

GENERATION PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Presented by: Energy Supply

December 6, 2022

Informational Update

OUR COMMITMENT



HOST COMMUNITY CONVERSATION ON ENERGY SUPPLY

- Gain Rate Advisory Committee (RAC) and community feedback in the energy planning process
- Achieve the objectives of community Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP)
- Analyze a comprehensive list of options to gain broad perspectives
- Initial focus is on transitional needs through 2030, next we will leverage developing technologies to achieve the 2050 CAAP goal

Our goal is to ensure reliable, affordable, and sustainable energy resources through 2030 and present options to the Board by Jan 2023.

PATHWAY TO 2050 OUR TRANSITION TO NET ZERO CARBON EMISSIONS



201	0 20	22 20	30	2040	205			
	Taking Initial Steps	Accelerating Action	Utilizing New	Our Transition to N	let			
	 Early Closure of Deely Coal Plants, Wind & Solar Expansion 	○ FlexPower Bundle,	Solutions	Emissions				
	 Advanced Metering, Conservation/STEP, and Endorsed CAAP 	 Conservation/STEP, EV Charging Programs, and Gen Planning Update with RAC 	 R&D Partnerships: EPIcenter, EPRI, & Others, Geothermal Energy, Hydrogen Storage & Utilization, Large-Scale/Long-Duration Storage, 					
	Pathway to Net Zero Carbon by 2050	******	 New Nuclear Technologies, Integrated Energy Management Systems, Customer Partnerships, Conservation/STEP, Data Analytics & Utilization, and Other Technologies and Partnerships 					

A blend of proven technologies and timely commercialization of new generation and storage technologies is our path to net zero carbon by 2050.

PLANNING OBJECTIVES IN ORDER OF RAC PRIORITY*





System Reliability & Climate Resiliency Consistent delivery and ability to cope with extreme events

Environmental Sustainability Support for community environmental goals



Affordability Customers' ability to pay for service



System Flexibility Ability to respond to changing conditions



Workforce Impact Employees needed to operate effectively

CPS Energy considers all objectives equally critical to serving our customers.

* CPS Energy Financial Stability was moved to a model requirement based on input from RAC & is not shown

ROBUST PLANNING PROCESS



• Engaged consultants with broad expertise supporting utilities in comprehensive generation resource planning

LEVERAGING BROAD PERSPECTIVES AND EXPERTISE

- Jointly developed 9 portfolios, each with a diverse set of technologies to serve the expected energy demand
- Analyzed 50 data sets, across 4 market scenarios and sensitivities like extreme weather and conservation/STEP
- Detailed feedback/input from the Rate Advisory Committee shaped the planning process
- Focused on near-term ability to replace 2,100 MW of retiring fossil-fuel power plants by 2030
- Further our strategy to reduce carbon intensity

POWER GENERATION RESOURCE PLANNING APPROACH







Agree on planning objectives and metrics to measure the performance of the plan against each objective <u>Develop</u> <u>Market</u> <u>Scenarios</u>

Identify key sources of uncertainty and the potential range of future outcomes, and design internally consistent future scenarios <u>Develop</u> <u>Resource</u> Portfolios

Design options for future resource plans, often based on different future scenarios and priorities Portfolio Modeling and Analysis

Evaluate the performance of each resource portfolio against each future scenario, stochastic uncertainty, & extreme risk events Select Preferred Plan

Identify trade-offs from each resource portfolio and select the preferred portfolio

