

**SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)
June 17, 2024, 9:05 a.m. to 2:59 p.m.
WebEx 2483 326 2567**

MINUTES

AGENDA ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER AND ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m., June 17, 2024, with a quorum present. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. Denise Buffington was noted as a proxy for Derek Brown, and Steve Gaw was noted as a proxy for David Mindham if needed. Chair Raheem then reviewed the meeting agenda (Attachment A). Commissioner French (KCC) moved to approve the agenda as read. Steve Gaw (APA) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Ms. Russell reviewed the May 20, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B) and outlined action items. Heather Starnes (MJMEUC) moved to approve the previous meeting's minutes. Commissioner French (KCC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – GETTING DISIS READY FOR CPP

Chair Raheem highlighted the purpose of getting the DISIS ready for CPP and the transition study. He communicated that this was a preliminary draft on areas of potential risk with the transition to CPP. It is a preliminary proposal from staff to gauge stakeholder interest in pursuing this option to get ready for the CPP transition study. He explained that this is a way to start discussion on how to bridge the two efforts together. The main purpose of this effort is to see if there is enough interest to initiate a voluntary option to generator interconnection customers for improving cost certainty and timeliness of results. The CPP transition study was envisioned to be a forward-looking study when initially setup to identify upgrades. The GI backlog was to be cleared, so this is operating under the assumption that this will help with GI on an on-going basis. This will help to improve assumptions going into the CPP transition study and identify which projects will be included in the analysis. It would also be a preview of entry fee price discovery. The biggest benefit is to connect generation quicker for load growth and resource adequacy requirement as well as for cost certainty. The other thought is to reduce the possibility of future restudies in the GI backlog, which would free up resources to work on CRIS and the CPP transition study. This is what is being referred to as the generator interconnection cutover study into the CPP transition study. Through our historical processes, there is a 17% success rate meaning that 17% of the projects that enter the open window make it to commercial operation. This low rate of success creates cost uncertainty and unviability to the generators that are dropping out or staying in the queue. Under FERC order 845, there must be metrics provided on progress in the generator interconnection queue including withdrawals

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.

which trigger late-stage restudies. One SPP member highlighted a connection between the data on the slide to demonstrate where CPP is headed. It was stated that in order for SPP to establish a baseline for CPP, we would have to understand what projects are likely to move forward and we can't because of how the DISIS queues are stacked up against one another. One member asked how the transition study will help with the baseline and how generation gets connected in the future. The SPP member responded that there would have to be some assumptions made but SPP is working on an approach to make these assumptions more realistic. We would identify which are more probable and make estimates of which transmission projects are in place to understand which ones will move forward. Another member asked how SPP will establish the low percentage of likelihood (requesting more clarification on the table in slide 7). Chair Raheem explained that low percentage is below the 125K/MW with low-cost certainty percentages. [Slide 8 shows the high mountain of transmission projects being assigned through DISIS. Slide 10 - see need for unplanned restudies as a prelim look at the schedule, final decisions for DISIS 2020 -2023 will be extended which will have a waterfall effect. An upgrade is assigned to it. How will we know what to put in transition study?] A third member is unsure if the characterization of the unplanned restudies will capture what has happened with the GI process. What worries him is if the contingent facilities will translate into late withdrawals that haven't been seen yet, which could cause a cascade effect. This could be a risk factor that will be seen, and we don't know if this creates something more significant. There is a lot of uncertainty around this. He agreed that we need to make some decisions, and we need a plan of action on how to handle the cutover which will occur regardless of the problems. He declared that we don't need to add more to our plate by trying to do several things at once and end up with more problems than what is already known. He stated that what would be helpful is to understand what the best transmission upgrades are to facilitate multiple needs. If what comes out of the DISIS is upgrades that would be built anyway, then this becomes easier. The question now just becomes who is going to pay for this. A fourth member asked what the chance is of DISIS 2024 not starting in 2024. Chair Raheem responded that part of the feedback request today is if this window should remain open because of uncertainty for projects and assumptions baked into it. The members thought that we should kick the study off with shortfall discussions and studying potential generation and the consequences of not beginning the study on time. Chair Raheem noted that there will be discussion later today to decide if leaving DISIS in an open state is the right thing to do. A fifth member mentioned that we may not be able to craft a fair answer that would satisfy everybody on how to pay for the studies and suggested that we do the same for the transition study. Chair Raheem stated that we had initial discussions about adding the cutover plan and bringing costs in the current process to determine costs for entering into the transition. We may not have the cost answer until late 2026, which was the only real challenge that we initially saw but the new DISIS studies would see that as a benefit to calculate the cost earlier. Chair Raheem highlighted high level potential solutions and noted that a cutover transmission plan is needed for cost sharing between load and generation. There is discussion about if there needs to be more commitment from GI customers on shared network upgrades. The plan is to make more informed decisions and discuss the need for a restudy instead of just initiating one. Chair Raheem requested discussion about whether there is a need to do a cutover plan before the CPP transition study. The plan is

