



Integrated System Plan Large Stakeholder Group Meeting #3- Summary

Prepared by Kearns & West

Large Stakeholder Group – Meeting #3 Overview

Meeting Objectives:

- Inform stakeholders on the process to interpret the results and Integrated System Plan (ISP) outputs
- Update on analytical process and key findings
- Share initial strategy themes and gather feedback

Topic: ISP Early Key Findings

Date: May 12, 2023

Time: 10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

Location: Tempe Mission Palms

Of the more than 120 organizations invited, 32 stakeholders from 27 organizations attended. Please see Appendix A for the Large Stakeholder Group member roster and attendance information. The [meeting agenda](#) and [presentation](#) are available at the [Integrated System Plan \(ISP\) portal](#).

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Joan Isaacson, facilitator from Kearns & West, welcomed attendees and introduced the SRP video “Planning and Partnering for Our Future,” which provided an overview of the purpose of ISP. She then introduced Bobby Olsen, Senior Director of Corporate Planning, Environmental Services and Innovation at SRP. Olsen welcomed members of the Large Stakeholder Group and introduced SRP Board and Council observers, thanking them for their attendance and participation. He described the process of planning together for the ISP and noted this as the first in-person engagement opportunity for the Large Stakeholder Group.

Isaacson previewed the meeting, including the meeting objectives and agenda ([slides 8-9](#)). She explained how stakeholders could ask questions during Q&A and by writing questions on index cards at their tables throughout the meeting. She then reviewed the timeline for Large Stakeholder Group engagement, including the Technical Working Sessions, and shared the guides for a productive meeting ([slides 10-11](#)). She explained that throughout the meeting stakeholders would be providing feedback using a polling tool and then led stakeholders in responding to an initial question, “How does your organization plan for transformational change?”

Attendees offered a wide range of responses (see [slide 14](#) and Appendix B). Multiple stakeholders described seeking to understand the nature of the change by gathering as much data as possible. Another set of responses focused on engaging with internal teams and stakeholders as part of the change process. Some Large Stakeholder Group members cited specific plans around renewable energy projects.

After noting some responses, Isaacson introduced Angie Bond-Simpson, Director of Integrated System Planning & Support at SRP.

Where We Are Today & Approach to Complete the Integrated System

Bond-Simpson introduced herself and then provided an overview of the ISP, emphasizing the holistic nature of integrated planning. She described how SRP established the ISP Roadmap ([slide 16](#)) for navigating this first-of-its-kind effort for power planning and for achieving its Board-approved 2035 goals. The ISP team is currently at the *Analyze* phase, which includes performing validation and sharing preliminary results, and is preparing for the *Synthesize* phase. She explained that although analysis is ongoing, the team is at the point of being able to engage in dialogue. The *Synthesize* phase will involve developing system strategies, drafting a balanced system plan, and developing the ISP actions ([slide 17](#)). Bond-Simpson stated that the team will make ISP strategy recommendations to the SRP Board in August or September 2023.

Next, Bond-Simpson briefly reviewed the four ISP scenarios ([slide 18](#)), explaining that SRP is not selecting one future scenario, but rather working to be successful in planning for various possible futures unfolding in Arizona by 2035. She also referenced the fundamental factors that inform differences between the scenarios ([slide 19](#)) and described the strategic approaches ([slide 20](#)). She concluded by showing a matrix of the system-wide analysis for the ISP ([slide 21](#)) before pausing for stakeholder questions.

Q&A

Question: What was the planning horizon? Did SRP go beyond that?

Response: We focused on the 2025-2035 timeframe in the ISP. The resource planning model component of the system simulations is able to go beyond 2035.

Question: How does a regional transmission organization (RTO) play into the analysis?