PORTFOLIO METRIC RESULTS

Legend

More Favorable

Less Favorable



	System Reliability & Climate Resiliency					menta	l Susta	inability		Aff	ordability		System Flexibility		Workforce Impact	
	Diversity of Generation Mix	Capacity Head- room	Extrem Ex	e Weather posure	Progress ⁻	Progress Towards City of SA CAAP Goals		Energy Co	Energy Cost (\$/MWh) Present Value (PV) Revence Requirements			Market Purchases	Dispatch- ability	CPS Energy Workforce Impact	Local Economic Impact	
	Generation Mix (MWh)	Expected Reserve Margin (%)	Rev. Req. Extreme Weather (\$Billion)	% Of CPS Energy Consumption That Is Met Through ERCOT Market Purchases	% CO2 Intensity Reduction Relative To 2016 (Ref Scenario)	Emis Inter (Ib CO2	ssion hsity 2/MWh)	% Reduction In Consumption Due To STEP	Reference Scenario Average Cost (\$/MWh)	Range In Cost In <u>Al/</u> Scenarios (\$/MWh)	Ref Scenario (\$Billion)	Range Across <u>All</u> Scenarios (\$Billion)	% Of CPS Energy Consumption That Is Met Through ERCOT Market Purchases	% Of CPS Energy Capacity That Is Dispatchable	# Of Impacted CPS Energy Generation Employees	Capital Expenditures For New Generation Capacity Built In Greater San Antonio Area (\$Millions)
	2030	2030	2030	2030	2030	2030	2040	2030	2023	- 2030	2023 – 2030	2023 – 2030	2030	2030	2030	2023 – 2030
P1	🕙	13.7%	\$1.70	1.0%	37%	578	547	9.7%	\$58.07	\$52-60	\$8.58	\$7.87-8.58	1%	61%	155	\$2,758
P2	\geq	15.7%	\$2.04	3.1%	44%	518	350	9.7%	\$60.04	\$55-63	\$8.85	\$8.19-8.99	4%	57%	170	\$2,004
P3		14.5%	\$3.26	12.8%	65%	321	161	9.7%	\$60.58	\$56-63	\$8.90	\$8.36-8.98	13%	46%	345	\$1,310
P4		15.3%	\$2.02	6.1%	30%	641	361	9.7%	\$59.16	\$53-61	\$8.72	\$7.99-8.72	7%	63%	90	\$1,787
P5		15.0%	\$3.28	13.5%	65%	325	161	9.7%	\$60.47	\$55-62	\$8.88	\$8.23-8.88	13%	46%	355	\$866
P6		13.2%	\$3.27	19.6%	78%	200	31	9.7%	\$65.34	\$61-69	\$9.54	\$9.07-9.68	18%	39%	355	\$4,041
P7		13.1%	\$3.34	19.7%	78%	202	35	9.7%	\$65.96	\$61-69	\$9.63	\$9.14-9.76	18%	39%	355	\$4,041
P8		15.4%	\$2.79	11.2%	59%	378	160	9.7%	\$60.67	\$55-62	\$8.92	\$8.20-8.92	11%	48%	295	\$548
P9		14.6%	\$2.69	7.9%	60%	371	160	9.7%	\$58.64	\$54-59	\$8.65	\$8.04-8.65	9%	46%	295	\$548
Nuclear	 Geothermal 	= Coal	- Gas													

Gas Toll
 Storage

Wind

Hydrogen

Solar

Energy Efficiency

- Other

PORTFOLIO SCORING DETAIL

 Scale

 1
 2
 3
 4

 Note: Refer to Portfolio Metric Results Scorecard



8

- 1. Assigned metric scores per the scale
- 2. Calculated an average score by Objective
- 3. Calculated a unweighted total score by Portfolio

