

SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)
May 20, 2024, 9:05 a.m. to 2:59 p.m.
WebEx 2496 527 9507

MINUTES

AGENDA ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER AND ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m., May 20, 2024, with a quorum present. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. Jason Tanner was noted as a proxy for Carrie Dixon, Steve Gaw was a proxy for David Mindham, Brian Johnson was a proxy for Jim Jacoby, and Michael Wegner was also noted as a proxy for Alan Myers for 1 hour (from 1:00p – 2:00p). Chair Raheem then reviewed the previous meeting's action items and agenda (Attachment A). Commissioner French (KCC) moved to approve the agenda as edited. Alan Myers (ITC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Ms. Russell reviewed the April 30 – May 1, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B). Commissioner French (KCC) moved to approve the previous meeting's minutes. Heather Starnes (MJMEUC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – TECHNICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Chair Raheem provided a high-level review of the priority changes noted based on feedback from the previous meeting. There was a great deal of discussion on moving some of the medium priorities to high impacts. The next steps will include putting the impacts into a schedule and getting into a roadmap. There are targeted topics for upcoming CPPTF discussion and highlighted key decisions to move high-priority topics forward. If the staff has a preferred option, that will drive the order of priority. Any additional scope to the CPP study or on-going studies can be accommodated into the schedule timelines. Chair Raheem reminded the group to be sure that decisions are improving cost certainty under the entry fee framework.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – ENTRY FEE FRAMEWORK

Chair Raheem provided a recap of the feedback and decisions from previous meetings on intra-queue priority and entry fee maintenance. He stated that the group talked about updating maintenance in each annual cycle and what would progress in each study. He reminded the group that there would be a focus on intra-queue priority options 1A & 1B. He indicated that the challenge would be determining which customer gets the first right for the generating sites going into their 20-year assessment. The question was around the need for a safeguard for intra-queue priority when we have an open window. Some developers felt that it wasn't needed to define intra-queue priority for general contribution to network upgrades. The customers

Antitrust: SPP strictly prohibits use of participation in SPP activities as a forum for engaging in practices or communications that violate the antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to, agreements between or among competitors regarding prices, bid and offer practices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.

would follow a first-ready, first-assign priority. Chair Raheem asked if there was any disagreement with the takeaway from the last meeting, and there was no response. The next item for discussion was to review the three entry fee maintenance decision points. The group voiced support for the enhanced estimation option. The group preferred minor adjustments to be needed between annual assessments to allow for minor changes and not to chase precision. An SPP member asked about where we are on stringent readiness criteria. Chair Raheem responded that we have developed accelerating financial commitments that we have today under decision point 2 where we enter the entry fee on an annual basis. We are developing software to submit online applications to validate quickly to have high degree of confidence that requests will be able to move forward. The two criteria will make us ready. A concern was voiced about kicking sites out due to size; some level of safeguards will be needed in place but we don't want to delay the buildout of generation. There was member discussion on the replacement process continuing in CPP. Chair Raheem stated that discussions could continue but wanted to determine if there were any disagreements of options 1A & 1B before moving forward. Chair Raheem reviewed the SPC action item to provide clarity regarding how risks of cost overruns and project delays are balanced between GI customers and load and develop recommendations that can be brought to SPC in July. The 2024 STEP report revealed that 90% of upgrades were coming from base plan funding mechanisms. There were projects directly assigned to customers and direct assigned cost carry forward with the customer as part of the study process and interconnection agreement. The direct-assignment bucket will carry forward with customers. Chair Raheem stated that a lot of sub-optimal locations will have more direct assigned upgrades if it's not a benefit to load; the focus will be around regional and sub-regional buckets which introduces putting the responsibility on customers. Option 2 would be a historical review of cost overruns and applied during the next assessment, which will allow for adjustments to carry forward. Both of the listed options did not apply to the current set of customers; for cost certainty to current customers, there must be a payment mechanism established. There was member discussion regarding the definition of cost overrun and comments on cost sharing and cost responsibility. One member stated that both sides are concerned about future generation, and that is better than just one side being concerned. A member stated that issues deserve a different level of scrutiny, and part of the equation is determining if we are handling things the way that they are being done to get ahead of it. The suggestion was made to respond to questions with examples to show how project selection is determined over time. Then present what we consider examples of how this would be handled under scenarios that members outlined to see if the questions and concerns are addressed. Another member commented on handling the fee regarding the cost of upgrades. It was stated that there is a good record on the cost but an issue to address is if there are systemic issues that are unknown but may be experienced in the future. He commented that staff may consider a bandwidth approach to address the variability to make something subject to refund when a project is due or goes in service as a way to protect all parties. The next item of discussion was regarding current day project delays. There is a requirement for an extension of in-service dates for impacted generators to allow for restudies as part of the project delay. PCWG is focusing on transmission upgrade delays and a phased approach. One approach to consider is SPC's discussion on GETs as a way to bridge the timing gap before network upgrades are in-service;