Response: We have analyzed RTOs to a limited extent. While an RTO doesn't currently exist in the West, we heard from Advisory Group members that understanding market impacts is important. In the ISP study plan, market interaction is represented by the market support lever ([slide 19](#)) as a fundamental factor for scenario definition (i.e., as a proxy for an RTO). We also have a regional market sensitivity. We hosted a [Technical Working Session on regional markets](#) and found more variables to explore when considering market value.

Review of Early Key Findings

In the next section, Bond-Simpson first asked subject matter experts to introduce themselves and their role on the Integrated System Planning team ([slide 26](#)). Joining her were subject matter experts from SRP to respond to questions about their planning areas: Jed Cohen, Manager of Forecasting and Load Research; Nathan Morey, Manager of Product Development; Melissa Martinez, Manager of Distribution Planning; and Justin Lee, Manager of Transmission System & Planning. Arne Olson and Joe Hooker from E3, the technical consulting team for the ISP, were present to respond to questions about long-term capacity expansion model results.

Isaacson reminded stakeholders about the opportunity to speak with the subject matter experts at the poster session during lunch.

Current Trends

Bond-Simpson began by sharing early key findings for the Current Trends scenario, explaining that this central case for the ISP would be used as a basis for comparison for the other scenarios. She shared findings for peak demand and customer programs ([slide 28](#)), noting the 3% peak load growth rate for the Current Trends scenario. In showing future resource needs ([slide 29](#)), she pointed to 2027 where the system requirement first shows a gap between need and resources that then continues to grow during the study period. Next, Bond-Simpson described generating resources and modeled resource additions ([slides 30-31](#)), emphasizing that SRP may need to double or triple the number of generating resources in the next 7 years.

Bond-Simpson continued by describing grid infrastructure needs for transmission and distribution planning, including considerations for geographic load growth in the SRP service territory ([slides 32-34](#)). In explaining transmission upgrades and additions, she stated that if SRP ordered a 500/230 kilovolt (kV) transformer today, it would be up and running in three to four years ([slide 33](#)). On distribution, the Current Trends scenario projects a 19% increase in the number of substation bays during the study period ([slide 34](#)). She then summarized the analysis, highlighting the rapid expansion of the power system in this scenario ([slide 35](#)).

Q&A

Question: One finding indicates that the location of generation determines transmission needs. Why is there such a broad range [20-140 miles] of 500 kV transmission needed ([slide 32](#))?

Response: We modeled both a dispersed or pro rata system based on the interconnection queue and a hub system. The hub system requires more 500 kV lines to connect back to the grid.

Question: The megawatts (MW) for peak load ([slide 28](#)) shifted to effective MW ([slide 29](#)) from one slide to the next. What explains that difference?

Response: Effective MW is what contributes to reliability; not all resources contribute equally to reliability. Capacity additions refer to total nameplate capacity needed to satisfy reliability.

Question: For distribution, were there different scenarios for the location of electric vehicle charging?

Response: The inputs for the model include distribution of electric vehicles. We saw in some results more pockets of concentration versus location on the outskirts of our service area.

Question: On the hub versus pro rata results, do the assumptions include a central hub on the bulk system for those resources and then pro rata is the queue at the bulk system, or does that include the queue at the distribution level?

Response: We focused just on the bulk system. The pro rata approach looks at interconnection queues in our system today connecting to the 230 kV network and evenly distributes future resources proportional to what is currently in the interconnection queue today.

Question: Why is there little consideration for customer programs in the scenarios?

Response: There are two rounds of looking at customer programs in the study plan. Customer program inputs are built into the assumptions starting at the level of the 2035 commitment from SRP. There are also opportunities to use customer programs to manage load, which we are exploring through a sensitivity.

Response: Customer program sensitivities are built into the study plan. That includes higher customer adoption of solar, batteries, energy efficiency, demand response and load management technologies. What we see is that if we have more customer-sited solar and batteries, then SRP wouldn't need to add as much utility-scale solar and batteries, but it's not on a one-to-one basis. Avoided costs will be quantified across all the plans, and SRP would use those to evaluate customer plans.

