

Utilities Policy Advisory Committee (UPAC) Wednesday, September 3, 2025 8:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Blue River Board Room

121 S. Tejon Plaza of the Rockies or Microsoft Teams

Join the meeting now

If you require an ADA-accessible version of this packet of information, please send an email to ub@csu.org or call 719-448-4800.

8:00 a.m.	1.	Call to Order	
8:05 a.m.	2.	Approval of August 8, 2025 UPAC Meeting Minutes	Decision
8:10 a.m.	3.	State of Colorado Energy Office	Discussion
9:30 a.m.	4.	Geothermal Assignment Timeline	Discussion
10:20 a.m.	5.	Customer Comment Residents can provide comment in person, by joining the meeting from computer or by phone using the link above. If you would like to speak during the customer comment period, please sign up to speak through BoardSubmissions@csu.org prior to the meeting.	Discussion
10:25 a.m.	6.	Committee Member General Discussion	
10:30 a.m.	7.	Adjournment	

Next meeting: October 1, 2025

Note: UPAC Bylaws, Rule 6: Customer and Public Comment: (b) At the discretion of the Chair, or the majority of the Committee Members present, customers and members of the public will be allowed to comment or ask questions concerning items discussed at regular meetings or concerning matters discussed at special meetings. Comments or questions by individuals will be limited to five minutes each, and all customer or public comments will not exceed twenty minutes on any agenda item unless time is extended by the Chair or majority of the Committee Members present.



Utilities Policy Advisory Committee (UPAC)

Wednesday, August 6, 2025 8:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Blue River Board Room
121 S. Tejon Plaza of the Rockies or Microsoft Teams

1. Call to Order

Chair Katherine Danner called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m..

Present – Vice Chair Michael Borden, Committee Member Larry Barrett, Committee Member Chris Meyer, Committee Member Scott Smith, Committee Member David Watson, Alternate Member Albert Badeau and Alternate Member Tom Carter

2. Approval of July 2, 2025 UPAC Meeting Minutes

Committee Member Smith made a motion to approve the meeting minutes and Vice Chair Borden seconded the motion. The minutes passed unanimously.

3. Geothermal Power Generation in Chaffee County—Mt. Princeton Geothermal, LLC Mr. Hank Held, Mr. Fred Henderson, and Mr. Michael Albrecht, founders of Mt. Princeton Geothermal, LLC., presented the Geothermal Power Generation in Chaffee County and gave an overview of what their company has done in Buena Vista, Colorado.

Committee Member Meyer asked if there were any special requirements for drilling the down holes. Mr. Albrecht stated they are using existing drilling materials used to drill oil and gas.

Committee Member Watson requested an explanation of the difference between the Turkey and Iceland powerplants. Mr. Albrecht explained that the powerplant in Turkey handles lower temperatures as opposed to the powerplant in Iceland.

Committee Member Carter asked for the distance between the prison and the energy source. Mr. Held stated the prison is about three miles from the energy source. Chair Danner asked for clarification on the economics of the plant system structure. Mr. Held explained that due to high cost, it is more beneficial to find heat sources that are near existing distribution lines.

The committee discussed the feasibility of generating power to the City of Colorado Springs and why the powerplant is only able to withhold 10 megawatts (MW) of power.

Vice Chair Borden asked if the steam from the powerplant was in a closed loop cycle. Both Mr. Held and Mr. Albrecht confirmed all the steam is enclosed.

Chair Danner inquired about community support around the site locations. Mr. Held stated those who are opposed are out of state residents who have vacation homes in the area. Chair

Danner commended Mr. Held and Mr. Albrecht for having a path forward even with opposition.

Mr. Held asked the committee for a letter of interest to move forward a partnership with Utilities. Ms. Natalie Watts, Strategic Planning and Governance Manager, advised this committee is a policy advisory committee and their task is to gather research for the current geothermal assignment. She stated UPAC is unable to make a commitment. Ms. Lisa Barbato, Chief System Planning and Projects Officer, followed up by stating Springs Utilities is looking into their Integrated Resource Plan and geothermal energy will be a part of it. She confirmed Springs Utilities is not ready to submit a letter of interest at this time.

The committee thanked Mr. Held and Mr. Albrecht for their presentation and all the information they provided.

The committee took a break at 9:45 a.m. and returned at 9:51 a.m.

4. Geothermal Assignment Timeline

Ms. Bethany Schoemer, Strategic Planning and Governance Specialist, discussed the approved geothermal assignment scope and the draft timeline.

Vice Chair Borden referenced getting someone from the Distributed Energy Resources (DER) to come and speak.

Committee Member Burghart suggested recommending the Utilities Board not lose sight of geothermal energy.

UPAC members discussed the relevance of proposed guest speakers to the assignment scope.

Committee Member Meyer proposed revisiting the timeline after the September meeting. All members of the committee agreed to reassess at that time.

Chair Danner suggested holding a workshop in the middle of October to further discuss key topics of the assignment scope. The idea was supported by other committee members.

5. Customer Comment

There were no customer comments.

6. Committee Member General Discussion

Alternate Member Carter stated he attended the Advances in Nuclear Fuel Conference and advised the United States Airforce is looking for a micro reactor in Alaska.

7. Adjournment

Chair Danner adjourned the meeting at 10:14 a.m. The next meeting will be on September 3, 2025.



Geothermal Assignment Timeline

September 3, 2025

Geothermal Energy Assignment Scope

- 1. Is geothermal energy a feasible source of energy in Colorado and for Colorado Springs Utilities? What should Springs Utilities be doing to prepare for geothermal generation in the future?
- 2. What is the state of the technology? And what are the associated project risks?
- 3. What is the cost range for different options? Should cost be seen as prohibitive?
- 4. What are the environmental pros and cons?
- 5. Are the water constraints in Colorado a prohibitive factor?
- 6. What is the regulatory/legal environment in Colorado and nationally?

Geothermal Energy Assignment Scope

- 7. Are there federal grants, private investment opportunities or other funding that Springs Utilities should investigate?
- 8. What is the permitting environment? Are there any that have been permitted in CO? Are there public land considerations? What is the build out timeframe?
- 9. What is being done domestically and internationally in areas with similar water limitations and climate and altitude are found?
- 10. What are the opportunities for partnerships and collaboration?
- 11. What is recommended for the frequency of UPAC re-examining this topic, including for the EIRP?
- 12. Based on this assignments' findings, what if any are areas needing further evaluation by UPAC?

Colorado Springs Utilities

6 of 8

Draft Timeline

- July 2025: Assignment approved by Utilities Board
- August 2025: Mt. Princeton Geothermal, LLC
- September 2025: Colorado Energy Office
- October 2025: American Public Power Association
- October 2025: Working session
- November 2025: TBD
- December 2025: Begin concluding assignment
- January 2026: Utilities Board recommendation

