Drew Burczyk (Project Manager, Resource Planning & Market Assessments, 1898 & Co.) – Introduced the meeting facilitator and covered meeting protocols and participation.

Shane Bradford (Vice President, Indiana Electric, CenterPoint Energy) – Shared the safety message for the meeting and the updated generation timeline.

- Slide 7: Generation Transition Timeline: Revised
  - Question: Why were the solar PPAs [Power Purchase Agreements] canceled? Did the tariffs play a part in that decision? What's the potential for restarting negotiations for those projects?
    - Response: The main reason for the termination of the PPAs was increased pricing for each project. The price increases were due to rising MISO [Midcontinent Independent System Operator] interconnection costs, contractor costs, and material costs. Tariffs were not a direct cause for the price increase, but CenterPoint would expect tariffs could potentially increase the prices more. CenterPoint will most likely not revisit those projects.
  - Question: Are there any termination costs related to the termination of the solar PPAs?
    - Response: No. However, there are some legal costs related to the termination of the PPAs and embedded costs from getting project approval from the IURC [Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission].
  - Question: On the Generation Transition Timeline, does this include the wind farm in MISO Zone 4? Has CenterPoint received commission approval for that project?
    - Response: There are two wind projects on the timeline in Zone 4: Galesburg Wind in 2026 and Additional Wind Power in 2027. CenterPoint has received approval for both wind projects from the IURC.
  - Question: Could you please confirm that FB Culley 2 is on track to retire in 2025? Please remind me of the specific timing of that process.
    - Response: Yes, FB Culley 2 is on track to close at the end of December 2025.
  - Question: Regarding Salt Creek Wind, is this project going to serve CenterPoint customers or just provide power to the MISO grid as accredited power? If it's going to be serving to CenterPoint customers, what kind of transmission loss are you expecting since the power is coming from Iowa?
    - Response: [Please see Witness Swanson's public testimony in Cause No. 46218[1]].
  - Question: In the first meeting, the Generation Transition Timeline included an asterisk that the FB Culley 3 conversion was paused, so does the "add 2 combustion turbines" on the Generation Transition Timeline relate to FB Culley 2 or FB Culley 3?

[1] https://iurc.portal.in.gov/docketed-case-details/?id=43b79da2-5219-f011-998a-001dd8084fd9

        - Response: The 2 combustion turbines are currently being constructed at the AB Brown site. FB Culley 2 is slated for closure at the end of this year, and the FB Culley 3 conversion to natural gas is still being evaluated in this IRP. [There has been no change related to those units since meeting 1]
    - Question: Can you please restate the capacity of the two solar PPAs that have been canceled?
        - Response: Rustic Hills PPA was 100 MW, and Vermillion Rise PPA was 185 MW.

Matt Rice (Director, Regulatory and Rates, CenterPoint Energy) – Provided an overview of the IRP process and summarized stakeholder feedback.

- Slide 12: Summary of Stakeholder Feedback from Meeting #1
    - Question: On the subject of EVs, does the load forecast take into account regulatory and policy changes at the federal level on potential impacts to EV adoption?
        - Response: No. The forecast utilizes the Energy Information Administration's prior forecast of electric vehicles adoption, and it would not include any updates from the new administration. The alternative high case scenario utilizes Environmental Protection Agency's EV adoption goal prior to the new administration.
- Slide 15: Objectives & Draft Measures
    - Question: The energy burden metric should look at the entire portfolio period (20 years), with maybe an additional view at the 10-year (half-way) mark. A 5-year window is too short to provide a meaningful view given generation investments are evaluated over the long term. Could CenterPoint please reconsider this time period?
        - Response: The intention of the 5-year look is to provide a near-term impact since there can be more certainty in near-term analysis. When we finalize the IRP, the next step is to potentially ask for a CPCN [Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity] for resources that enable the energy transition, or a request for PPAs. The 5-year look is meant to give the near-term impact in addition to what we traditionally show, the 20-year look. We will still include a 20-year net present value of revenue requirements, and we also consider the cost risk on a 20-year basis.
    - Question: Why did you not include a 10-year retail rate impact on the scorecard?
        - Response: The intention of the 5-year look is to provide insight into the tangible near-term impact on customers. The long-term impact is captured in the 20-year metrics and will still be considered in this IRP analysis.
    - Comment: I disagree with the short-term (5-year) impact look. We will just have to evaluate it again, and it will cost more in the end. The main focus of IRPs should be long-term.

