding with the stakeholder requested modeling proposals, which will be presented during the June 17, 2025, and July 23, 2025, stakeholder meetings. As of the last meeting in May 2025, the stakeholders have expressed agreement with the information that is being provided and presented.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>5. When will the ELCC study be available? (Chris Leger, Cynthia Mitchell, Orland Whitney, workshop #5, 5/21/2025)?</p> | <p>☑ Presented during July 9th Office Hour Presentation https://gridworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/EPE-Office-Hours-7_9_2025-1.pdf</p> |
| <p>6. Day-ahead purchases for near -term summer shortfalls? Plan for meeting capacity needs from now until 2030 (Anastasia Stevens, Workshop #5, 5/21/2025)?</p> | <p>☑ EPE cannot address the near -term in the modeling; therefore, the near-term needs to be addressed through alternative measures that will be discussed as part of EPE's Action Plan.</p> |
| <p>7. Load forecasting. Break out how much due to IT data server load? And details on NM system (slide 11). (Cynthia Mitchell, Workshop #5, 5/21/2025)</p> | <p>☑ Base Load Forecast breakout posted on SharePoint</p> |
| <p>8. EV adoption shapes and percentage charging on and off peak (Chris Hickman, Workshop #5, 5/21/2025)</p> | <p>☑ EPE's Transportation Electrification Study was provided in the SharePoint on July 1, 2025 and is accessible to stakeholders.</p> |
| <p>9. Gas price forecasting (Cynthia Mitchell, Workshop #5, 5/21/2025)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. For slide 29, gas forecast: Gas price forecast, shown as annual average. EPE stated that in the model, the forecast is monthly. For a limited operation gas unit (say 5% at peak), is the higher peak gas price matched to that unit? b. LBNL tool, gas price volatility. With the PNM staff report, section 15, we discuss risks in potential disruption on NG supply and price volatility, recommending in part that PNM utilize a LBNL tool to evaluate; to which PNM agreed to do. Could EPE please look at this and find an appropriate time to discuss with stakeholders? c. The gas forecast is E3 proprietary. Could EPE discuss, document, even, how their forecast diverges significantly from the NREL public ATB forecast and why? | <p>☑ Ms. Mitchell confirmed on June 24, 2025 that a meeting with staff to discuss natural gas matters listed below is no longer necessary. EPE spoke to Ms. Mitchell on June 12, 2025, and confirmed this meeting can be scheduled in a few weeks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. EPE representatives will be available to stakeholders to discuss. b. EPE representatives will be available to stakeholders to discuss. c. The gas forecast is EPE's gas forecast and proprietary since EPE uses a license and subscription to obtain the information. EPE will need the NREL public ATB forecast that is being discussed by Ms. Mitchell to ensure EPE is evaluating the same forecast being referenced in c. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>10. You ran a scenario without the RPS requirements, right? Why? (Cara Lynch, workshop #6, 6/17/25)</p> | <p>☑ This question was responded to at the June 17, 2025 workshop by E3. The base case presented by E3 does not include RPS requirements. E3 also presented the results of the base case including least cost plus REA. See slides 19 through 24 of the June 17, 2025 workshop.</p> |
| <p>11. Getting an office hour follow-up asap please. I have many questions and comments on the DER analysis. The residential DER analysis appears very positive; can we expect to see a revised EPE base case? (Cynthia Mitchell, workshop #6, 6/17/25)</p> | <p>☑ Weekly office hours scheduled for July 2, 9, 16 to address stakeholder questions, including demand-side scenario questions.</p> |
| <p>12. Would request office hours next week to cover in more detail the eddy county and demand side scenarios. Tons of great info provided that we all need to digest. But kudos again on the effort to date and excited to see the results of the modeling to date. (Chris Hickman, workshop #6, 6/17/25)</p> | <p>☑ Weekly office hours scheduled for July 2, 9, 16 to address stakeholder questions, including SPP market enhancement and demand-side scenario questions.</p> |
| <p>13. Is Steve getting at requesting that DSM qualify as renewable in the RPS? This is a nuance in the RPS law so it's either directed to the EPE legal person or to the PRC Reps. In modeling we call DSM a "resource". As a "resource" it delivers negative energy. Yet I don't think the ETA or REA anticipate this kind of "resource" and there are no RECs for its energy. Has EPE considered trying to call DSM a renewable or zero-carbon resource or does this not make any sense? (Glenn Wikle, workshop #6, 6/17/25)</p> | <p>☑ The REA does not include demand response in its definition of "renewable energy resource". In EPE's all source RFPs, all resources are considered, including demand side resources.</p> |
| <p>14. Data centers will have a huge impact going forward. Need to set a strategy with parameters for special services agreements, a data center rate structure, protections for other native customers etc as part of the action items. (Steve Fischmann, workshop #6, 6/17/25)</p> | <p>☑ Special services agreements, data center rate structure, protections for other native customers, etc. are not part of Integrated Resource Planning. There may be other future regulatory proceedings where stakeholders can share their opinions. Stakeholders are not restricted in offering suggestions for the Action Plan.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 15. Where can I find the parameters and/or characteristics used as an input for each technology type (CC, CT, geothermal, etc.) (Glenn Wikle, workshop #6, 6/17/25) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data requested was uploaded to SharePoint on July 21, 2025 |
| 16. Add a metric to compare scenario results - water impacts. (Steve Fischmann, workshop #6, 6/17/25) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At this stage of the modeling process, it would be a substantial effort to calculate the water impacts outside the model as they pertain to the inputs and assumptions of the current model. |
| 17. Add the social cost of carbon to DER scenarios. (Cynthia Mitchell, workshop #6, 6/17/25) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder modeling request including social cost of carbon was presented at Stakeholder Workshop #7. |
| 18. Be consistent in presentation of NPV metrics (Chris Hickman, workshop #6, 6/17/25)) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EPE and E3 will presented at July 16 Office Hour consistent NPV metrics across all modeling results. |