



**Xcel Energy/SPS's 2026 Integrated Resource Plan
Statement of Need and Action Plan
Workshop #7 (Aug 26-27, 2026) Summary
Carlsbad, NM and Zoom**

WORKSHOP SUMMARY

Representatives from 23 organizations attended this workshop to meet with the Xcel Energy/SPS Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) team and provide input to the Statement of Need (SoN) and Action Plan. The 34 participating stakeholders had opportunities to ask questions as the stakeholder conversation returned to “big picture” topics related to the utility's resource needs to meet expected demand. The list of participating organizations (excluding Xcel Energy/SPS, its consultants, and Gridworks) is attached.

MATERIALS

- [Gridworks Slide Deck](#)
- [Xcel Energy Slide Deck](#)
- **Statement of Need and Action Plan:** [Draft SoN and Action Plan](#)
- **Revised Statement of Need and Action Plan:** [8.26 Redlines SPS 2026 IRP SON and AP](#)
- **Recordings:** Day 1 - <https://youtu.be/FDXtxx5OHrc>, Day 2 - <https://youtu.be/7K0hJ7pPGeQ>
- **Website for all materials:** <https://gridworks.org/initiatives/xcel-sps/>

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

This workshop had the following objectives:

- Review the Statement of Need and Action Plan and gather stakeholder reactions,
- Seek agreement on the Statement of Need and Action Plan, and
- Identify and work through any remaining issues to seek alignment, where possible.

A review of the purpose of the Statement of Need (SoN) and Action Plan (AP) provided context for the workshop. Elements of the SoN and AP, based on the New Mexico IRP rule, along with discussion questions, were sent to stakeholders with the draft document on Aug. 17. The discussion questions are listed below.

Statement of Need

- What are your reactions to the amount and types of resources SPS identifies?
- What questions or concerns do you have about the technical characteristics of the resources identified in the Statement of Need?
- Does the Statement of Need take a broad view of SPS's evolving system? What, if anything, is missing or should be reconsidered?

Action Plan

- What are your reactions to the specific steps SPS proposes to implement its resource plan over the next four years? What, if anything, is missing or should be reconsidered?
- Are SPS's proposed resource solicitation and contracting activities appropriate, clear, and timely?
- Does SPS report on commitments from the 2023 Action Plan?



DRAFT STATEMENT OF NEED AND ACTION PLAN

The SPS IRP team presented a review of how the components of the SoN were developed, based on the modeling analyses. Stakeholders offered comments and questions along the following lines:

- Requests for more transparency regarding the elements of the constrained demand forecast, in particular, for data centers and other large loads
- The relationship between generic resources selected in the IRP analysis and specific resources that might be included in responses to future Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for new resources
- Understanding of how the multi-jurisdictional boundaries impact the selection of resources
- Alignment of the "base" resource acquisition period (2031-2034) with the timeframes noted in Section C. of the draft SoN
- Increased clarity on the technical characteristics of firm, dynamic balancing, and carbon-free resources
- Appreciation for consideration of long-duration energy storage resources
- Timelines, assumptions, and actions for long-lead-time (LLT) resources, including the technological maturity curves and costs over time. References for procurement examples were provided by the Long Duration Energy Storage Council:
 - California's centralized LLT procurement:
<https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/news-and-updates/all-news/cpuc-advances-clean-energy-with-centralized-procurement-strategy>
<https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/electrical-energy/electric-power-procurement/long-term-procurement-planning/ab-1373-centralized-procurement-of-specified-long-lead-time-resources>
 - Ontario IESO's LLT RFP:
<https://www.ieso.ca/Sector-Participants/Resource-Acquisition-and-Contracts/Long-Lead-Time-RFP>

ASSESS STAKEHOLDER COMFORT LEVEL

Each stakeholder was invited to offer their thoughts about a set of specific questions, prompted by the prior conversation and the draft SoN and AP. These questions and a summary of responses are shown below.

	Question	Stakeholder Feedback
	STATEMENT OF NEED	
1a	Are stakeholders comfortable with using the constrained planning forecast as the basis for the statement of need?	The key concern is the composition of this load forecast. Stakeholders were comfortable using this "mid-level" forecast (vs. a low or high/unconstrained forecast).
1b	Are there any concerns about the statement in B.ii.1 that says "SPS will update the forecast values prior to RFP issuance to ensure that procurements capture the	No concerns or disagreements were offered. (Note that SPS added an action plan item to convene a technical working group prior to