        - Response: We have historically and will continue to emphasize long-term results during from the IRP. We are adding an additional metric to also consider the short-term impacts, providing a more balanced view.
    - Question: Is the electric energy burden going to be a point in time metric? Also, for model simplicity, when are resources assumed to come online?
        - Response: Electric energy burden will be a point in time metric, 5 years out. New resources options are added on the first of the year, while named projects with a planned online date will be in-service on that date.
    - Question: For cost recovery, for model simplicity, will cost be recovered as they are incurred?
        - Response: The model recovers costs as they are incurred.
    - Question: The proposed calculation for energy burden does not align with what I was hoping it would capture. Can you add a low and high energy burden metric? I am most interested to see what impact this has on the already high energy burden customers.
        - Response: For the purposes of this IRP, we are most interested in the relative difference among portfolios. Thus, we are using Vanderburgh County median income to calculate energy burden since it is a representative value.
- General Questions
    - Question: Will the electric energy burden separate electrically heated homes from gas heated homes, or will those be combined in the aggregate?
        - Response: We could look separately at both the customers with electrically heated homes and the customers with gas heated homes. However, either view will show the same relative difference among portfolios.

Matt Rice – Discussed the addition of a fourth IRP scenario, the Alternate High Regulatory Scenario, following stakeholder feedback from the first stakeholder meeting.

- Slide 22: Narrative – Low Regulatory
    - Question: Your low regulatory scenario only removes Clean Air Act [CAA] 111(b) and 111(d) but there are other regulations that are being discussed that would affect future costs for coal plants, such as ELG [Effluent Limitations Guidelines].
        - Response: Our FB Culley 3 plant is fully compliant with ELG, so it would not meaningfully change the results. If you can send what you'd like to see incorporated in the modeling to irp@centerpointenergy.com, we would consider incorporating these changes into the model.
- Slide 23: Scenario Summary
    - Question: Could we add a scenario that is if Clean Air Act 111 is rescinded during this administration, but then a similar CO_2 policy is added back within the next 5 years (i.e., sort of a delayed carbon policy scenario)?
        - Response: Please send an email to irp@centerpointenergy.com with how that scenario would play out with associated drivers.
    - Question: The current scenarios are skewed towards a higher load. We have seen that the load has not really increased that greatly even with low regulatory.

With the low regulatory scenario, I would suggest adding an option where load stays at base. In this scenario, generation capital costs could still be high. How easy is it to change these variables in the sensitivity study?
    - Response: We can consider adding this alternative low regulatory scenario. However, if we only change one variable (load) in this alternative scenario, it may be better evaluated as a sensitivity analysis.
- Question: For the high regulatory scenario, would the decreased demand for coal actually lead to lower coal commodity prices? Conversely, would the rolling back of regulation in the low regulatory scenario lead to higher coal commodity prices?
    - Response: Our perspective is that the high regulatory scenario leads to additional burdens on the cost of producing coal which would get passed onto the utilities. In the low regulatory scenario, the cost burdens would be removed, thus creating a lower cost for coal.
- Question: Are the coal prices a publicized index, or can you incorporate real coal price offers made to CenterPoint?
    - Response: Our commodity forecast is a blend of forecasts from 4 vendors: Hitachi [ABB], EVA, S&P, and WoodMac. This is described in the IRP Stakeholder Meeting #1 slide deck, which can be found at centerpointenergy.com/irp.
- Comment: There's no reason not to include coal bid numbers. The uncertainty variable is not the mining cost as much as the demand.
    - Response: We can discuss further in the tech-to-tech meeting.

Drew Burczyk – Discussed the draft supply-side resource inputs into the IRP model.

- Slide 28: Storage Cost Curve
    - Question: Did you model cost curves for long duration options or other storage types (not just 4-hour Lithium-Ion)?
        - Response: Yes. We plan to have cost curves for all the different storage options presented in the first IRP stakeholder meeting, including one long duration non-Lithium-Ion battery.
    - Question: How many bids did you receive for storage?
        - Response: This is provided in the first stakeholder meeting presentation, which can be found at centerpointenergy.com/irp. [There were 17 standalone storage bids.]
    - Question: Are you familiar with iron oxide batteries?
        - Response: Yes, and we have discussed that resource option. We do have a long duration storage option in the model. If you have additional feedback or information, please email irp@centerpointenergy.com.
- Slide 29: Solar Cost Curve
    - Question: The cost-benefit for solar over time is going to be better than any other option. If you incentivize rooftop solar again then you won't have to spend the capital costs to get the benefits.
        - Response: We will be running a sensitivity that considers an additional incentive for rooftop solar. With the additional rooftop solar, we will look at how much additional solar is selected and how it impacts the portfolio.