Antitrust: SPP strictly prohibits use of participation in SPP activities as a forum for engaging in practices or communications that violate the antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to, agreements between or among competitors regarding prices, bid and offer practices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.

the idea is to couple limited enhancement amounts with GETs to address project service delays. The staff would need to build out what is being done with GETs in response to upgrades under the CPP concept. Chair Raheem requested the team's thoughts on other ways of how to approach project delays under the CPP concept. One member stated that what comes out of the effort is important and if we can get something with additional options and get ahead of this by getting things built with an NTC that doesn't account for the fact that we need this tomorrow. Chair Raheem stated that we have the ability to implement topology optimization. There are pieces of FERC Order 1920 that will be incorporated, and it is an important area for everyone so we don't keep being behind the eight ball. He stated that this will keep NTC's from being delayed so they can move forward. An SPP staff member mentioned that we don't have a lot of network upgrades so Operations is managing the interconnects; we have to be aware of the bulk of the stability limit of the system. He commented that there are meetings with Operations this summer to start building this partnership to permit interconnections to go forward with our larger network upgrades. Another member echoed the SPP staff member's comments on using GETs as an interim solution for network upgrades. He stated that there may be room for GETs in the planning process as well; we would just need to put criteria around it. Based on how models are set up and overloads are triggered, we could look at criteria to use the planning process by putting rooms around it. Another member agreed that we can find solutions in a limited arena, but this would be the primary usage for GETs. Chair Raheem responded that we would have to justify comparing GETs to transmission solutions. The next item for discussion is of one CRIS DA benefit and how to approach the cost-sharing scenario. One member asked if we could calculate benefits for each region and what it would be (load ratio share or generation share?). Chair Raheem responded that we could calculate with the seven metrics that the FERC Order 1920 ruling put forward, which will make it more data-driven. Another member agreed on how to get this done in terms of this not occurring at the borders; it exists today in the byway upgrades (portion allocated to zone & portion allocated to region). He suggested that we handle this in the same way as determining percentages for the highway/byway concept (regional vs. sub-regional rates depending on highway/byway percentages). Another member stated that this suggestion should take into account that we shouldn't make this complicated with assessments to each region. He stated that we should think about what we want to accomplish with a planned regime, and we should look at how we handle the highway/byway to allow for CRIS constructs and what happens with C1 to continue with simplicity. Chair Raheem mentioned that there is education scheduled on HITT C1 and how it could impact the entry fee. Those interested can register on spp.org for the May 31st session. We would focus on the option 2B approach of how to build out for a more balanced approach. One member stated that we shouldn't eliminate other options without knowing where we are headed. Chair Raheem responded that if funding is needed from multiple generators, we could use the same process as what we have for GI customers in the bucket. The member agreed and stated that we don't want to have the same issue as today with dropouts causing higher costs, and it will lower the risk level. Chair Raheem responded that if we analyze properly, then we would think about this when setting the policy. This is the one-time waiver on the entry fee with the limited transferability option. Chair Raheem requested the group to review the transferability clause and keep things moving in the annual cycle. He asked for input from the

Antitrust: SPP strictly prohibits use of participation in SPP activities as a forum for engaging in practices or communications that violate the antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to, agreements between or among competitors regarding prices, bid and offer practices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.

group on the limits and how we define what "alike" is. He deferred further discussion and stated that we could resume when all members were available. We recapped that we have good direction on next steps for SPC action items and intra-queue across sub-regional area upgrades.

