

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

PROCEEDING NO. 25D-0183G

IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT PETITION OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO AND THE COLORADO ENERGY OFFICE FOR APPROVAL OF SELECT GAS PLANNING PILOT COMMUNITIES AS DIRECTED BY HOUSE BILL (HB) 24-1370.

**COMMISSION DECISION ADDRESSING
INTERVENTIONS; DENYING REQUEST FOR
EVIDENTIARY HEARING; GRANTING PETITION; AND
PROVIDING GUIDANCE FOR FUTURE STEPS**

Issued Date: June 26, 2025

Adopted Date: June 18, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BY THE COMMISSION	2
A. Statement	2
B. Procedural Background	3
C. Discussion.....	4
1. Petition	4
2. Interventions	7
3. Initial Comments	8
4. Responsive Comments	13
D. Findings and Conclusions.....	15
1. Interventions and Process.....	15
2. Petition and Draft Partnership Agreement	16
3. Next Steps	17
II. ORDER.....	18
A. The Commission Orders That:	18
B. ADOPTED IN COMMISSIONERS’ WEEKLY MEETING: June 18, 2025.....	19

I. BY THE COMMISSION**A. Statement**

1. Public Service Company of Colorado (“Public Service” or the “Company”) and the Colorado Energy Office (“CEO”) (together, “Joint Petitioners”) jointly filed the Petition for Approval of Selected Gas Planning Pilot Communities and Submittal of Proposed Partnership Agreement (“Petition”) on April 30, 2025, pursuant to House Bill (“HB”) 24-1370. The Petition seeks approval of three Primary Communities and two Backup Communities. Concurrent with the Petition and in accordance with HB 24-1370, Joint Petitioners submitted an associated draft agreement upon which the Company and approved communities will negotiate the terms of their partnership (“Draft Partnership Agreement”).

2. By this Decision, the Commission grants the Joint Petition and provides additional context as to the anticipated next steps for the Commission’s review of Gas Planning Pilot Communities pursuant to HB 24-1370. In accordance with § 40-3.3-102(2)(c), C.R.S., the City and County of Denver (“Denver”); the Town of Winter Park (“Winter Park”); the City of Boulder (“Boulder”); the City of Breckenridge (“Breckenridge”); and the City of Golden (“Golden”) comprise the list of the proposed Gas Planning Pilot Communities. We further establish the parties to this Proceeding: Public Service, CEO, Denver, the Office of the Utility Consumer Advocate (“UCA”), Boulder, and Breckenridge. Finally, we deny the request made by UCA for an evidentiary hearing and the requests by certain intervening parties to order modifications to the Draft Partnership Agreement in this Proceeding.

B. Procedural Background

3. On April 30, 2025, Public Service and CEO jointly filed the Petition and associated Draft Partnership pursuant to requirements in HB 24-1370 as codified at § 40-3.3-102(2)(a), C.R.S.

4. By Decision No. C25-0356-I, the Commission set a shortened notice and intervention period through May 14, 2025, as well as encouraged written public comments regarding the Petition.

5. On May 14, 2025, the Commission received motions to intervene from Denver, Boulder, and Breckenridge.

6. On May 14, 2025, the Commission received notice of intervention as a matter of right by the UCA.

7. The Commission also received initial stakeholder comments on May 14, 2025, from UCA, Denver, Winter Park, Colorado Communities for Climate Action (“CC4CA”), the Southwest Energy Efficiency Project (“SWEEP”), Golden, the Conservation Coalition,¹ and Breckenridge. On May 22, 2025, the Commission received initial comments from Boulder.

8. The Commission received responsive comments on May 23, 2025, from Public Service/CEO, UCA, Breckenridge, and Denver.

9. The Commission also received comments from members of the public and State Senator Hon. Cathy Kipp.

¹ The Conservation Coalition’s comments were signed by members of Sierra Club Colorado Chapter, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Colorado Jewish Climate Action, Healthy Air and Water Colorado, Building Decarbonization Coalition, Tracey Bernett, Clean Energy Economy for the Region, Rewiring America, Pueblo’s Energy Future, 350 Colorado, Conservation Colorado, Natural Resources Defense Council, Western Resource Advocates, Environmental Defense Fund, and Mountain Mamas.