	System	Reliability 8	& Climate R	limate Resiliency Environmental Sustainability						Afford	lability		System Flexibility		Workforce Impact		
Portfolios	Diver- sity of Genera-tion Mix	Capacity Head- room	Extreme Wea	ather Exposure		Progress Towards Ci	ty of SA CAAP Goals		Energy Co:	st (\$/MWh)	Present Value (PV) F	tevenue Requirements	Market Purchases	Dispatchability	CPS Energy Workforce Impact	Local Economic Impact	
	Generation Mix (MWh)	Expected Reserve Margin (%)	Rev. Req. Extreme Weather (\$Billion)	%of CPS Energy consumption that is met through ERCOT market purchases	%CO2 Intensity Reduction Relative to 2016 (Ref Scenario)	Emission (Ib CO)	Intensity 2/MWh)	%reduction in consumption due to STEP	Reference Scenario Average Cost (\$/M Wh)	Range in Cost in <u>alf</u> Scenarios (\$/M Wh)	Ref Scenario (\$Billion)	Range Across <u>all</u> Scenarios (\$Billion)	%of CPS Energy consumption that is met through ERCOT market purchases	%of CPS Energy Capacity that is Dispatchable	# of Impacted CPS Energy Generation Employees	Capital expenditures for new generation capacity built in greater San Antonio area (\$Millions)	
	2030	2030	2030	2030	2030	2030	2040	2030	2023 -	2030	2023 - 2030	2023 - 2030	2030	2030	2030	2023 - 2030	
P1	1	2	4	4	See Note 1	1	1	4	4	2	See Note 2	2	4	4	3	3	
P2	2	4	4	4	See Note 1	2	2	4	2	2	See Note 2	2	4	4	3	3	
P3	3	2	1	2	See Note 1	3	3	4	2	2	See Note 2	4	2	2	1	2	
P4	2	4	4	3	See Note 1	1	2	4	4	2	See Note 2	2	4	4	4	2	
P5	3	4	1	2	See Note 1	3	3	4	2	4	See Note 2	2	2	2	1	1	
P6	2	1	1	1	See Note 1	4	4	4	1	2	See Note 2	4	1	1	1	4	
P7	2	1	1	1	See Note 1	4	4	4	1	2	See Note 2	4	1	1	1	4	
P8	4	4	2	2	See Note 1	3	3	4	2	2	See Note 2	2	2	2	2	1	
P9	4	2	2	3	See Note 1	3	3	4	4	4	See Note 2	4	4	2	2	1	
Portfolios	System I	Reliability 8	& Climate R	Resiliency	Env	vironmenta	l Sustainat	pility		Afford	lability	<u>l</u>	System	Flexibility	Workfore	ce Impact	Total Score
P1		2.	75			2.	00		2.67			4.00		3.	00	14.42	
P2		3.	50			2.	67			2.	00		4.00		3.00		15.17
P3		2.	00			3.	33			2.	67		2.	00	1.	50	11.50
P4		3.	25			2.	33			2.	67		4.00		3.	00	15.25
P5		2.	50			3.	33			2.	67		2.	00	1.	00	11.50
P6		1.	25			4.	00			2.	33		1.	00	2.	50	11.08
P7		1.	25			4.	00			2.	33		1.	00	2.	50	11.08
P8		3.	00			3.33				2.	00		2.	00	1.	50	11.83
P9		2.	75			3.33				4.	00		3.	00	1.	50	14.58
Notes:																	
1. % CO2 intensit	y metric was no	ot used since it	is redundant to	o CO2 intensity i	n lb/MWh.												
2. Reference PV	. Reference PV of Revenue Requirements in \$B was not used since it is redundant to Reference Average Cost in \$/MWh.																

PORTFOLIO SELECTION

	Objectives								
	Reliability & Resiliency	Environmental Sustainability	Affordability	Flexibility	Workforce	l otal Score			
Ρ1	2.75	2.00	2.67	4.00	3.00	14.42			
P2	3.50	2.67	2.00	4.00	3.00	15.17			
Р3	2.00	3.33	2.67	2.00	1.50	11.50			
Ρ4	3.25	2.33	2.67	4.00	3.00	15.25			
Ρ5	2.50	3.33	2.67	2.00	1.00	11.50			
P6	1.25	4.00	2.33	1.00	2.50	11.08			
Ρ7	1.25	4.00	2.33	1.00	2.50	11.08			
P8	3.00	3.33	2.00	2.00	1.50	11.83			
Р9	2.75	3.33	4.00	3.00	1.50	14.58			



 P3, P5, P6, P7, & P8 are least aligned with the objectives.



ALIGNED PORTFOLIOS P1, P2, P4, & P9



	System Reliability & Climate Resiliency Environmental Sustainability				Affordability				System Flexibility		Workforce Impact					
	Diversity of Generation Mix	Capacity Head- room	Extrem Ex	e Weather posure	Progress	Towards Go	owards City of SA CAAP Goals		Energy Cost (\$/MWh)		Present Value (PV) Revenue Requirements		Market Purchases	Dispatch- ability	CPS Energy Workforce Impact	Local Economic Impact
	Generation Mix (MWh)	Expected Reserve Margin (%)	Rev. Req. Extreme Weather (\$Billion)	% Of CPS Energy Consumption That Is Met Through ERCOT Market Purchases	% CO2 Intensity Reduction Relative To 2016 (Ref Scenario)	Emis Inte (Lb CO	ssion nsity 2/MWh)	% Reduction In Consumption Due To STEP	Reference Scenario Average Cost (\$/MWh)	Range In Cost In <u>All</u> Scenarios (\$/MWh)	Ref Scenario (\$Billion)	Range Across <u>All</u> Scenarios (\$Billion)	% Of CPS Energy Consumption That Is Met Through ERCOT Market Purchases	% Of CPS Energy Capacity That Is Dispatchable	# Of Impacted CPS Energy Generation Employees	Capital Expenditures For New Generation Capacity Built In Greater San Antonio Area (\$Millions)
	2030	2030	2030	2030	2030	2030	2040	2030	2023	- 2030	2023 – 2030	2023 – 2030	2030	2030	2030	2023 – 2030
P1		13.7%	\$1.70	1.0%	37%	578	547	9.7%	\$58.07	\$52-60	\$8.58	\$7.87-8.58	1%	61%	155	\$2,758
P2		15.7%	\$2.04	3.1%	44%	518	350	9.7%	\$60.04	\$55-63	\$8.85	\$8.19-8.99	4%	57%	170	\$2,004
P4		15.3%	\$2.02	6.1%	30%	641	361	9.7%	\$59.16	\$53-61	\$8.72	\$7.99-8.72	7%	63%	90	\$1,787
P9		14.6%	\$2.69	7.9%	60%	371	160	9.7%	\$58.64	\$54-59	\$8.65	\$8.04-8.65	9%	46%	295	\$548

Benefits and risks are examined in the following slides.