10-min break until 11:00a

AGENDA ITEM 4 – SCRIPT C3: COMMON MODEL APPROACH

David Duhart and Lottie Jones provided a SCRIPT C3 common model update on Modeling activities. They reviewed each of the sub-recommendations. Lottie outlined that C3.1 created the common base model. She stated that the goal for CPPTF is to keep the topology as close as possible to optimize projects, which would save time and be more streamlined on delivering models. There will be a discussion on whether July - April is the best time to have the most participation from SPP and data submitters. This will be discussed in MDAG this year and brought back to this group for an update. David summarized C3.2 as using the common model build data to dispatch generation as opposed to the operational bid data. This concept was brought to the MDAG, and members were on board with using this for dispatch because it brought visibility. One member questioned if there was an evaluation using this SCRIPT initiative to consolidate into future local areas (CRIS DA's, match C1 sub-regions, LRE firm transmission service I/O source and sinks, etc.) for how to get to the future of IBR in modeling areas. Chair Raheem stated that we should have an offline discussion with the Modeling team to have discussions with MDAG. David reviewed C3.3 and that it would change how we handle/currently use the MPM model using C3.1. Modeling is working with 1898 to develop alternatives to the feedback model. An SPP member asked if Modeling was handling two specs of source data. David confirmed that it is being brought down to one data source. The SPP member asked if GI schedules were included in the common model. Chair Raheem clarified that model assumptions are a good first step to getting to a single source of data. At some point, we will need to consolidate going forward. David stated that C3.4 is looking for a way to be more efficient with data in an analytical way. David explained that C3.5 combined ITP Powerflow with the Base Model benchmark to see if there is a potential time savings. SPP staff is still working on this recommendation for one benchmark. Next steps will be for the staff to introduce guidance documents to stakeholder groups and present recommendations. Lottie will get with Ramunda offline with action items for the Modeling team.

recessed for 45-minute lunch break following this agenda item – returned at 12:30p

AGENDA ITEM 5 – GENERATOR INTERCONNECTION ASSESSMENT

Chris Jamieson opened with the need to strengthen the base reliability model and simplify the DISIS. One member asked how the conventional resources benefits are being included. An SPP

Antitrust: SPP strictly prohibits use of participation in SPP activities as a forum for engaging in practices or communications that violate the antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to, agreements between or among competitors regarding prices, bid and offer practices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.

staff member responded that resources are being treated as capacity. He tried to lay out the plan for going a step further. Chris explained that we have a base reliability prime model to address the first question of how to address pre-transfer case criteria violations for initial reliability assessment. Any case violation would have to look at the portfolio as with any other base plan upgrade. SPP staff is in the works on how to address the second question of how GI congestion analysis can use the economic model and how we use this model to right-size the DISIS analysis. Chris stated that there are three types of assessments to be performed to gather transmission system limits or needs to build out CPP and the entry fee. This will provide more information on what the transmission system is capable of for the CPP resource plan and sites. He stated that if we have a good transmission build and ITP, then CRIS transition type analysis is more transfer. The difference between CRIS and DISIS is that there are two footprints. He explained that in DISIS we don't bring legacy units (never brought into the process) into the source. He described that in CRIS we bring in all units and the footprint looks different. Chris mentioned that we are currently suggesting a reliability look in year 20 (build BR', dynamic ready, DISIS, models for CRIS analysis, etc.). One member wanted us to be able to answer how we are attaching everything onto legacy BA's. He stated that it will make things better for how to manage change. SPP staff could do a baseline study to go into the new way of doing reliability models - taking into account network upgrades. Chris suggested creating a base reliability and adding sites into the model. He mentioned that we have several footprint options (LRE, LBA, LOLE zones, DA, or BA). The recommendation is DA with inter-DA transfer equal to ITP BR model. There was a great deal of discussion from members to get clarity on the base reliability model and to merge the information, and an SPP staff member explained that adding resources which have interconnection agreements that get dispatched. One member asked if we would build facilities thru ITP and then spread them instead of being assigned costs through the process. He claimed that there would be cost allocation issues through this process. An SPP staff member responded that there will be long-term assessments and we should treat resources as a CRIS resource to understand cost. Chair Raheem stated that this group feedback will help to set up cost assumptions. Another member recognized that DA's align with what we have been talking about regarding the resiliency discussions. He stated that all of these concepts need to be brought into the same equation (deliver through & across the CRIS zones, lack of availability in the current CRIS zones). The idea of seeing this as one common idea to address based upon the must-do. He voiced that the details are not concise. This should be driven down to understand the concepts clearly on why this is the positive thing to do. A third member agreed that more clarity was needed and doesn't know what level of deliverability we should be studying. He asked how this is built into the entry fee as opposed to how much is a reliability benefit that will flow to load. An SPP staff member stated that we will work within the construct of having the CRIS adder for deliverability to the entry fee. He stated that we need to define what we want the system to do and what is the reinforcement criteria that we want to set. A member said that we should ask if the customers would be interested in the entry fee. The SPP staff member responded that we need to define a baseline for ERIS & CRIS and determine what analysis we want to do to see what appetite the developers have regarding ERIS. Another member stated that we could list the minimum requirements with assessed costs to do so for ERIS & CRIS. A different member had a concern about transferring costs to ERIS units. He then