C. Discussion

1. Petition

10. HB 24-1370 established a process by which dual-fuel utilities can partner with communities to mutually explore opportunities for neighborhood-scale alternatives energy projects, or non-pipeline alternatives (“NPA”). The statute establishes minimum criteria that a local government must meet in order to become a “Gas Planning Pilot Community.”²

11. HB 24-1370 required CEO to issue a request for information (“RFI”) to identify local governments interested in becoming a Gas Planning Pilot Community no later than December 1, 2024. In the Petition, the Joint Petitioners state that CEO solicited communities through several avenues to ensure eligible communities were informed of the process and able to apply to become a Gas Planning Pilot Community, including working with the Colorado Municipal League, CC4CA, and distributing the RFI to community contacts. The Joint Petitioners filed the results of that RFI as Attachment B to the Petition.

12. CEO and Public Service evaluated the responses to CEO’s RFI and asked for additional feedback from communities which was included as Attachment B to this Petition. They received responses from: Breckenridge, the City of Fort Collins (“Fort Collins”), the City of Louisville (“Louisville”), Denver, Winter Park, Boulder, Golden, and the Town of Erie (“Erie”).³

² A “gas planning pilot community” means a local government in which constituents have gas service provided by a dual-fuel utility and an active franchise agreement with the dual-fuel utility, which local government formally indicates an interest in working with the dual-fuel utility to mutually explore opportunities for neighborhood-scale alternatives projects, including through the exchange of utility gas infrastructure data and community development plans. § 40-3.3-102(1)(7), C.R.S.

³ The Joint Petition does not indicate that there are any plans to proceed with Fort Collins, Erie, or Louisville.

13. HB 24-1370 further required the Company and the Gas Planning Pilot Communities to rank and prioritize projects⁴ within each community based on local government input and consideration of several factors, including: (a) the number and customer class served; (b) the degree of support for the project from impacted customers; (c) the cost-effectiveness of the project; (d) the net cost to customers potentially participating in the project; (e) the availability of alternative energy service; (f) the availability of thermal energy networks; (g) whether the project would serve new development, existing customers, or both; (h) prioritization of projects included in a gas infrastructure plan (“GIP”); and (i) the location of nearby disproportionately impacted communities.⁵ CEO and Public Service individually evaluated and scored the responses and the combined scores determined the top five communities.⁶ The order of highest scored as follows: (1) Denver; (2) Winter Park; (3) Boulder; (4) Breckenridge; and (5) Golden.⁷

14. Once CEO and the Company developed the top five communities, the Company evaluated the proceedings in which it could be directed to pursue non-pipeline alternatives or alternative energy services, including the Thermal Energy Network Pilot (Proceeding No. 24A-0369G), the Mountain Energy Project (Proceeding No. 25A-0044EG), and the 2025-2030 Gas Infrastructure Plan (Proceeding No. 25A-0220G). As part of that evaluation, the Company identified that there were no GIP planned projects within Winter Park, meaning that designating the community as a Gas Planning Pilot Community may not have as much of an impact as

⁴ These projects would either target the decommissioning of a portion of the gas distribution system or target the avoiding of expansion of the gas distribution system for new construction and would provide alternative energy service (such as geothermal, all-electric construction, or thermal energy heating) to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the building sector.

⁵ See § 40-3.3-103(1), C.R.S.

⁶ Petition, p. 6.