Desert Contraction

In reviewing early key findings for the Desert Contraction scenario, Bond-Simpson highlighted differences from the Current Trends scenario, such as a 1.1% peak load growth rate and a reduction in needed capacity when compared to Current Trends ([slides 38-40](#)). For grid infrastructure needs, she shared that although the transmission team was not able to incorporate this analysis, the distribution findings indicated an 8% increase in substation bays ([slides 41-42](#)). Bond-Simpson then summarized highlights of the analysis, noting that despite stagnant growth, new resources, including infrastructure, will be needed and that the transition away from coal will require replacement investments ([slide 44](#)).

Desert Boom

Bond-Simpson next described early key findings from the Desert Boom scenario. She described a potential future with further acceleration of growth in the Valley, translating to 4% peak load growth. This results in almost 13,000 MW of peak load by 2035 ([slide 45](#)). Significant capacity additions result in a large quantity of solar and wind being added to the grid when natural gas isn't available ([slide 46](#)). Bond-Simpson explained that without firm resources, the extraordinary load growth results in an inability for the resource portfolio to achieve planning reserve margins by a significant number of MW ([slide 47](#)). Hooker added that without firm capacity and given large load growth, the system requires much more nameplate capacity. He explained that E3 has seen in its work for other utilities that firm capacity is needed to maintain reliability.

On grid infrastructure needs, Bond-Simpson described how load growth increases in areas with more land availability ([slide 48](#)). Modeling indicates additional needs for 230 kV transmission in

both the pro rata and the hub approaches ([slide 49](#)), and the distribution system reaches a stress point. Overall, this results in a 24% increase in substation bays, with one year alone requiring 20 substation bays, which is considered infeasible ([slide 50](#)). In summarizing key points, Bond-Simpson emphasized how the increased pace of expansion entails more risk and described the need to go more granular in the analysis for reliability on the distribution system ([slide 52](#)).

Strong Climate Policy

The Strong Climate Policy scenario, Bond-Simpson explained, contemplates bipartisan federal support for carbon reduction policies that go beyond the Inflation Reduction Act. This would include new public policies and measures to mitigate climate change, support for the next generation of energy technologies (e.g., hydrogen), and an opportunity for domestic manufacturing to be able to maintain and scale to the supply needed. On early key findings, she noted that the Strong Climate Policy scenario growth rate for peak demand is very close to that for Current Trends, 2.9% ([slide 53](#)). The differences are in customer behavior and load shape.

Bond-Simpson explained that generating resources for the Strong Climate Policy scenario include high levels of renewables and battery storage as well as a reliance on emerging technology such as hydrogen to provide clean firm power to meet capacity needs ([slides 54-55](#)). In this scenario, the planning reserve margin is reduced to 13% due to assumptions that regional transmission capacity will expand and that regional diversity will play a role. Regarding grid infrastructure, a 15% increase in substation bays would be needed to support growth ([slides 56-57](#)). Bond-Simpson concluded by noting highlights of the analysis, including that in this scenario SRP would need to accelerate renewable and storage deployment significantly and that customer programs may defer infrastructure needs beyond the study period ([slide 59](#)).

Customer Programs

Bond-Simpson spoke to the early key findings for customer programs ([slides 62-63](#)). She explained the concept of net load and how the peak for the 2035 peak day will shift later, necessitating changes in customer communication and education. She described how SRP could, for example, use pricing signals to incentivize electric vehicle charging to when solar energy is abundant, shifting that load to earlier in the day. Bond-Simpson explained how SRP wants to leverage energy use in the middle of the day while still meeting customer needs at other times of day.

Q&A

Question: How much interregional transmission expansion is included, and how does that change modeling? How is SRP thinking about the capacity contribution of renewables and how to leverage it?