    - Question: Are you accounting for all costs and benefits, including considerations such as health costs? Will these other benefits be incorporated into the IRP?
        - Looking at the costs and benefits of all resources will be the core analysis of the IRP. This section covered only the cost inputs into the model. [Health costs are considered by EPA when regulations are being considered and drafted, thereby incorporating those costs into each scenario by way of including the applicable regulations.]
- Slide 35: Nuclear Cost Curve
    - Question: Why do we call the resource "Nuclear" instead of "Small Modular Reactor"?
        - Response: We used generic language in this section since there are multiple resources of each type.
    - Question: What does CenterPoint consider a realistic timeline for adding a new small modular reactor?
        - Response: The timeline is still being developed as we derive the inputs for the model, but it likely won't be able to be selected in the model until the mid-to-late 2030's.
    - Question: Do you know why the moderate NREL curve is decreasing in the outer years?
        - Response: The information is provided by the 2024 NREL Annual Technology Baseline (ATB) and is publicly available. [NREL states their assumption is that as the technology is standardized, supply chains are established, and costs decrease.]
    - Question: Have you considered the water pressure nuclear option, such as the Westinghouse AP1000?
        - Response: We can evaluate if this option would be well represented by the nuclear option currently in our technology assessment. If you have information regarding technology performance or costs that you would like to see in the model, please email irp@centerpointenergy.com.
    - Question: How do you include nuclear in your model? Will you be including nuclear in your model?
        - Response: For each of the different resource types, we can set boundaries for the number and timing of new resource additions in the model, which will then select the optimized portfolio for the given inputs. At some point, every resource we presented today will be considered in the model.
    - Question: What is the technology assessment cost?
        - Response: The technology assessment is an analysis that evaluates the different resource options and develops the associated costs for a generic project site in or around CenterPoint's service territory.
    - Question: In Indiana, which has a recent bill that was approved with regard to SMRs [Small Modular Reactors], taxpayers are paying for the development of SMRs. Is the cost to taxpayers for SMR development captured in the costs that were summarized and presented?

        - Response: The costs that are summarized represent the total estimated costs that CenterPoint would pay for these new resources.
- General Questions
    - Question: Were any resources screened out?
        - Response: There are no resources that have been screened out. The technology assessment does not include a new coal option.
    - Question: How are the DG [Distributed Generation] Storage and DG Solar bids included or not included in these curves?
        - Response: This section only presented a snapshot of resources over 100 MW. There are other resources we are modeling, including smaller solar resources and we intend to inform our modeling with RFP cost data. We will perform a sensitivity on rooftop solar.
    - Question: Are there any restrictions on the timing of when resources can be added by the model (e.g., combustion turbines might not be available until 2030+) and how much can be added from one resource in a year?
        - Response: Yes. We can add boundaries to the model on the number and timing of new resource additions but have not gotten to that point in the modeling process yet. We will use the best available data from the market and technology assessments to set these constraints.
    - Question: For FB Culley 3, is there an option for natural gas conversion or co-firing the unit?
        - Response: Both natural gas conversion and co-firing will be considered at FB Culley 3 in the IRP modeling.

Jeffery Huber (Principal, Energy Efficiency, GDS Associates) – Presented an introduction to Market Potential Studies and discussed the energy efficiency and demand response modeling methodologies.