⁷ *Id.*

designating a community with planned projects, as the statute directs data sharing for GIP planned projects.⁸

15. HB 24-1370 also required Public Service and CEO to jointly file with the Commission the results of the RFI no later than April 30, 2025. In their filing with the Commission, they shall identify up to five proposed gas planning pilot communities and provide a draft agreement between the Company and any proposed gas planning pilot community. Because of the lack of projects in Winter Park, and because of the Company's concerns with resource availability to move forward with five communities at once, the Joint Petitioners bring forward (1) Denver, (2) Boulder, and (3) Breckenridge as the recommended communities for the Company to begin negotiations with as Gas Planning Pilot Communities. The Joint Petitioners also recommend Winter Park and Golden as "Backup Communities."⁹

16. Public Service and CEO agree that moving forward at this time with three Gas Planning Pilot Communities is appropriate due to the magnitude of gas-related proceedings pending or expected before the Commission. Public Service states that it is concerned that committing to more than three Gas Planning Pilot Communities will leave the Company spread too thinly to properly serve the communities and support potential projects and may unduly burden or lead to a poor experience for the communities on projects that the Company is unable to support to the best of its capabilities.¹⁰

17. In the Petition, the Joint Petitioners request that the Commission issue a final decision as soon as possible, but no later than June 30, 2025. The Petition seeks approval of the three Primary Communities and the two Backup Communities.

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ *Id.* at p. 8.

¹⁰ *Id.* at p. 7.

2. Interventions

18. On May 14, 2025, the Commission received a Motion to Intervene from Denver. As grounds for intervention, Denver states that it and its residents and businesses purchase natural gas, electricity, and steam from Public Service. Denver highlights its aim to eliminate 100 percent of its greenhouse gas emissions by 2040, including all new buildings and homes performing as net zero energy by 2030, and all existing buildings and homes performing as net zero energy by 2040. Denver states that its score on the CEO/Public Service RFI was the highest of all communities, and that the contents of the Draft Partnership Agreement are highly consequential to Denver as it will provide the foundation of the partnership between Public Service and approved communities. Denver seeks to intervene to explore several topics, including: the Joint Petitioners' selection of Gas Planning Pilot Communities, including criteria used and the final recommendation of primary and backup communities; the terms outlined in the draft partnership agreement; and the proposed data and information to be shared with Gas Planning Pilot Communities to identify and evaluate potential neighborhood-scale alternatives projects.

19. On May 14, 2025, the Commission received notice of intervention as a matter of right by the UCA. In its filing, UCA requests a formal evidentiary hearing to determine if approval of the Joint Petition and the relief requested is just, reasonable and in the public interest. UCA plans to address several issues including: (1) information regarding the specific locations proposed for the primary communities as Gas Planning Pilot Communities; (2) whether there is a need for backup communities; (3) the relation of the proposed gas planning in this Proceeding to other ongoing proceedings, including the Company's current Gas Infrastructure Plan and Clean Heat Plan, as well as the ongoing Mountain Energy Project Application and Proceeding

24A-0369G, PSCo's Thermal Energy Pilot Application; and (d) potential rate impacts of these pilots, and whether the projects result in no cost shift to nonparticipating customers.

20. On May 14, 2025, the Commission received a Motion for Intervention from Boulder. In its Motion, Boulder requests intervention because it is a large customer of Public Service and many of its citizens and businesses are also Public Service customers. Boulder seeks to intervene in this Proceeding to protect its interests with respect to its current status as a selected Gas Planning Pilot Community. In addition, it may address certain issues, including: (1) approval of the Petition; (2) approval and changes to the Draft Partnership Agreement; (3) data sharing; (4) compliance with statutory provisions; and (5) the potential for inclusion of additional communities as primary Gas Planning Communities.

21. On May 14, 2025, the Commission received a Motion for Intervention from Breckenridge. In its Motion for Intervention, Breckenridge states good cause for its intervention exists because Breckenridge seeks to become a Gas Planning Pilot Community and that its interests in this Proceeding align with its interests in the Mountain Energy Project proceeding in which it is also an intervenor. Breckenridge seeks leave to intervene to review and provide recommendations on the Draft Partnership Agreement, to ensure compliance with HB 24-1370, and to advance its residents' environmental, health, and economic interests that may be affected by the outcome of this proceeding.

3. Initial Comments

22. In addition to comments from individuals, the Commission also received initial stakeholder comments on May 14, 2025, from UCA, Denver, Winter Park, CC4CA, SWEEP, Golden, the Conservation Coalition, and Breckenridge. On May 22, 2025, the Commission received initial comments from Boulder.