GRIDWORKS

	best available information, consistent with best planning practices.”?	release of future RFPs to discuss the basis and possible parameters with interested individuals. See item 9 below.)
2	Are stakeholders comfortable with the range of years defined as the base “Resource Acquisition Period” (RAP) of 2031-2034?	There were no objections offered.
3	Do stakeholders agree with defining resources in three categories: firm, dynamic-balancing, and carbon-free?	Stakeholders requested more detail on the technical characteristics of each category and asked whether these categories would be used in future RFPs. There were no objections to using the categories, and there was a shared understanding that some resources could fall into multiple categories.
4	Do stakeholders support all-source solicitations over technology-specific solicitations?	No responses were offered.
ACTION PLAN		
5	Are there any concerns or objections to defining the action period as 4 years after filing instead of 3 years, as currently specified by the IRP Rule?	There were no objections; one stakeholder suggested that the need and rationale for this request, along with how it meets the intent of the rule, be explained in the IRP Report.
6	On actions with existing resources to meet capacity needs and upgrading Jones Generating Station Units 3 and 4 - do people agree with this action specifically and, generally, actions with existing resources that can meet capacity needs or result in customer cost savings (e.g., life extensions and repowering existing resources)?	No responses were offered.
7	On actions with respect to pilot projects - any reactions, thoughts, concerns, about exploring pilot projects as capacity need management tools with the objective of advancing technology evolution, increasing resiliency, and capturing capacity benefits?	No responses were offered.
8	Any concerns about site-specific procurements and procurement specificity in Quay County?	One stakeholder expressed concern about the constraint of a single site.



GRIDWORKS

9	On base resource acquisition - the system-wide competitive procurement will be a base RAP expected to cover 2031-2034, and once an RFP is drafted, SPS will hold a Technical Working Group Conference to discuss key components in the RFP and load forecast used in the assumptions - any reactions, thoughts, or concerns about this approach?	Several stakeholders offered support for the technical working group idea for both near- and long-term resource acquisitions.
10	Any concerns about the Long Lead Time Resource Acquisition Period covering 2035 - 2040?	No responses offered.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS - THE IRP PROCESS

Attendees discussed the IRP process in general and offered the comments listed below.

- Expressing stakeholders' level of agreement or disagreement and coming to consensus is challenging because it's a black-and-white question - stakeholders can agree to things conceptually but not the details of the assumptions.
- Stakeholders were very interested in the components of the load forecast, particularly for large load requests and their feasibility. Anything that SPS could share about how it analyzes or categorizes large load requests would be helpful. It seems this may be addressed during large-load tariff filings, so pointing to that process with a high-level explanation may be sufficient.
- Is there a need to reform the IRP process in recognition of the potential that data centers can develop very quickly and can't always be forecasted three to 10 years in advance? This seems to be addressed by the Notice of Material Change process in the near term.
- Stakeholders showed interest in better understanding how this IRP process and the Statement of Need and Action Plan then translate to the Draft RFP process and, ultimately, resource procurement. Of particular interest seemed to be a better understanding of how and why actual procurement can differ from the generic modeling results, and what, if anything, SPS does when the resulting bid pool differs markedly from the modeling.

FOLLOW UP ITEMS

- SPS team to follow up with EFG to answer questions.
- SPS team to follow up with Eddy County Community Development to discuss ways both organizations can accelerate development activities.
- SPS team to revise the SoN and AP by Aug. 28 for distribution by Gridworks to all stakeholders. (Note: this was completed and a revised document was sent to stakeholders on Aug. 28.)

NEXT STEPS

The SPS team expressed appreciation to all stakeholders who participated in the workshop and to the many individuals who offered comments and questions. This input is invaluable to the utility.

A summary of this workshop is available at <https://gridworks.org/initiatives/xcel-sps/>. Questions, concerns, and suggestions are welcome and can be directed to Linda Hudgins (linda.l.hudgins@xcelenergy.com) and Deborah Shields (dshields@gridworks.org).



Final Opportunity for Comments on SoN and AP

Written comments, edits, or suggested changes to the REVISED Statement of Need and Action Plan (8.26 Redlines SPS 2026 IRP SON and AP) are invited from stakeholders by 5 PM MDT on September 4, 2026. Please send these to Linda Hudgins (linda.l.hudgins@xcelenergy.com) and Deborah Shields (dshields@gridworks.org).

The final workshop will be held on Sept. 22 (2 PM – 5 PM MDT) via Zoom. The focus is to inform stakeholders about the contents of the IRP report and to invite feedback on the overall stakeholder engagement process.

WORKSHOP #7 PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS (Excluding SPS, its consultants, and facilitators)

Chavez County
Coalition for Community Solar Access
Conoco Phillips
Eddy County Community Development*
ExxonMobil*
EDC of Lea County
Energy Futures Group
Energy Transfer
Enterprise Products Company
Interwest Energy Alliance
Long Duration Energy Storage Council
New Mexico Junior College
New Mexico Large Customer Group
New Mexico Oil and Gas Association
NM Local Siting Network
NM PRC
Natural Resources Defense Council
OPL
Petroleum Recovery Research Center - New Mexico Tech
RW Energy
Sandia Labs
Targa Resources
Western Resource Advocates

* A special thanks to those stakeholders who attended the workshop in person in Carlsbad, NM.