- Slide 42: EE Overview: Flow Chart
    - Question: Can you expand on the "Cost Effectiveness Screen" between the economic potential and technical potential?
        - Response: In the Utility Cost Test, for each measure on the EE [Energy Efficiency] or DR [Demand Response] program side, it is quantifying the lifetime benefits of avoiding energy or capacity and the costs of the incentive to CenterPoint.
- Slide 44: EE Overview: Market Characterization
    - Question: What are the Forecast Sales, and what does it include? Does this include people who have opted out?
        - Response: The forecasted sales are the load forecast. There is a portion of the customers who don't pay into the energy efficiency surcharge programs, so the "opt-out sales" show the portion of CenterPoint customers that would be ineligible as they do not contribute to the energy efficiency charge.
- Slide 45: EE Overview: Market Characterization

    - Question: On slide 45, which talks about market characterization, it's pointing out that 67% of folks are incomed qualified. Does that impact adoption rates if a significant portion of those are renter customers versus a homeowner?
        - Response: First, it is important to state that the percents on this screen are not additive, so the slide suggests that roughly half of multi-family homes are income qualified. Willingness and ability to participate in these programs would be affected by if the customer is a renter or owner and that is something we attempt to capture in the market research.
- Slide 50: EE Overview: Types of Potential
    - Questions: What are the parameters for cost-effectiveness?
        - Response: In Indiana, the Utility Cost Test is defined in terms of what is included from an energy efficiency or demand response perspective. The primary benefits are generally the avoided cost of energy, capacity and transmission & distribution.
- Slide 52: EE Overview: Model Outputs
    - Question: What would be the source for net-to-gross ratios?
        - Response: For EE, the net-to-gross ratios will be the latest evaluated net-to-gross ratios that are available to us, and we will use those as a proxy going forward.
- Slide 55: DR Overview: Methodology
    - Question: Will the levelized cost for Market Potential Study measures include avoided T&D [Transmission & Distribution] benefits?
        - Response: In the IRP model, which does not capture the T&D benefit, the avoided cost for T&D is taken out of the cost.
    - Questions: Will MISO-provided DR offerings be factored into the potential estimates?
        - Response: For the aggregation amount that is listed, that aggregator would be the MISO participant. The Aggregation DR will be included in the IRP modeling but is not a function of the market potential study.
    - Question: Does achievable potential account for opt-out customers?
        - Response: They have been excluded from the potential.
- Slide 56: DR Overview: Program Level Concepts
    - Question: For the battery storage program, without large enough penetration of batteries, it's hard for benefits to outweigh the costs. Could we look at a battery storage equipment incentive?
        - Response: Generally, we have found that an incentive substantial enough to drive significant adoption will hurt cost-effectiveness. With that being said, we can follow up on if a sensitivity analysis would be worthwhile.
    - Question: What is the compensation rate for when the battery is dispatched?
        - Response: The report will detail each program and what the incentive structure is.
- Slide 57: DR Overview: Program Level Concepts
    - Question: For the TOU [Time-of-Use] and CPP [Critical Peak Pricing] Rate Pilot Program, is there a specific on-peak to off-peak ratio for the rates that is being considered at this point?

        - Response: It is 4 to 1.
- General Questions
    - Question: For EVs, are customers bringing their own device for the charger? Would customers have to use specific technology to participate?
        - Response: [We are assuming that the customer would be supplying their own charger, and CenterPoint would provide an incentive to join the program, as well as an annual participation incentive. A managed charging program would require some sort of network connection, which could include Wi-Fi, cellular, or a wired connection. A specific technology would not be required, as control could happen through the charger or telematics through the EVs].
    - Question: Some DR measures like batteries and water heaters can be used for other grid services (ancillary services, resilience) – how are these benefits being considered in developing levelized costs and/or accounted for in the IRP? Is it possible to treat these like T&D benefits and reduce from the cost side?
        - Response: When performing cost-effectiveness screening the benefits include the avoided energy, capacity, and T&D. Resilience and ancillary services have not been a benefit of DR captured in the IRP analysis.
    - Question: Has CenterPoint identified a marginal line loss rate which will be used to convert EE savings to the generator?
        - Response: We have a peak demand loss factor, which is higher than the energy loss factor which is used as a proxy for the line loss factor. We will be using 8.4% for the current IRP and Market Potential Study.
    - Question: Regarding the MPS discussion, is it the intent of the potential study to primarily model business-as-usual or explore a fuller scope of savings opportunities beyond existing pilots and programs?
        - Response: From a DR standpoint, it's definitely not business-as-usual. We've included EV growth and demand response for residential and non-residential, and same for battery storage. We're also looking at smart thermostat DR products on the commercial side. We are looking at near- and long-term emerging technologies.

Michael Russo (Forecast Consultant, ITRON) – Presented updates to the demand forecast development process, including impacts from electric vehicle and behind-the-meter solar photovoltaic adoption.