Response: SRP is actively involved with what Markets+ would look like, up to and including RTOs. In the West, the interest in Markets+ is due to wind. The biggest challenge between East and West are the significant costs with increased connectivity. We are exploring the Southwest

Power Pool (SPP) and see potential for a value proposition, but the practical timeline [for a fully mature market] is outside the 2035 horizon and [may be] into the 2040s. We are also looking at the Western Resource Adequacy Program (WRAP). In 2026-27, we would start to have binding operational definitions for WRAP. It's not in the modeling presented here, but we do see opportunities for involvement.

Question: On customer programs, why does SRP include artificial constraints through most of the modeling. Shouldn't the 2035 [Sustainability Goals] be the minimum?

Response: We don't see the 2035 Sustainability Goals as an artificial constraint. We see them as the starting point. The 2035 goals are aggressive and are based in customer participation. We are not picking a portfolio and seeing how much energy efficiency would be required to satisfy that need. We might see a combination of portfolios and anticipate increases in energy efficiency.

Response: The team developed a set of assumptions on what was most reasonably feasible for year over year resource additions. Not meeting the planning reserve target was a surprise. Those year over year resource addition feasibility assumptions were the initial assumptions, and one learning is that amount of resource additions may not be enough. We will digest the technical findings and go back to look for additional resources to solve challenges.

Question: Have you modeled the lower planning reserve margin of 13% with any scenarios besides Strong Climate Policy?

Response: That is a sensitivity in the ISP Study Plan, and that analysis is ongoing.

Response: There is a lot of benefit in regional and resource diversity. New transmission is one way to achieve that. It requires more than SRP to do that. It involves multiple utilities, multiple states. The industry is in a phase where it's trying to organize itself to go after those benefits in a more integrated way.

Question: On Markets+ and the Southwest Power Pool, is that the only option? What about the extended day-ahead market (EDAM) and the California Independent System Operator (CAISO)?

Response: We are also evaluating EDAM. When we look around the West, we see the Energy Imbalance Market (EIM) and benefits of regionalization and also the CAISO opportunity that will exist with or without SRP. While we were involved in much of the EDAM discussions, our current efforts have been focused on the Southwest Power Pool as an alternative market offering to EDAM. Elements of both markets will require some compromises for SRP. We believe it's in the best interest of our customers to have market options so we can balance opportunities with compromises in each offering before moving forward.

Question: In the Desert Boom scenario, for the No New Fossil and Minimum Coal strategic approaches, what’s the difference? Why don’t they build the same resources ([slide 47](#))?

Response: The chart shows new resources. One assumption in the Minimum Coal cases is that early retirement of Springerville frees up transmission for additional wind resources.

Question: How did you incorporate Inflation Reduction Act impacts and how do they matter in the planning? How does it impact the strategies?

Response: We wanted to have resource costs with additional tax incentives from the Inflation Reduction Act reflected and embedded in the assumptions for all cases.

Response: We had a [Technical Working Session on the Inflation Reduction Act](#) and the specifics of the modeling. Tax credits for solar, storage, wind and emerging technologies are embedded throughout the analysis. Without the Inflation Reduction Act, you wouldn’t see as many of these carbon-free resources being built.

Question: On the modeled resources for Strong Climate Policy ([slide 55](#)), storage appears separate from wind or solar. Is my interpretation of this correct?

Response: We did assume renewables and storage could be paired and that there would be savings of doing so, but savings are relatively small. Much of the storage being added in the analysis is paired storage located on-site with solar. What’s interesting about the Inflation Reduction Act is it may change future resource development, because now standalone storage also qualifies for a tax credit.

Bond-Simpson recapped the early key findings, emphasizing the needed resources and infrastructure in the next decade, evolution of customer programs and other future considerations, such as uncertainty around planning and permitting processes ([slide 65](#)).