23. In its initial comments, UCA argues that the Commission should disregard the two backup communities as an “unnecessary expense” which would be passed on to ratepayers and that is unnecessary pursuant to the statute. UCA states that its position is similar to its position in Proceeding No. 24A-0369G, in which the assigned Administrative Law Judge recently found that the evidentiary record did not support approval of additional backup projects. UCA argues that like in Proceeding No. 24A-0369G, concerns about ratepayer affordability and the necessity of backup communities/projects and the associated additional compounding expenses from nascent technologies in the process of evaluation support denial of the backup communities.

24. CC4CA raises concerns with the Petition’s request that only three communities move forward as Priority Communities and argues that both Golden and Winter Park scored very highly and are deserving of selection in addition to the other three communities. CC4CA raises that the inclusion of a project in a GIP is just one of several factors to be used in the evaluation, but not a mandatory requirement. CC4CA also raises that it is concerned that the Draft Partnership Agreement unfairly favors Public Service at the expense of the local governments. Finally, CC4CA is concerned that the Draft Partnership Agreement inappropriately narrows the categories of projects in which Public Service will share information with a local government.

25. SWEEP argues that the language of HB 24-1370 establishes prioritization of pipeline segments that are part of projects included in a GIP as one community ranking criteria, but that there are other criteria to consider as well, and so Winter Park should not be disqualified for not having any GIP projects within its community. SWEEP is also concerned that moving forward with only Boulder, Denver, and Breckenridge may not lead to any new Neighborhood-Scale Alternatives being identified because these communities are already partnering with the Company, but the two Backup Communities are, to SWEEP’s knowledge, not

currently working with the Company. SWEEP also highlights that HB 24-1370 specifically provides a pathway for communities who receive gas service from Public Service and electric service from a cooperative or municipal utility to engage in this process and attempt to work out agreements between the two utilities and Winter Park is the only proposed communities that does not receive both gas and electric service from Public Service and, thus, presents an important opportunity to identify how it may be possible to work with multiple utilities in identifying Neighborhood-Scale Alternatives Projects.

26. SWEEP also provides comments to the Draft Partnership Agreement. It suggests redlines to eliminate what it characterizes as giving the Company “veto power over any project for any reason”¹¹ and also changes that would not limit the sharing of information about projects not included in the GIP to capacity expansion and new business projects with an investment of greater than \$3 million.

27. Conservation Coalition states it is concerned with the proposal to move forward with only three communities and asks the Commission to move forward with all five of the highest-scoring communities as Primary Gas Planning Pilot Communities. It also raises a similar concern to SWEEP that requiring inclusion in a GIP as a requirement for consideration is contrary to the statutory requirements, which has inclusion in the GIP as one of many criteria that must be considered in identifying and ranking projects. It argues that this blanket exclusion circumvents the collaborative process between local governments and Public Service, by limiting consideration to projects already identified by the Company instead of allowing local governments to also bring forward project ideas for consideration. The Conservation Coalition also states it is concerned that the Draft Partnership Agreement unfairly allows Public Service to veto projects and limits data

¹¹ SWEEP Initial Comments, p. 6.

sharing for new projects to capacity expansion and new constructions, to the exclusion of new projects under the categories of system safety and integrity and mandatory relocation.

28. Winter Park requests that the Commission reconsider its inclusion as a gas planning pilot community. Winter Park states its committed to advancing geothermal energy and energy efficiency improvements and would embrace the opportunity to work with Xcel. Winter Park indicates that it has received funding from CEO to complete a second phase feasibility study for a thermal energy network in its downtown corridor which will occur later this year.

29. In its comments, Golden requests reconsideration as a Gas Planning Pilot Community and requests to be approved as part of the five communities allowed for by HB 24-1370. Golden argues that its pilot can offer benefits to all parties, and that it is committed to pursuing geothermal projects. It highlights that its existing rebates support rebates provided for by Xcel, and that it has a vision for a site in Golden that includes a mix of all-electric buildings served by a localized geothermal utility district. Golden states that it broke ground this month on 34 geothermal wells for the first building in this neighborhood. Golden offers that it would share the data collected from this project to consider design of the potential geothermal district including geologic conditions for drilling, thermal conductivity, and costs.