 Nuclear 	 Geothermal 	= Coal	 Gas
Gas Toll	 Wind 	 Solar 	- Othe
 Storage 	Hydrogen	 Energy Efficiency 	/

	Le	gend	
Less Favorable			More Favorable

P1 – GAS GAS ADDITIONS



Benefits	Risks
 Higher energy availability in normal and extreme conditions Reduced market exposure More dispatchable generation Includes flexible gas technologies 	 Greater risk of natural gas availability issues and price volatility
 One of the lower-cost portfolios; especially in extreme weather Leveraging Spruce 2 infrastructure with gas conversion 	
	 Does not meet CAAP 2030 (+6%) or 2040 targets (+105%)
Low impact on our workforceGreater local economic impact	
Reliability & Flexibility Affordability Sustainability Workforce I	mpact

P2 – BLEND GAS, SOLAR, WIND & STORAGE ADDITIONS



Benefits	Risks
 Lower risk in extreme weather Reduced market exposure More dispatchable generation Includes flexible gas technologies 	 Some risk of natural gas availability and price volatility
 One of the lower-cost portfolios; especially in extreme weather Leveraging Spruce 2 infrastructure with gas conversion 	
• Meets 2030 CAAP target (-5%)	 Does not meet 2040 CAAP target (+31%)
Reduced impact on our workforceGreater local economic impact	
Reliability & Flexibility Affordability Sustainability Workforce	e Impact

P4 – BLEND (RETAINS COAL) GAS, SOLAR, & STORAGE ADDITIONS



Benefits	Risks						
 Retains greater energy security Lower risk extreme weather Reduced market exposure Greater dispatchable generation 							
 One of the lower-cost portfolios; especially in extreme weather 	 Potential for additional environmental regulations 						
	 Does not meet CAAP 2030 (+18%) or 2040 (+35%) targets 						
Lower impact on our workforceGreater local economic impact							
Reliability & Flexibility Affordability Sustainability Workforce Impact							

P9 – RENEWABLES WIND, SOLAR, & STORAGE ADDITIONS



Benefits	Risks
 Retains some existing dispatchable gas generation Retains Spruce 2 infrastructure with gas conversion for 7 years 	 Less dispatchable generation Greater energy availability risk in normal and extreme conditions
 One of the lower-cost portfolios due to lower capital investment 	 Higher cost exposure in extreme weather events due to increased market purchases
 Lower carbon intensity Meets 2030 (-32%) and 2040 (-40%) CAAP targets 	
	High impact on our workforceSmall local economic impact
Reliability & Flexibility Affordability Sustainability Wo	rkforce Impact

P2 AND P9 ARE MOST VIABLE RETIRE COAL AND ACHIEVE 2030 CAAP TARGET



- P2 offers increased reliability, affordability and retains our experienced workforce to support our lower-carbon transition
- P2 will require continuous evolution to meet 2040 CAAP target
- P9 allows us to meet CAAP 2030/2040 without new technology
- P9 challenges our ability to ensure reliability during extreme weather conditions - more prevalent in recent years as disruptive climate events have increased

Regardless of portfolio selected, our plans must respond to evolving ERCOT market and adapt to leverage new technology.

OTHER FACTORS ON OUR PATH FORWARD

- Adequate rate support
- PUC/ERCOT market changes
- State legislative actions
- EPA/TCEQ permitting & rulemakings
- Supply chain risks
- Geopolitical impacts on energy markets
- Timely approval of individual plant closures by ERCOT
 - ERCOT will analyze grid reliability with each plant closure
- Timely commercialization of new generation and storage technologies
 - Geothermal, hydrogen storage, large scale/long duration storage, new nuclear technologies
 - Integrated energy management systems, customer partnerships, conservation/STEP, data analytics & utilization, and others

Carbon neutrality requires a coordinated multi-part plan.



DISCUSSION