Stakeholder Responses

Isaacson invited stakeholders to briefly discuss the early key findings at their tables and then use the polling system to respond to the question, “What’s a key finding that you see as important for the ISP?” (see [slide 67](#) and Appendix C). Multiple stakeholders noted the size and pace of load growth as a key finding, with a few noting the importance of mitigating peak load growth. Other stakeholders commented on modeling constraints for customer programs and renewable or distributed resources. Still other Large Stakeholder Group members cited the need to plan for transmission and siting of resources as an important key finding. A few other responses mentioned resource adequacy and costs of implementation.

Initial System Strategy Themes

Angie Bond-Simpson introduced the concept of ISP system strategies, which are long-term strategies for operating the power system through 2035 and described their importance in the ISP process ([slide 71](#)). She explained the importance of SRP being prepared and having options in developing system strategies for the ISP.

Bond-Simpson then highlighted five of the emerging strategy themes:

- Evolve Customer Programs & Price Plans
- Develop and Preserve Optionality
- Build and Leverage Partnerships
- Proactive Siting for System Investments/Additional Infrastructure
- Prepare and Equip the Workforce

Stakeholder Responses and Themes

Isaacson posed a question to stakeholders and asked people to respond using the polling system: “Based on these themes, what are the potential strategies SRP could consider for the ISP?” Stakeholder responses addressed a wide range of potential strategies (see [slide 74](#) and Appendix D).

Customer Programs – Multiple respondents recommended strategies related to expanding customer programs for both residential and commercial/industrial customers. Suggestions included support for behind-the-meter systems and that ambitious programs be used to address peak load growth.

Modeling and Analysis – Some responses made suggestions about the types of modeling used in the analysis, with a few stakeholders requesting more information about the drivers in the ISP and the data used in the modeling.

Policy & Stakeholder Engagement– A few responses called for SRP to leverage its independent governance to optimize tools for growth and engage in more policy advocacy at the state and federal level. One commenter suggested increasing stakeholder feedback opportunities while another recommended more information-sharing for building partnerships.

Transmission and Distribution – Other stakeholder responses focused on how SRP can leverage its current assets (e.g., retired coal transmission for renewable sources) and non-wires alternatives for distribution. A few responses encouraged proactive siting and planning, especially for future transmission needs. On requests for proposals, recommendations included aligning with siting and transmission priorities and constraints and providing adequate lead time.

Other responses touched on rate affordability, elimination of carbon emissions and efforts to use solar power at the time of generation.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Maria Naff, Manager of Integrated Planning at SRP, wrapped up the meeting and reviewed the remaining 2023 engagement calendar, highlighting opportunities for Large Stakeholder Group members to continue their involvement ([slide 76](#)). She described the next steps for the Integrated System Planning Team, which include completing the ISP analysis, developing the

draft system strategies, and conducting Phase 3 of the ISP customer research effort ([slide 77](#)). She thanked the Large Stakeholder Group members and invited them to remain for the appreciation lunch and opportunity to speak with the subject matter experts during the poster session.

Appendix A

Meeting Attendance

Large Stakeholder Group Organizations (groups represented on 5/12/23 are shown in **bold**)

AARP

Advanced Energy Economy
AEPCO
AES Clean Energy
Air Products
American Lung Association
AMPUA
AMWUA
Apache County
Apache County Economic Development
Apex Clean Energy
Apple Inc.
AriSEIA
Arizona Cattle Growers Association
Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest
Arizona Chamber of Commerce
Arizona Commerce Authority
Arizona Competitive Power Alliance
Arizona Cotton Growers Association
Arizona Energy Policy Group
Arizona Farm Bureau
Arizona Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Arizona Lodging and Tourism Association
Arizona Power Authority
Arizona Public Service
Arizona Residential Utility Customer Office
Arizona Solar Deployment Alliance
Arizona Solar Energy Industries Association/Veregy
Arizona State Land Department
Arizona State University
Avangrid Renewables
Atlas Renewable Power
AzCPA
AZ Thrives
AZ PIRG
AZ Strategies