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.

to overlay NRIS or NRIS+ with the current project portfolio and identify incremental projects that are needed. One member asked if the items listed will require a tariff filing for the change. Chair Raheem shared that the site control review does not, but all other items would require a revision request including the cutover plan. The member stated that we need to understand what makes sense within this process and ensure that we don't lose time with FERC by getting prior agreement. He recommended weighing the benefit of getting something done on the solutions and determining the impact to get to the CPP. Chair Raheem mentioned that SPP is working on the best approach for filings, and discussions will occur at the July meeting. When outlining the potential approach to the cutover study, one member asked for clarification of which DISIS would be eligible for the cutover. Chair Raheem responded that we don't want to delay who is at the finish line, so it would include those generators in the study who have long-term, high-interconnection costs (in 2020 - 2024). The same member is concerned about an attempt to raise the B/C to 1.25 from 1.0 and would feel better if we included benefit from FERC order 1920 in the calculation. A different member asked if there will be a contingency cost in the cutover based on history for the larger projects that are more prone to having contingency costs when comparing actuals to estimates. Chair Raheem stated that we would use similar cost estimation to the ITP process today. The member responded that he has concerns about the approach. A SPP member added to the previous member's comment and stated that our approach is looking at DISIS solutions and running over an existing ITP portfolio. He explained that there won't be projects to meet the 1.25 - 2.0 ratio alone but should look at them to provide support to GI customers just for this cutover approach. Another SPP member outlined an additional benefit of this option for resource adequacy which is to connect more generation faster and provide cost share with load. Chair Raheem reviewed the need to balance the FERC order 1920 compliance approach with what we are doing. We want to be mindful of the number of studies to kick off because of the budget impact. One member suggested that we separate options into must-haves and nice-to-haves. There needs to be a basic understanding of what's in the base case and then come to an agreement. We need to evaluate based on how much time it will take vs. the benefit from that process and what the potential dangers are to the process. Chair Raheem stated that we will bring back to the next meeting a list of must-haves vs. nice to have and a list of items requiring a revision request or filing. He also requested feedback on whether there is a general need to have further discussion with the group. One member stated that the other working groups will want more details on the cutover plan. Another member requested more details around the cutover plan as the rest of the group has requested. A third member asked about the fee for customers included in the cutover plan and which DISIS will be included in the cutover plan. Chair Raheem stated that this will apply to DISIS 2020 up to 2024 and will be a voluntary submission of the GI customers to enter the cutover plan for cost certainty solution. We would need to determine the cost contribution to forward-looking upgrades - possibly in the form of a 3rd future - so we don't double account for financial commitments. We will need to decouple the analysis so that customers won't be included in analysis for the cutover plan if they are in the current process. Chair Raheem summarized next steps noted which are: needing more schedule and timeline on how this aligns with the CPP transition study, sharing with GIAG, and fitting into TWG discussions as a

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.

preliminary approach. We still have more internal discussions because of the processes that we have but want to get this out to the stakeholders.