- Slide 63: Forecasting Methodology
    - Question: Does the energy price assumption vary by scenario?
        - Response: No, the energy price assumption will not vary by scenario in the load forecasting. [In the IRP analysis, energy prices will vary by scenario.]
    - Question: Does CenterPoint peak at the same time as the MISO system?
        - Response: In the first stakeholder meeting, the timing of CenterPoint's peak was shared. Please visit centerpointenergy.com/irp to reference those slide decks.
- Slide 67: Scenario Development: Load Forecast

    - Question: Why would you assume a low regulatory scenario would lead to moderate inflation and increased economic growth? Why is there a pessimistic outlook with near-term financial stress and reduced economic growth with the high regulatory case?
        - Response: These are the outlooks and definitions provided by S&P Global. The outlooks were placed in the low and high regulatory scenarios in order to increase or decrease load. If the S&P forecast with high economic growth were utilized in the high regulatory scenario, it would offset the effects from the energy efficiency forecast, thus creating a load forecast that does not significantly deviate from the reference case.
    - Question: Are you considering the possible removal of the Energy Star program?
        - Response: Energy Star has been changing for a number of years. All of our EE programs do not rely on energy star ratings; it is all based off of energy efficiency performance metrics of the equipment. The removal of Energy Star ratings would not affect the modeling.
    - Questions: Are you finding SEER [Seasonal Energy Efficiency Ratio] ratings to being good proxies for Energy Star?
        - Response: Yes. We can attribute significantly higher energy savings to equipment with higher SEER ratings.
    - Question: When looking between high regulatory and alternative high regulatory, can you potentially do the same with low regulatory (an alternative low regulatory with low load)?
        - Response: If we only change one variable (load) in this alternative scenario, it may be better evaluated as a sensitivity analysis.
- Slide 69: Residential Economic Concepts
    - Question: What population are you talking about in the figure?
        - Response: There are a few slides from 1st IRP Stakeholder meeting presentation explaining the change from Evansville to Indiana state population. The state-level population is much more correlated to the number of CenterPoint residential customers than the number of Evansville households.
- Slide 73: Electric Vehicle (EV) Forecasts
    - Question: Is the alternative high electrification case just for the alternative high regulation case and the reference case will be applied to all other scenarios? Would you consider changing the forecast to match the considerations taken in the EE/DR methodologies, such as income?
        - Response: Yes, the reference case will be used for all scenarios except the alternative high regulation scenario, which uses the alternative high electrification forecast. We will discuss this internally, although if we decrease the EV adoption forecast significantly, then our scenarios will lose their differentiation.
- Slide 76: Large Load Sensitivity
    - Question: What considerations about load growth went into the large load sensitivity? Where did the different scenario levels (100, 300, 1,000MW) come from?

        - Response: Those are indicative of the types of speculative load consistent with what CenterPoint has received.
    - Question: Can you provide more information on the determination of that load factor for the large load sensitivity?
        - Response: A 90% load factor is a very common assumption for large load customers.
- General Questions
    - Question: Is there a final report on the load forecast that can be shared with the OUCC [Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor] from Itron?
        - Response: The full report will be available as an attachment to the IRP. We will share the modeling files and scenario-based forecasts ahead of filing the IRP.
    - Question: If federal standards changed for energy efficiency, do you expect them to have a big impact on the load forecast?
        - Response: The impact of these changes would depend on what changes and by how much.

Brian Despard (Sr. Project Manager, Resource Planning and Market Assessments, 1898 & Co.) – Outlined the methodology for capturing uncertainty in model inputs via stochastic modeling.

- Slide 85: CO_2 Methodology
    - Question: Are you going to include Scope 3 emissions?
        - Response: CenterPoint has limited control over Scope 3 emissions as it is related to emissions of energy use by the end-user. [Additionally, electricity generation emissions are not classified as Scope 3.]
- General Questions
    - Question: Why are you only looking at natural gas and coal scenarios?
        - Response: We are looking at uncertainties of coal, natural gas, carbon prices, load, and capital costs.
    - Question: Since you are considering nuclear, do you want to run a stochastic process for uranium?
        - Response: The problem with that is that there are limited forecasts for uranium costs and uncertainty around uranium is difficult to define. We can follow up if this is something we should incorporate.
    - Question: Are you shaping your natural gas prices? What are the sources for the data?
        - Response: We are shaping our natural gas prices on a monthly basis. There is more information on the data sources in 1st IRP Stakeholder meeting presentation.