AZ Sustainability Alliance
Balanced Rock Power
Basha's
Beatitudes Campus
Boeing
Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA)
Bureau of Land Management
Calpine
Candela Renewables
Casa Grande
Chicanos Por La Causa
Christian Care Inc., Mesa District
City of Apache Junction
City of Chandler
City of Mesa
City of Phoenix
City of Tempe
CMC Steel, AZ
CommonSpirit Health
ConnectGen, LLC
Coolidge
Copper State Consulting Group
Cushman & Wakefield
Cyrus One
Digital Realty
DMB
East Valley Chamber of Commerce
East Valley Partnership
Enel Green Power North America, Inc.
Energy Exemplar, LLC
Environmental Defense Fund
EPRI
Facebook
Forest Service U.S. Department of Agriculture
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
Freeport-McMoRan Copper and Gold

Gamage & Burnham Attorneys at Law
General Electric
Gila Bend
Gilbert
Glendale
Google
Greater Phoenix Economic Council
Greater Phoenix Leadership
Greenlots
Home Builders Association of Central
Arizona
Hospice of the Valley
Innergex
Intel
Interwest Energy Alliance
Invenergy
JKL Consulting Services, LLC
Kroger Co. (Ralphs and Food4Less)
Kyl Center for Water Policy
Local First Arizona
Mercy Gilbert Medical Center/Dignity
Health
Mesa Community Action Network
Mesa Gateway Airport
Mesa Public Schools
Microchip Technology
**Mitsubishi Hitachi Power Systems
Americas, Inc.**
Navajo County
New Leaf/Mesa-CAN
New Life Christian Center, Coolidge
NextEra Energy Resources
Northern Arizona University
NREL
Onward Energy
Origis Energy
Orsted Onshore North America
PAC Worldwide

Page
Pattern
Phoenix Chamber of Commerce
Pinal County
Profile Precision Extrusions
Queen Creek Chamber of Commerce
Queen Creek Unified School District
Roosevelt Water Conservation District
**Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian
Community**
SRP Customer Utility Panel
Scottsdale
Seguro Energy
Sierra Club
Southwest Energy Efficiency Project
Southwestern Power Group
St. Johns
St. Paul Church, Randolph
Starwood Energy Group Global, Inc.
Sustainable Energy Power Alliance
The Nature Conservancy (Arizona Thrives)
Tierra Strategy
Tormoen Hickey, LLC
Town of Florence
Town of Springerville
Tucson Electric Power
United Dairymen of Arizona
University of Arizona
Valle Del Sol Strategic Initiatives: The Real
Arizona Coalition
Valley Partnership
Vote Solar
Walmart
Wärtsilä North America, Inc.
West Marc
Western Grid Group
Western Resource Advocates
Wildfire

Other Organizations in Attendance

Arizona Corporation Commission
BayWa r.e. Solar
Clearway Energy
HDR Engineering
Solar United Neighbors
Stellar Renewable Power
Strata Clean Energy
Triple Oak Power

Key SRP Staff

Angie Bond-Simpson, Director of Integrated System Planning & Support
Bobby Olsen, Senior Director of Corporate Planning, Environmental Services, and Innovation
Domonique Cohen, Senior Strategic Planner for Integrated Planning and ISP Communications
Lead
Duncan Kraft, Planning Analyst for Integrated System Planning & Support
Jed Cohen, Manager of Forecasting and Load Research
Justin Lee, Manager of Transmission Planning
Kyle Heckel, Senior Engineer for Integrated Planning and ISP Project Manager
Maria Naff, Manager of Integrated Planning
Maxwell Burger, Senior Predictive Analytics Analyst for Integrated System Planning & Support
Melissa Martinez, Manager of Distribution Planning
Nathan Morey, Manager of Product Development

Key Facilitation Team

Arne Olson, E3
Joe Hooker, E3
Brisa Aviles, Kearns & West
Karen Lafferty, Kearns & West
Joan Isaacson, Kearns & West

Board & Council Observers

Chris Dobson, SRP District Vice President
Anda McAfee, SRP Board Member
Larry Rovey, SRP Board Member
Rocky Shelton, SRP Council Member
Suzanne Naylor, SRP Council Member

Appendix B

Polling Responses

How does your organization plan for transformational change?