Antitrust: SPP strictly prohibits use of participation in SPP activities as a forum for engaging in practices or communications that violate the antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to, agreements between or among competitors regarding prices, bid and offer practices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.

stated that this dialogue has not helped him and sounds different than what he has heard and understood. He requested that it be clarified at the next meeting. Chair Raheem recommended that we move the dialogue forward by taking an action to document the assumptions in a concise straw proposal that looks at benefits under a CRIS structure as the baseline and proactively planning it for ERIS only and as a CRIS adder (need to evaluate risk reward and compare options for entry fee accuracy and inform about transmission needs) in the June meeting. He stated that based on the June meeting, SPP staff may need to repurpose a CNAT meeting and open up to the wider group to talk through the details of the straw proposal. One member stated that we need to define who customers are, what the analysis is, who benefits, and what the different structures are with which we need to be concerned.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – CPP SCOPE & FUTURES RECOMMENDATIONS

Joshua Norton recapped the discussion from the last meeting. He presented straw proposals for futures and siting in ongoing CPP cycles as well as the CPP transition study. He showed that our peak loads have been increasing, and load is the main driver in futures and needing more resources. He stated that the FERNs analysis is a long-term analysis for use as a first version of the zonal capacity plan. He requested that the CPPTF endorse two futures and siting plans to be used in the CPP transition study, futures to be developed with consideration of the FERNs scenarios and approved by ESWG, and following ITP manual procedures for working group responsibilities. One member stated that the two futures should be evaluated because FERC Order 1920 will have three scenarios, and we need to know how this plays into using the transition study for this. Another member agreed that we need to understand how FERC Order 1920 works with this before determining the number of futures. He stated what we shouldn't just do it how it's always been done. He explained that we need to take into account big drivers such as load growth being different than in the past and determine if two futures will be enough to span the amount of load growth and give us what we need - it will involve the question of resource mix. He requested to see the siting information used for the FERNs study and asked can the FERNs scenarios be used here. He also inquired if we will get adequate stakeholder support for the transition study. He stated that SPC should be involved in this discussion because it is a basic change in direction and we want people on board with the assumptions/outcomes. He is not ready to endorse today with FERC Order 1920 just coming out. A third member agreed that we will need to look at FERC Order 1920 and may need three futures. He prefers three futures but would rather have two good futures. The second member responded that we need to understand from a compliance standpoint as well as being prepared for what we will take to FERC (strengthening our hand for the filing). The third member agreed that we need to understand the language first. Chair Raheem stated that the timeline on when we need to get SPC action on the futures and when to have this discussion with ESWG is needed from Joshua. It was proposed to do this evaluation more frequently than every five years, and we can discuss under the two or three future approach. He explained that FERNs doesn't have a baseline future, so this may be where we need guidance from SPC.

Antitrust: SPP strictly prohibits use of participation in SPP activities as a forum for engaging in practices or communications that violate the antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to, agreements between or among competitors regarding prices, bid and offer practices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.

AGENDA ITEM 8 – Wrap Up and Action Items

Chair Raheem and Ms. Russell reviewed the upcoming meeting dates and action items from the meeting:

- SPP staff to draft education materials for the next meeting to review with this group - include examples of the portfolio-based approach (will post with background materials)
- Identified the need for in-service requirements – SPP staff will check with PCWG reps for an update on phase 2 to bring to the June meeting
- SPP staff to define a baseline for ERIS & CRIS and determine what analysis we want to do - to document the assumptions in a concise straw proposal that looks at benefits under a CRIS structure as the baseline and proactively planning it for ERIS only and as a CRIS adder (need to evaluate risk reward and compare options for entry fee accuracy and inform about transmission needs)
- SPP staff to review FERC Order 1920 in relation to the number of futures and understand the language
- Joshua to provide the timeline on when we need to get SPC action on the futures and when to have this discussion with ESWG

Confirmed that the St Louis meeting will be at the same hotel as the SPC meeting (Marriott)

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 2:59 p.m.

Attachments: Agenda, 04/30 – 05/01/24 Minutes, Attendance List

SOUTHWEST POWER POOL, INC.
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)

May 20, 2024: 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. CT

WebEx: 2496 527 9507 | Password: yMfE3y5Pgi4

This meeting will be recorded. By attending the meeting, you are consenting to be recorded.