30. Denver comments that it supports the Commission selecting five Gas Planning Pilot Communities and believes that the top five communities have demonstrated their willingness to bring resources, including funding and staff, to support these initiatives. Denver also argues that the statute does not define “neighborhood-scale decommissioning projects” as “NPAs” and the Petition’s focus on framing the issue only on NPAs is misplaced. Denver emphasizes that capacity constraint projects are not the only type of projects that this process should focus on. Denver argues the data sharing required by HB 24-1370 should be considered a floor, not a ceiling, and that after

signing appropriate non-disclosure agreements, community staff should have access to GIS-based map locating Public Service's gas infrastructure that can be used to identify end-of-line segments that are ripe for decommissioning. Denver also proposes that replacement and repair projects should also be considered as they represent a critical opportunity to decommission parts of the gas distribution system that are aging and require repair.

31. Breckenridge indicates in its initial comments that a major source of concern for it is to what extent the Company is willing and able to employ cost recovery mechanisms in developing, constructing, and operating neighborhood-scale alternative projects, and is concerned that the Draft Partnership Agreement is not explicit enough. It also has concerns with the unilateral protections and veto power afforded to the Company by the Draft Partnership Agreement, as well as its proposed data sharing provisions. Breckenridge also proposes that community engagement and educational efforts on projects should be a shared burden between the community and the utility. Breckenridge provided redlines attached to its comments to address proposals to meet each of these concerns.

32. Boulder supports the approval of the Gas Planning Pilot Communities but suggests the Commission make five findings or changes to the Petition and Draft Partnership Agreement. First, Boulder argues that requiring projects to be included in a six-year GIP prohibits communities from proposing projects and is inconsistent with statute. Boulder is concerned with the exclusion of Winter Park as a prioritized community and suggests that the Commission reject the proposed narrow focus on inclusion in the GIP as the determining criteria. Second, Boulder suggests approving five communities. Finally, Boulder suggests three changes to the Draft Partnership Agreement—Public Service should not have unilateral veto of projects, projects consideration should include system safety and integrity projects as well as new business and capacity expansion

projects, and Public Service should have to make all necessary data available to communities to support evaluation and planning. Boulder recommends that the Commission more clearly delineate an efficient process to resolve any conflicts regarding data sharing that may arise, consistent with C.R.S. 40-103.3.3(2)(a)(III) and (IV) and provides a redline as an attachment to its comments to effectuate these proposals.

4. Responsive Comments

33. The Commission received responsive comments on May 23, 2025, from Public Service/CEO, UCA, Breckenridge, and Denver.

34. Joint Petitioners provided response comments that include one section of comments supported by both CEO and the Company which reiterate its proposal for approval of five communities, with three as Primary Communities and two as Backup Communities. CEO and Public Service share concerns over resource availability to move forward with five communities at once and share in the expense and affordability concerns raised by UCA. They also highlight the numerous other proceedings before the Commission in which the Commission could address alternative gas service.

35. The Company also provided a redlined version of the Draft Partnership Agreement that CEO does not take a position on. The Company's redlined Draft Partnership Agreement includes several changes proposed by commenters, including the addition of more collaborative language, the removal of the Company's "sole and absolute discretion" regarding cost consideration, and adding a 20-business day timeframe for dispute resolution. The Company also states that it will in good-faith negotiate with communities to reach a signed agreement and that specific concerns raised by a community may be addressed in that negotiation process.

The Company asserts it is inefficient and a poor process in this expedited proceeding for the Commission to attempt to resolve all contractual issues raised in the comments.