10-min break until 10:50a

After returning from break, Chair Raheem proposed a schedule change for the sake of Brattle's time.

AGENDA ITEM 7 – FERNS STUDY UPDATE

Afshin Salehian provided an update on Brattle's progress with the generation expansion data. Kate Peters provided a high-level overview of the status of land use expansion. Brattle is working to ensure that the generation capacity plan is consistent with SPP processes. Sam Willett gave an update on the land use analysis. They must determine if the county and state regulations could impact the generation capacity within each FERNS zone with restrictions placed on available potential. NREL provides generation potential across the continental US, and a summary was provided of the FERNS zones using the NREL reference case. Brattle showed the next step of analysis by taking the data from preceding steps as input for the transmission network proximity analysis for possible use in CPP. They could restrict land that would be developed for generation capacity to be within the estimated connection below. One member mentioned the need to do this restriction in some studies but questioned how this would work within a 20-year assessment and if designs of projects that may be better for significant amounts of generation are being restricted. Hannes responded that this provides the tool to look at the costs; this is all input-driven. From a future CPP purpose, this is a tool to evaluate tradeoffs for looking at new facilities vs. existing facilities. The member recognized that it would be a challenge to determine the screenings in the CPP. He also stated that it would be helpful to get high-level feedback from GI developers and load-serving entities to see if there is something missing from the tool. Hannes stated that this is not a definitive, decision-making tool. This data would be valuable to make zonal assignments to the nodal level for the CPP effort. This does not exclude development in other areas but serves as a model for grid buildout. Another member asked if simplified assumptions had to be made to identify areas with less land use restrictions or interconnection costs. Hannes stated that their model has an option to limit billable transmission. Brattle wanted to be sure that the model does not allow for more resources than can be built in any area. The land use analysis will allow the ability to take zonal results for planning into the nodal model. The same member was not sure if the numbers would be conservative enough. Hannes stated that this is just a layer of information and will not be used to determine connection into the transmission system. There is a significant amount of group discussion between Brattle, Afshin, & the member. Hannes responded that SPP needs to determine if further analysis is needed. There will be multiple variables, and we should focus on how to get a fixed TW number down to something more reasonable to plan for on a 20-year scale. Brattle will provide a model for each of the six zones. Afshin stated that we need a phased approach for potential of new resources connecting into existing infrastructure.

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.

Following other members' questions and comments, Chair Raheem mentioned that there are a lot of things for consideration.

Recessed for 30-min lunch break until 12:30p

AGENDA ITEM 3 – SCRIPT C3: COMMON MODEL APPROACH

Eddie Watson provided an overview of the SCRIPT C3 modeling activities. He outlined a recommendation and the actions to implement. He recapped C3.1 which creates the base model. The past models were to build the BR models first then MDAG models. The existing MDAG will be renamed as MMWG models and use the same approach for other modeling needs outside of BR models. He summarized C3.2 which uses common model build data to dispatch generation EIA vs. operational bid data. He addressed Derek's question from a previous meeting regarding future local areas. Additional conversations will be needed in the future with MDAG. Eddie discussed the initiatives still under development (C3.3 - C3.5). SPP staff are still working on this recommendation for consolidating into one benchmark. The Modeling team will bring C3.3 information back to the CPPTF. They will be working with I/T to get information into EDST. After approval at MDAG, it will go to TWG/ESWG for approval as well.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – FERC ORDER 1920 TRANSMISSION PLANNING AND COST ALLOCATION

Chair Raheem provided a brief update on our approach to FERC order 1920. He stated that we are comparing the requirements to our current 20-year assessment and ITP processes and the anticipated CPP requirements because we are still working on the revision request details. The next update to this group will be reviewing the chart/matrix in detail to determine the areas to add to the CPPTF workplan to be compliant with FERC order 1920 and areas covered under the current workplan. This will help with prioritization on the tariff revision request update as well.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – CPP TARIFF REVISION REQUEST UPDATE