AGENDA

- 1) **Call to Order and Administrative Items** (15 mins.)
 - a) Administrative Items.....Ramunda Russell & Sunny Raheem
 - b) Previous Meeting’s Action Items..... Sunny Raheem
 - c) Agenda ([Approval](#)) Sunny Raheem
 - d) Meeting Minutes..... Ramunda Russell
 - i) April 30 – May 1, 2024 ([Approval](#))

- 2) **Technical Impact Assessment** (15 mins.)..... Sunny Raheem
High-level review of priority changes based on feedback from previous meetings.

- 3) **Entry Fee Framework** (90 mins.)..... Sunny Raheem
Recap feedback and decisions from previous meetings for intra-queue priority and entry fee maintenance. Review approaches for cross-subregional area HV upgrades, direct assigned allocations, and withdrawal impacts after Entry Fee commitment.
 - a) Review Previous Meetings Decisions: Intra-Queue Priority, Entry Fee Maintenance
 - b) SPC Action Item: Risk Premium for Transmission costs and delays
 - c) Cross Subregional Area HV Upgrades
 - d) Direct Assigned Allocation

- Break (5-15 mins)*

- 4) **SCRIPT C3: Common Model Approach** (50 mins.)..... David Duhart/Lottie Jones
2026 ITP and CPP Transition Study assessment base model approach update

Lunch (30 - 60 mins)

- 5) **Generator Interconnection Assessment** (90 mins.)Chris Jamieson & Kelsey Allen
The DISIS impact assessment in the CPP assessment
 - a) ERIS: Invest, Connect, and Manage
 - b) CRIS: Invest, Connect, and Deliver
 - c) Transmission Reinforcement Criteria

Break (5-15 mins)

- 6) **CPP Scope & Futures Recommendations** (60 mins.)Joshua Norton
A strawman proposal for Futures and Siting in the CPP & application in transition study

- 7) **FERC Order 1920 Transmission Planning and Cost Allocation** (15 mins.) Sunny Raheem
If time allows, review the high-level requirements of FERC Order 1920, released on May 13.

- 8) **Wrap-Up, Action Items, and Future Meetings** (5 minutes) Ramunda Russell
Review of documented takeaways, action items, and discussion of potential additional meetings.

Future Meetings

Mon, June 17, 2024 (9a-3p) WebEx
Mon, July 22, 2024 (9a-3p) WebEx
Wed, Aug 7, 2024 (8a – 5p) St. Louis
Wed - Thur, Sept. 11-12, 2024 (12p-5p / 8a-12p) Little Rock

**SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)
April 30, 2024, 12:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.**

Evergy Offices
1200 Main Street
Kansas City, MO 64105

MINUTES

DAY 1

Lunch 12:00 – 12:30 pm and started meeting at approximately 12:30 pm

AGENDA ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER AND ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 12:32 p.m., April 30, 2024, with a quorum. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of the meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. Commissioner Andrew French was noted as a proxy for John Krajewski, and Commissioner French was also noted as a proxy for Adam McKinnie. Chair Raheem then reviewed the agenda (Attachment A). Derek Brown (Evergy) moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner French (KCC) seconded, and the motion passed with one abstention – Commissioner French on behalf of Adam McKinnie in his absence.

Ms. Russell reviewed the March 18, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B). Alan Myers (ITC) moved to approve the March 18th meeting minutes and Carrie Dixon (NextEra) seconded, with the motion passing with one abstention – Commissioner French on behalf of Adam McKinnie in his absence.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – QUARTERLY MEETING DEBRIEF

Chair Raheem provided an update on the MOPC, SPC, & RSC approvals and follow-up actions from the recent meetings. He reported that the group received approval to move forward into the revision request process from MOPC and SPC and was informed to get the resources to dedicate to the revision request effort. There was a targeted action item noted from SPC to figure out what will occur if the CPP entry fee plan doesn't work as originally anticipated. He stated that there was a high-level approval going to RSC next week on Monday where the seven individual approvals were aggregated into one draft motion for RSC. The next item of focus will be to determine how we can backcast participation in the CPP transition study or entry fee.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT IMPACTS