36. The Company also argues that expanding the data sharing requirements beyond what is already proposed in the Draft Partnership Agreement is not required by § 40-3.3-102(5)(a)(I), C.R.S., which requires only that the Company provide project information for all planned gas infrastructure projects located in a Gas Planning Pilot Community within the six-year gas project planning forecast in the Company's most recent Gas Infrastructure Plan;" and (2) future projects that were "not included in the [GIP] but that represent emerging capacity expansion or new business projects that require Company investment of at least \$3 million." The Company asserts that the Draft Partnership Agreement already commits the Company to share more data than is required by HB24-1370 and any additional expansion would be unreasonable. The Company also opposes the commenter proposals to remove the provision that allowed the Company to find a project unwarranted due to "unreasonably high anticipated costs." The Company is concerned that if such edits are approved by the Commission then the Commission would be giving the Company's prudence responsibility to individual communities. The Company also opposes the change suggested by SWEEP and Breckenridge to change the data processing from 20 to 15 business days.

37. UCA responds to the initial comments to make three points. First, it reiterates its concerns about cost effectiveness and overall spending, and therefore states that Public Service may be in the best position to evaluate the cost effectiveness of proposed pilots, despite comments suggesting that decision-making regarding what projects move forward should be shared between Public Service and the communities. UCA also argues that it too shares concerns about replacement and repair projects but that initiatives or projects to mitigate Public Service's system

safety and integrity projects does not appear to fit the intent of HB 24-1370 and its focus on “neighborhood-scale alternatives projects.” Finally, UCA argues that Winter Park and Golden should not be made primary communities because it will help contain costs that will be borne by all gas ratepayers.

38. Breckenridge provided a second set of comments in which it reiterated its support for five communities and disputes the use of GIP inclusion as a criterion for selecting communities. Breckenridge also comments that it supports comments from others that replacement and repair projects should be included and generally supports the redlined proposals of other communities to the Draft Partnership Agreement.

39. Denver also provided a redline of proposed changes to the Draft Partnership Agreement in its second round of comments. Denver’s proposed modifications include that communities should get the same access to the GIP maps that Public Service expects to make available in its upcoming GIP filing, and that communities should retain their right to file dissenting comments or testimony in support of projects the Company has decided not to include or deem viable in any application before the Commission. Denver also reiterates its support for the inclusion of five communities and argues that the projects proposed by Winter Park and Golden are aligned and supported by a variety of state proposals beyond HB 24-1370.

D. Findings and Conclusions

1. Interventions and Process

40. The Commission received notice of intervention from UCA. Pursuant to Rule 4 *Code of Colorado Regulations* (“CCR”) 723-1-1401(b) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, no decision is required in response to appropriately filed notices of intervention by right. The intervention of right by UCA is acknowledged and UCA is a party to this Proceeding.

41. The Commission received motions for intervention from Breckenridge, Boulder, and Denver. Rule 1401(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 4 CCR 7 23-1, requires persons seeking permissive intervention to show the following, in pertinent part:

A motion to permissively intervene shall state the specific grounds relied upon for intervention; the claim or defense within the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction on which the requested intervention is based, including the specific interest that justifies intervention; and why the filer is positioned to represent that interest in a manner that will advance the just resolution of the proceeding. The motion must demonstrate that the subject proceeding may substantially affect the pecuniary or tangible interests of the movant (or those it may represent) and that the movant's interests would not otherwise be adequately represented.

42. Each of the intervention pleadings meets the requirements of Rule 1401, 4 CCR 723-1 regarding permissive intervention and thus are parties to this Proceeding.

43. Pursuant to § 40-3.3-102(2)(b), C.R.S., the Commission shall provide an opportunity for the public to submit written comments on the filing. The Commission solicited public comment through Decision No. C25-0356-I and received comment from numerous stakeholders. In its intervention, UCA requests that the Commission also hold a hearing. However, the Commission must also approve or modify the list of proposed Gas Planning Communities no later than June 30, 2025. In light of this statutory deadline and the fulsome public comments already received, the Commission finds additional hearing unnecessary at this time.

