

Myers, Denaë

From: Trustees
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2019 1:12 PM
To: 'Russell Seal'
Subject: RE: [InternetMail] Burning coal until 2060 is irresponsible

Dear Valued Customer,

Your letter was shared with our Board of Trustees and they have asked me to respond to you directly. I want to say, "Thank you!" We sincerely appreciate your perspective, and passion, and are grateful that you took the time to share your thoughts with us. CPS Energy, along with the entire energy industry, is in a state of transition that includes more renewable and non-emitting sources of energy. This is a worldwide issue, and while much progress has been made, we believe it is currently unclear when in the future technologies will progress and mature to the point that renewable energy can be relied upon for all of our electricity needs.

Our current fleet of power plants represents investments that the community has made over decades, and the continued renewable transition is thoughtfully underway. After adding over 1,500 MW of wind and solar over the last couple of decades, we are leaning into our **Flexible Path** strategy, which enables us to increasingly take advantage of smaller, shorter-duration solutions for our power supply. These solutions must meet the needs of our community in terms of 1) affordability, 2) reliability, 3) safety, 4) security, 5) resiliency, and 6) environmental impact. Our **Flexible Path** also enables swift changes in plans, as technologies develop. Specifically, when more efficient and cost-effective energy storage, hydrogen-based power, or other non-carbon-emitting technologies become available in the future, and meet the six criteria mentioned above, we will explore moving to these types of technologies as soon as reasonably possible.

While our slides about the technical life span of existing traditional assets are only informational, there has been no formal declaration about whether or not to run Spruce 2 through its original design life of 2060.

We hope this information provides you further insight. Please join us at our community events and continue to provide your feedback and perspective. Again, thank you for taking the time to reach out to us.

Sincerely,

Cris Eugster, Chief Operating Officer (COO), on behalf of,
The CPS Energy Board of Trustees

Copy to: Members of the Board of Trustees
Paula Gold-Williams, President & CEO

From: Russell Seal <russellseal@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 8, 2019 3:14 AM
To: Trustees <trustees@cpsenergy.com>
Subject: [InternetMail] Burning coal until 2060 is irresponsible

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear CPS Energy Board Member,

I'm outraged to learn that CPS Energy is planning to keep running the coal-burning Spruce 2 power plant until at least 2060. This is extremely irresponsible in the face of the climate crisis.

The Spruce coal plant is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in San Antonio. It's also a major source of other air and water pollution. And it's more expensive than clean renewable energy. A recent analysis by Synapse Energy Economics shows that CPS Energy could reduce costs by approximately \$85 million per year — for a total of at least \$1 billion over 15 years — by replacing the coal-burning Spruce power plant with a combination of solar, wind and energy storage.

In addition, CPS Energy is now proposing to add a significant amount (500 megawatts) of natural gas capacity to its resources. Natural gas also is a major contributor to the climate crisis and is more expensive than clean renewable energy. This addiction to expensive fossil fuels has to end.

I expect the CPS Energy board of directors and the San Antonio Mayor and City Council to act with urgency to shut down the Spruce coal plant as quickly as possible and come up with a plan to fully transition away from polluting fossil fuels over the coming decade. Waiting 40 years isn't an option.

There needs to be a fully transparent resource planning process, with data and assumptions about all of the costs and benefits of various scenarios shared publicly. The city owns CPS Energy, which means that we — the people of San Antonio — own CPS Energy. We should be fully informed and involved in these important decisions that affect our health and our finances. A representative group of community members should be selected to engage with resource planning at a deeper level. The costs and benefits of various options should be publicly shared. This level of transparency is the standard for investor owned utilities in Texas. Why should CPS Energy not be held to that standard?

I'm counting on you to lead CPS Energy into a clean energy future that will help clear our air and reduce our electric bills.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Russell Seal