Chair Raheem outlined the review that internal staff has performed for the initial technical impact assessment. The CPPTF was requested to review the information in this meeting and the next meeting to refine the process and determine the right level of assessments to decide if what has been proposed is the right approach. He outlined the current process milestones for the ITP and GI DISIS processes. He stated that the priorities for impacts (build – “how do we do these in the CPP study?” and design – “how do we carry this forward into future studies?”) will have to be refined and determine what will carry forward into CPP. These items will have to be discussed in the next twelve months. SPP I/T has an organizational readiness structure developed but automation will have to be prioritized. The CPP transition study items (types of assessments) have the highest priority; the items that can be done later in the year are ranked as medium (model assessments), and the lower priorities (transmission solutions) will be done in the future. One member shared his perspective on SPP’s need to focus on what we want to study and assess and how we will identify the issues. The transition models will start being built this summer. Another member suggested that SPP make it plain to FERC that we are following NERC standards and maintaining firm service. The previous member stated that SPP must prioritize - SPP can only build so many models and will need to identify areas where there isn’t value in order to free up the resources. A different member stated that this study is what we want to see on grid development over the course of CPP. He stated that we need to look at SPP’s long-term needs and come up with a cost-sharing system that is fair. Chair Raheem stated that we will align the 2026 ITP with the CPP transition study to balance with tariff needs. There was a great deal of group discussion on the various items and the justification behind the priority rankings. Chair Raheem stated that we want to target completing this impact assessment by June because of the work that will be framed up for this group. One member requested a clear timeline for completing the high/medium/low priorities.

There was no direct opposition to the proposed priorities, but the group had suggestions for considering some medium-priority levels as being ranked as high throughout the discussion.

The group took a 22-minute break from 2:58 – 3:22 pm

AGENDA ITEM 4 – REVISION REQUEST APPROACH

Ramunda Russell started the conversation about initiating the revision request process following the MOPC and SPC approval to move forward. One member voiced concern about how to handle tariff revisions on the entry fee itself. Since the study will not be completed in order to get feedback by the time this is presented to MOPC, there would be concern about bringing something this new to FERC without having the right level of detail spelled out on the GI side.

Chair Raheem stated that it adds complications to the filing, but we know the broad boundaries for the entry fee (minimum and maximum costs) so we will have to be diligent in sharing the numbers within the boundary conditions. The member responded that we need to evaluate the risk level before going to FERC and figure out if there is other work that needs to be done and the documentation to be developed so that this can be accepted. Chair Raheem stated that it will be difficult to wait to file the first iteration of the filing, but we can use outreach to educate FERC and get buy-in on an iterative basis. Another member agreed that the uncertainty of the entry fee and generation vs. load split could drive people to intervene and challenge this proposal. He felt that the lack of finalization on the studies wouldn't be the showstopper, but the vague nature of the cost allocation could be an issue. A third member stated that we should focus on the mechanics of the process and file this at FERC, as a minimum, by this year. Then, work to develop a portfolio of projects based on the comparison of what we would do today vs. the project selection from what we have built the study around and present that to FERC. A different member asked how new technologies would reduce cost and the risk of load not showing up the way we anticipated. Chair Raheem stated that this is a commit-over-time concept. He also stated that we will need to have some level of comfortability with being vague. If we put numbers out there, then we will veer away from the CPP process. The question was posed of the right level of support for the filing. A member stated that the CPP study will be a forecast; if SPP can get enough out of the study before it's done and we can provide adequate evidence, then we will have a stronger position. An SPP team member confirmed that we need to define the legal position. If SPP can develop a process with our legal team, then we can document the process and bring it back to the CPPTF. The members agreed that we need to find a way to do this in the background and do a ramp-up approach to get information to FERC in a timely fashion. One member expressed a desire to get some rough estimations and a different level of approximations to provide with the FERC filing. Another member voiced his concern about the amount of work for SPP in the next 45 days, especially if a new attachment has to be created for CRIS. A third member asked if the 20-Year assessment can be done on an as-needed basis because of the level of work involved vs. the amount of impact it would have on the numbers. Chair Raheem stated that we can see if there would be waivers; the FERC filing that is coming out may help to define how often assessments are required. A different member stated that we need to develop a plan to get to the finish line. He suggested that we get waivers approved by MOPC and the working groups and then document our approvals after the tariff revisions before going to FERC. Chair Raheem believed that we could get to a middle ground to ensure the filing is effective. Chair Raheem recapped that our next steps are to keep developing and working towards the revision request timeline, develop supporting evidence for the filing in Q1 or Q2, bring back to the group on how much supporting evidence is needed to make the first filing, and finalize the presentation date.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – ENTRY FEE FRAMEWORK

