



SUMMARY OF MARCH 15, 2023, TECHNICAL SESSION #12

On March 15, 2023, PNM held the 12th in the series of technical sessions for stakeholders devoted to discussing the advantages and disadvantages regarding the application of different technical methodologies within the modeling framework for the 2023 IRP (Integrated Resource Plan).

Participants were introduced to Gridworks, the nonprofit organization appointed by the New Mexico Public Regulatory Commission to lead the facilitated stakeholder process for the IRP. PNM's Public Advisory Process, begun on April 28, 2022, will transition into Gridworks' facilitated stakeholder process, beginning on June 15, 2023.

Gridworks provided an overview of the six-month, three-stage process, including: 1) Grounding (system requirements, resource options, and possibly load scenarios) and development of a statement of need; 2) Model runs by the Stakeholder Modeling Subgroup of its own models, engagement with PNM modelers, and development of action plans; and 3) Monthly IRP Reviews by all interested stakeholders to provide feedback on areas where PNM needs input.

The meeting also included a presentation by PNM IRP staff of PNM's modeling framework, featuring a demonstration of the steps involved in requesting modeling runs not already conducted by PNM.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Twenty stakeholders, not including PNM staff, attended the virtual meeting, including members of the public and representatives from InterWest Energy Alliance, MISO, NM AREA, New Mexico State University, and SWEEP, among others.

Meeting slides can be found [here](#).



Stakeholders raised the following questions.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Categories
NM AREA:	Will all the meetings be known all at once in advance? That would be very helpful.	Facilitated Process
Member of the Public:	I guess it's maybe too early in the process ... but I don't see in this anything that's much different than a lot of things that we've been doing, or that you've been guiding us through. And so, maybe that's something that can become part of the conversation—how this differs from the way at least the process has been going this time round.	Facilitated Process
NM AREA:	<p>So, I guess what strikes me on this is that it kind of hits us cold. And in terms of, well, what does this mean? And we're getting asked questions like that. And to me, that's not very concrete to react to. And maybe it's partly because we've been involved with the process before; we're familiar to the general concept of what the statement of need is trying to say.</p> <p>I guess it's important to get input and particularly new input where maybe it hasn't come through before. But to really provide something constructive, we would</p>	Facilitated Process





	<p>really need at some point a straw man put together on statement of need by those that are most interested in contributing to the drafting of that straw man. It's my experience in facilitated processes that often makes the process move much more efficiently. Because once there's a straw man, it becomes clearer, at least to those who have different perspectives, whether there's something in there that gives them concern, or there's something missing that's giving them concern.</p> <p>But I ... don't know what your process is going to be yet entirely. So, you very well may be envisioning something like that.</p> <p>I do want to provide feedback. We're kind of silent right now because it's very hard to react to this ... just the statement of need and what's said here to us. To actually see a first shot at a straw man and have a statement of need allows us to really provide constructive comments.</p> <p>So, that's what I want to share. Hopefully, that's of help.</p>	
<p>SWEEP:</p>	<p>I was just curious about how far in advance would you expect agendas for the different tentative meetings to be available?</p>	<p>Facilitated Process</p>





<p>InterWest Energy Alliance:</p>	<p>I just wanted to say thank you to both [PNM and Gridworks]. This all sounds very interesting and very useful. So, we Look forward to participating in it going forward. I didn't want you to just think that your comments had fallen into a vacuum or something. There's not much for us to say at this point other than thanks. And we look forward to it going forward.</p>	<p>Facilitated Process</p>
<p>Member of the Public:</p>	<p>At this point, do you have a list of some of the additional stakeholders you might be bringing in? Will there be some sharing of that for those of us who've been with this process for a longer time?</p>	<p>Facilitated Process</p>
<p>SWEEP:</p>	<p>I just had a question mostly on ... [Slides 20 and 21] How would different demand response futures be considered? Are we looking at it as a resource that could be competing against typical supply side? Or is this more of a key assumption like a forecasted modifier?</p>	<p>Modeling</p>
<p>New Mexico State University:</p>	<p>I just wanted to bring up your answer to my question about hydrogen prices. Was it that you're tracking hydrogen prices as gas prices? So, it seems like the gas price does continue to be relevant.</p>	<p>Modeling</p>





<p>NM AREA:</p>	<p>I look at this IRP sensitivities [Slide 22], and you go from left to right, with the changes on the various assumptions, and I'm trying to compare this to the IRP core futures. It seems like you've got more categories, from left to right on the slide you've got up right now versus what you have from top to bottom, on the slide before on core futures [Slide 21]. I'm wondering, is there a version of this RFP sensitivity slide that can be made that essentially lays out the four core futures at the top of it, or something, just so that it's easy to see how the four core futures compare under all of the things from left to right versus the sensitivities?</p>	<p>Modeling</p>
<p>SWEEP:</p>	<p>Are the energy efficiency technology bundles documented in a prior slide deck?</p>	<p>Modeling</p>

All IRP questions and answers can be found [here](#).

The latest future meeting schedule can be found [here](#).