- Developing new solar generation and battery energy storage systems
- By listening to our partners and the public, providing training, and being open to change; using good research to inform our decisions.
- Convene our faculty, envision desirable future, create task force, conduct research, make a plan, share and revise, implement.
- Understand recommendations of all stakeholders to determine strategy.
- Transportation Electrification Activators
- Clear objectives
- Ongoing - planning for change all year round.
- We gather data on the pros and cons of the change.
- Discuss with internal teams first.
- Utilizing pilot programs to inform new customer program offerings.
- Gradually
- Seek out the best data and most accurate information possible.
- We are starting to look at how rules will have to change to adapt to new technologies.
- Develop evolving renewable energy projects.
- Risk management approach
- We stay up to date on current technology trends.
- Understand the end state and identify potential roadblocks early.
- The President says bring me big ideas.
- Involve all staff and volunteers.
- Open and transparent process
- Difficult without knowing utility plans/priorities
- By using more solar.
- We spend time to ensure that we understand the problem and then get all departments involved.

Appendix C

Polling Responses

What's a key finding that you see as important for the ISP?

- Possibility of siting battery at the distribution level as new resource
- Reducing the potential of DSM to meet resource adequacy in strategic approaches
- Resource adequacy is extremely important in all scenarios.
- SRP will need an all-in solution (renewables, DERs, DSM, customer programs) to meet its future net peak.
- Capacity shortages may be alleviated by building new transmission.
- The size of the infrastructure buildout
- That SRP is allowing for resources that are not real at this point such as hydrogen yet constraining what is real — customer programs— in this modeling.
- Long-term planning to hedge against supply chain issues
- Cost of implementation and impact on customers. More rate increases?
- Tech neutral strategy has practically no solar. How can that be?
- More 500kV transmission
- Keeping peak load growth contained has huge benefits in terms of making lots of things easier.
- The need for significant capacity increase in the short term
- The role that customer programs can play in mitigating the growth issues.
- Knowing the energy generation applications that are being received for development on federal land.

Appendix D

Polling Responses

Based on these themes, what are the potential strategies SRP could consider for the ISP?

- Systematic, ambitious initiatives to use solar electrons at time of generation
- Eye to rate affordability
- Opportunity to leverage SRP's independent governance to optimize tools for growth
- Plan for a future that eliminates carbon dioxide emissions.
- Use ex-coal transmission more efficiently for new renewables.
- Relax DR/EE constraints and allow the model to consider all reliable and affordable peak-reducing measures that are available.
- Leverage the distribution more in your analysis. Apply programs strategically to resolve distribution issues and bulk issues simultaneously.
- Aligning all-source RFP with siting and transmission priorities/constraints.
- More policy advocacy at State Federal level to support appropriate scenario(s)
- Doubling down on customer programs.
- Conduct as much sighting [sic] in SEV now as possible.
- Continue to increase stakeholder feedback opportunities. Provide opportunity for a two-way dialogue rather than only one-way information sharing.
- Go with a conservative approach, but feel free to adjust as any forecast has much more error over time.
- Customer programs, even with tax incentives most cannot afford rooftop solar.
- More insight into drivers of system change and what of those drivers SRP could influence to exceed 2035 goals
- Allow stakeholders access to models and data to enable a real outside evaluation of findings.
- Encourage and support for behind the meter systems for commercial/industrial.
- Proactive siting of system assets
- Information sharing for building partnerships
- Model the impacts of TOU rates on shaving peak demand.
- Non-wire solutions in load pockets at the distribution level
- Systematic, ambitious programs to constrain peak load growth
- Providing transparency and adequate lead time for any future RFPs.
- Start planning for long-term transmission needs today.
- We need foresight into future load growth.