Chair Raheem recapped the entry fee framework. He described the four options for defining intra-queue priority and stated that we need to eliminate the less favorable options so we can provide more details on the selected option(s). One member asked for clarification on why we need an intra-queue priority. Chair Raheem stated that it will help to determine who pays for

the transmission demand. Another member questioned the additional readiness criteria (intra-queue priority options 2A & 2B). He also questioned the impact of the harm that a larger generator would cause by backing out of the commitment. Chair Raheem responded that there is work to do on the readiness criteria. Based on group conversations, he stated that 2A & 2B did not seem to be favorable options so we will focus on options 1A & 1B. A different member asked if we have considered contingencies, and Chair Raheem's response was that we don't want to include a contingency cost in the entry fee calculation for fear of double dipping. The same member then asked about the consideration of using a locational RFP that gets into generation planning. Chair Raheem stated that we are limiting our governance to determining the generator cost. The previous member stated that if we over build it is a concern, but under building is a larger issue. An SPP team member stated that we will need a guardrail to ensure that we don't have a response that will cost millions of dollars. Chair Raheem stated that we may need to explore other areas for this safeguard. Another SPP team member suggested to layout the flow for the all the possible impacts. Agenda item 5 was not concluded on day 1, so the remaining content carried over to day 2.

WRAP UP FOR THE DAY

Chair Raheem outlined plans for the next day and adjourned for the day at 5:04 pm.

**SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)
May 1, 2024, 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**

**Evergy Offices
1200 Main Street
Kansas City, MO 64105**

MINUTES

DAY 2

RETURN TO ORDER

Chair Raheem resumed the meeting at 8:31 am with a quorum. Ms. Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. Commissioner Andrew French was noted as a proxy for John Krajewski, and Commissioner French was also noted as a proxy for Adam McKinnie. Chair Raheem recapped the items that were discussed the previous day (agenda item 7) and stated that we would start the day with the entry fee maintenance discussion.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – ENTRY FEE FRAMEWORK

Agenda item 5 was resumed from Day 1. Chair Raheem started with discussion around regional and sub-regional buckets and determining the frequency of updates for the entry fee. One member stated that we may need to have some version of the three adjustment options since we don't have hard costs. He suggested that we need some version of a cost estimation to determine if the projects are possible. He also stated that we need to do more on feasibility and costs because we won't know final costs for years. Another member questioned how we will accept variability in the adjustments. He suggested that one approach is to aim for option 3 and adjust the cost accordingly. A different member asked about payment of a risk premium to cover the contingency and provide cost certainty in initial cost payments. Many members agreed, and one also stated that most of what is identified in an initial entry fee evaluation won't be built to support the growth - this is just forward estimation of what we could build. Chair Raheem responded that the main problem statement is to prevent large swings over time if there is no maintenance. This is just collecting funds from customers over time and showing that we are keeping a cost split between generation load reasonable. There was group discussion on cost sharing, credits to customers, and construction decisions. Chair Raheem summarized that the team decision is whether we need to adjust the entry fee after customers have committed. He stated that we also need to understand how competitive projects will come

into play. There was discussion about the entry fee and the metrics of how to get there. One member suggested that we should avoid using the word true-up. Chair Raheem proposed that we table the discussion of the remaining three topics until the next CPPTF meeting, and the team agreed.

The group took a 12-min break until 10:00 am

AGENDA ITEM 6 – CPP SCOPE AND FUTURES RECOMMENDATIONS

Joshua Norton highlighted the current ITP overview outlining stakeholder responsibilities and study scope. He discussed the current process for high level scope development and shared the resource siting plan schedule. He described the strawman proposal for the futures and siting plan. One member had a question on the models and methodology that Brattle is using in the FERNS study and how this overlaps. Joshua responded by explaining how this will work in the transition study. He then moved into the CPP transition study approach strawman proposal. There was group discussion about the FERNS scenarios and economics regarding the carbon drivers. One member stated that this strawman proposal could work as the framework. Another member added that our assumptions may not align. A third member stated that we won't be able to just add FERNS scenarios directly into the study. An SPP team member confirmed that we will leverage the FERNS study to select the sites in the various zones. Joshua concluded with the next step of incorporating feedback into the strawman proposal to bring to the next CPPTF meeting. Chair Raheem stated that we need to understand what we will use from the FERNS study and continue to develop the strawman proposal for further discussion in the next CPPTF meeting. He stated that we need to define the final scope of this recommendation and determine what we need to close it out.