2. Petition and Draft Partnership Agreement

44. With regard to the substance of the Petition, we find good cause to grant the Petition. Section 40-3.3-102(2)(c), C.R.S., requires the Commission to approve or modify the list of proposed gas planning pilot communities, but requires that the Commission shall not increase the number of proposed communities beyond five. We find that all five proposed communities have met the criteria set forth in § 40-3.3-102, C.R.S. to be eligible Gas Planning Pilot

Communities. While we decline to label certain communities as Primary or Back Up communities, we also agree with Denver and other commenters that the Company can prioritize resources as it sees fit. We therefore grant the Petition to approve the Gas Planning Pilot Communities as required by § 40-3.3-102(2)(c), C.R.S., with the understanding that the Company will prioritize its capacity to engage with communities as it sees fit.

45. We also acknowledge the filing of the Draft Partnership Agreement and updated redline of the Draft Partnership Agreement filed by Public Service in compliance with § 40-3.3-103(2)(a), C.R.S. The Draft Partnership Agreement as amended by the Company's May 23, 2025 redline is a positive starting point for negotiations with the communities. We agree with the Company that this Proceeding is not well-suited to litigate all proposed changes to the Draft Partnership Agreement and encourage communities to negotiate for terms they proposed in this Proceeding.

3. Next Steps

46. Pursuant to HB 24-1370, CEO, the Company, and the Commission must complete specific items by a prescribed timeline. The Petition satisfies CEO and Public Service's obligation pursuant to § 40-3.3-102(2)(a), C.R.S., to file with the Commission the results of the request for information required by § 40-3.3-102(1)(a), C.R.S., no later than April 30, 2025. This Decision also satisfies the Commission's obligation to approve or modify the list of proposed Gas Planning Pilot Communities no later than June 30, 2025, pursuant to § 40-3.3-102(2)(c), C.R.S.

47. Other statutory obligations will be addressed by future process at the Commission. For example, the Company must establish a Partnership Agreement with each Gas Planning Pilot Community and file it with the Commission no later than October 1, 2025, or some later date as mutually agreed to by Public Service and the community. For administrative convenience, such

agreements shall be submitted into the Proceeding to be opened by the Commission to receive the data and information addressed in § 40-3.3-102(5), C.R.S.

48. By no later than June 1, 2026, in accordance with § 40-3.3-103(2)(a)(I), C.R.S., the Company and each community will jointly file for Commission approval of at least one initial neighborhood-scale alternatives project, along with a list of projects that will continue to be evaluated with the communities. These future filings should each take the form of a joint application. Also, by June 1, 2027, the Company and communities will jointly file for approval of one or more projects within the Gas Planning Pilot Communities, or shall file a report explaining why certain projects included in the 2026 filing are not being pursued. A filing for Commission approval of projects should take the form of a joint application filed in a new proceeding, while a report can be filed in the application proceeding previously opened to receive the 2026 filing. During these future application proceedings, or at another appropriate future date, concerns raised by UCA regarding the cost-effectiveness of certain projects can be addressed. However, the Commission finds that at this nascent stage in the process, it is inappropriate for the Commission to weigh in on cost-related concerns. The approval of the Petition only grants Public Service authority to move forward in negotiations, and the merits of respective projects will be addressed by future Commission decisions.

II. ORDER

A. The Commission Orders That:

1. The Motion for Intervention filed by the City and County of Denver on May 14, 2025, is granted.
2. The Motion for Intervention filed by the City of Boulder on May 14, 2025, is granted.

3. The Motion for Intervention filed by the Town of Breckenridge on May 14, 2025, is granted.

4. The Petition for Approval of Selected Gas Planning Pilot Communities and Submittal of Proposed Partnership Agreement filed April 30, 2025, jointly by Public Service Company of Colorado and the Colorado Energy Office pursuant to House Bill 24-1370, is granted, consistent with the discussion above.

5. This Proceeding is closed.

6. This Decision is effective immediately upon its Issued Date.

**B. ADOPTED IN COMMISSIONERS' WEEKLY MEETING:
June 18, 2025.**

(S E A L)



ATTEST: A TRUE COPY

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

ERIC BLANK

MEGAN M. GILMAN

TOM PLANT

Commissioners

Rebecca E. White,
Director