Brian Despard – Shared the scenario inputs for natural gas, coal, and CO_2 price forecasts.

- No questions.

Drew Burczyk – Discussed the four steps in the portfolio development process including critical decision points, existing and alternative resource implementation, and modeling framework.

- Slide 95: Portfolio Development Methodology Overview
  - Question: In your methodology, are you making near-term decisions in step 2 and long-term decisions in step 3?
    - Response: Yes, we are making both near-term and long-term decisions. The IRP by nature sets the 20-year direction of resources and portfolios, but there are near-term decisions that have to be made during this IRP cycle.
- Slide 97: Step 2: Key Near-Term IRP Decisions
  - Question: Is there a timeline associated with the conversion of FB Culley 3?
    - Response: In our analysis, we are modeling different options for FB Culley 3. The timing options are all compliant with Clean Air Act 111 and include: a conversion to natural gas by 2030, retirement by 2032, or co-fire by 2030 with a retirement by 2039.
  - Question: Is there an option for full retirement for FB Culley 3 and replacement with renewables?
    - Response: Yes. There is a 2032 retirement option, and there are renewable resource options available that will be studied to fill the portfolio capacity need.
  - Question: On the low regulatory scenario, is the only option that is going to be evaluated is continuing FB Culley 3 on coal?
    - Response: It is an additional option to the ones listed above [on slide 97]. It cannot be included in the reference case evaluation due to CAA 111 compliance.
  - Question: Is "suspending" coal operations synonymous with retirement?
    - Response: Yes. Our language is consistent with MISO's language around the retirement of coal plants considering the intention to re-use the interconnection.
- Slide 99: Step 4: Modeling Framework and Diverse Portfolios
  - Question: What if I don't like the final 10 portfolios?
    - Response: If you have ideas for portfolios, please send your ideas to the IRP email: irp@centerpointenergy.com.
  - Question: Have you taken into consideration potential transmission issues (e.g., the difficulties of building new pipelines) related to increased supply & demand of natural gas under the "Low Regulatory" scenario?
    - Response: We are including gas pipeline upgrades cost. There is also analysis on the electric transmission that will be included in the final IRP.
- General Questions
  - Question: Is there a concern with long lead times for new natural gas resources and FB Culley 2?
    - Response: Yes, timing will certainly be considered. In those key decisions, we do need to make sure that the units we are proposing are feasible with the deadline of the MISO interconnection re-use.
  - Question: Related to the question of supply chain constraints for gas turbines, will you evaluate any risks related to gas supply due to factors like increased

demand (without increased production), the export market, pipeline capacity, storage constraints, or risks related to firm supply?
    - Response: This volatility will be simulated via the stochastic analysis.

Drew Burczyk – Presented the capacity expansion modeling overview and preliminary results from the draft reference case.

- Slide 104: Capacity Expansion Model Set Up
    - Question: Have you determined a limit that will be placed on market reliance?
        - Response: The limit on capacity purchases will be higher in the near term and will decrease over time. This allows the model more flexibility by not forcing it to meet all capacity need with new resources in the near-term. For energy purchases, we are limiting those to 15% of peak load. We plan to perform stochastic modeling on energy purchases.
    - Question: Is there a market capacity constraint by statute?
        - Response: Yes, CenterPoint needs 85% of their capacity covered before entering the MISO PRA (Planning Resource Auction) to meet the statute.
- Slide 106: Draft Working Model
    - Question: Is the capacity accreditation the same for PPA solar and utility owned solar?
        - Response: Yes.
- General Questions
    - Question: The base load is increasing. Is this consistent with historical trends? All scenarios have growth in demand.
        - Response: Historically the load has decreased primarily due to CenterPoint EE programs. The base load forecast does not include the impacts of EE since it is a selectable, additive option. Also, the federal codes and standards over the past ten years have resulted in savings significantly higher than what is projected.

General Q&A Section

- General Comment
    - Comment: CenterPoint has previously stated that they plan to be coal free by 2027. I would strongly encourage CenterPoint to consider a portfolio that is coal free by 2030 and look at what an aggressive buildout in renewables and battery storage would look like for customers.