AGENDA ITEM 8 – GENERATOR INTERCONNECTION ASSESSMENT

Chris Jamieson discussed how we bring the reliability and economics together as well as how to prepare for resource plans. He stated that the GI developers are not in our staff/stakeholder accountability program, but we need to tie them into it because they agreed to the entry fee. Two members have discussion on key items to address, stating that we need to focus on what we need to fix and determine which transmission investments make the most sense. Another member stated that we won't be able to do everything that we are doing today for GI in order to get studies completed in the future. We need to comply with NERC standards but may not be able to get a full analysis done until on the back end. Chair Raheem added that we need to be mindful of additional analysis. A different member asked about generator needs for the system. Chair Raheem responded that specific needs would go to the direct-assigned cost, but other isolated stability needs will be included in the initial reliability before the entry fee is set. One member outlined that there will be studies done with specific generators and design that is directly assigned. He stated that we need to have the right requirements so customers can

comply. Chris conveyed that we need to do analysis by performing all three assessment types. Based on feedback from this area of the transition study, the next steps are that we need to know the baselines for these assessments and if we need to build a 20-year Powerflow model.

AGENDA ITEM 9 - WRAP-UP, ACTION ITEMS, AND FUTURE MEETINGS

Chair Raheem and Ms. Russell reviewed action items from the meeting:

- Update slide 12 in technical assessment impacts .ppt (change last bullet item language)
- Update slide 21 in technical assessment impacts .ppt (change priority of last 2 items)
- SPP to provide a clear timeline for completing the high/medium/low priorities for assessment impacts in item 3
- SPP to work with our legal team to develop/define a process, then document the process and bring back to the CPPTF for review (item 4)
- SPP to keep developing & working towards the RR timeline
- SPP to develop the supporting evidence for the FERC filing
- SPP to bring supporting evidence back to CPPTF on what is required to make the first filing
- SPP staff to continue developing the strawman proposal & define the final scope of the CPP futures recommendation for further discussion in next CPPTF meeting (item 6)

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 12:04 p.m.

CPPTF ATTENDANCE LIST, MAY 20, 2024

Attendance list from WebEx registration & In-Person. Symbols: * denotes CPPTF Member and † denotes proxy.

#	Name	Organization
1	Sunny Raheem (Chair)*	SPP
2	Alan Myers*	ITC
3	Andrew French*	KCC
4	Jason Tanner+	NEXTERA
5	Carrie Dixon*	NEXTERA
6	Derek Brown*	Evergy
7	Heather Starnes*	MJMEUC
8	Michael Wegner+	ITC
9	Jim Jacoby*	AEP
10	Brian Johnson+	AEP
11	John Krajewski*	NPRB
12	Michael Wise*	GSEC
13	Steve Gaw*	APA
14	Ramunda Russell (Secretary)*	SPP
15	Adam Schieffer	OPPD
16	Adam Snapp	OGE
17	Afshin Salehian	SPP
18	Austin Baccus	SPP
19	Bernie Liu	Xcel
20	Brian Rounds	AESL
21	Calvin Daniels	WFEC
22	Charles Locke	SPP
23	Chris Jamieson	SPP
24	Chris Lyons	CES
25	Collin Sniff	OPPD
26	Conf 1F Room 117	SPP
27	Conor McKenzie	AEU
28	Daria Diaz	STONEPIGMAN
29	David Brauch	PES
30	David Duhart	SPP
31	Derek Sunderman	SE
32	Devon Pehrson	NGR

33	Don Frerking-SPP	SPP
34	Jason Chaplin	OCC
35	Jason Mazigian	BEPC
36	Jeremy Severson	BEPC
37	Jeremy Voll	BEPC
38	John Stephens	CU
39	Jonathan Goldsworthy	ITC
40	Joshua Norton	SPP
41	Joshua Ross	SPP
42	Justin Grady	KCC
43	Kelsey Allen	SPP
44	Kirk Hall	SPP
45	Lee Elliott Invenergy	INVENERGY
46	Lisa Barrett	ADVANCED ENERGY
47	Lottie Jones	SPP
48	Maggie Kristian	NGR
49	Marie Thompson	SOUTHERNCO
50	Marisa Choate	SPP
51	Matt Alvarado IUB	IUB
52	Maya Nevels	Power Alliance
53	Natasha Henderson	SPP
54	Naved Khan	SPP
55	Paul Antony	Gabel Assoc.
56	Regan Fink	PGR
57	Robert Safuto CES	CES
58	Ryan Benton OG&E	OG&E
59	Samuel Utomi	LEEWARD
60	Sherri Maxey	SPP
61	Steve Purdy	SPP
62	Temujin Roach	EDF-RE
63	Neeya Toleman	NEXTERA
64	Tyler Berton	AES
65	Vaibhav Bilagi	RWE
66	Jeff Wells	GRDA