Chair Raheem provided a high-level verbal summary of the revision request progress. A small team has been established to develop the structure for the revision request. Work has been started on the entry fee language for how it will be stood up and delivered over the allotment period. There is still a need to determine how the portfolio is split between generation and transmission. The plan is to focus on cost allocation revisions first, then move over to Attachments O and V. SPP wanted to cover Attachment V towards the end to see how much opposition there is to the FERC order 1920 filing to see where the initiation point is for the entry

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.

fee. We are working towards the goal of meeting our needs in a single filing for both CPP and FERC order 1920 compliance with some alignment. One member asked when FERC order 1920 needs to be filed, and response was by June 12, 2025, with additional time to file inter-regionally within another couple of months thereafter. Another member asked if there was an internal team working on compliance and that would provide a bullet item list of how CPP will comply. Chair Raheem confirmed and added that this would be along with outlining the gaps.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – ENTRY FEE FRAMEWORK

Chair Raheem covered timeline slides and the key topic on risk premium. SPC had an action item for SPP to determine if there needed to be more education on risk premium. SPP's approach was to review the remaining entry fee maintenance topics and understand how frequently it should be maintained throughout the life cycle to determine a recommendation and action item for update at the July meeting. Chair Raheem outlined that the education provided to SPC, at the recommendation of CPPTF, for entry fee contribution showed differences and that it may not be so important to chase final costs for each customer. The guiding principle was that this entry fee would provide cost certainty and a one-time financial contribution with details on who pays for the entry fee and what happens upon withdrawal. He offered a reminder that we have futures being developed every three years. He highlighted the timing of projects and assessments and how this concept would provide cost certainty for project upgrades. He covered the cost allocation approach which ties cost overrun/underrun to whoever pays today. One member stated that the method for tracking cost overruns may be too early. He commented that we may need to look at cost overruns in history and apply upfront. He does not think that this approach will be meaningful because of construction driving the need for project re-evaluation. Chair Raheem stated that we will provide a solution in an initial reliability look and asked if his concern would be addressed in the iterative approach. The member responded that the timing of the entry fee finalization may not work. Chair Raheem provided a key summary of recommendations from CPPTF for the SPC action item. It identified the three areas where entry fee maintenance may be captured in cost overruns and outlined in-service delays which include the addition of GETs. For the entry fee now, the rate for sub-regional upgrades will be based on the deliverability area. A series of examples were shown which demonstrated challenges for collection and disbursement situations. One member stated that we need a problem-solving discussion on how to distribute money in CPP. We need to re-evaluate what the equation means unless there is more work to be done to determine how to address the cost issue. Also, the collection of money needs to match a construct of voltage or in the CRIS zone. We need to start figuring out the realm of how to address the solutions. An SPP member responded that we would flush out the agenda item and will discuss to be prepared for various outcomes on the HITT C1 effort. One approach is to stay simple by assuming that they do and don't align and use this to uncover specific challenges for each. Chair Raheem chimed in that we need to come up with a mechanism of who pays for what when you have misalignment of pricing zones. If we stay with the legacy

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.

zones, then we need to go back to the drawing board with the entry fee development. The SPP member suggested that we may go with a percentage on a zonal level. One member stated that we may need options that are workable. We should know those once we have someone to cycle through the concepts. SPP should find a way to not have to track money in the individual pricing zones because this would create a mess. The SPP member proposed that we keep it to where the entry fee is calculated based on the deliverability area and work under the premise that the pricing zones will align with the deliverability areas until CAWG determines if we will move forward with HITT. SPP will need to understand what to work through if HITT is not approved. Another member agreed and shared the same concerns. He suggested that we may need to redesign CRIS zones to be 6 instead of 3, but he may not understand the full impacts of that modification. We must balance energy injection and energy withdrawals to eliminate FERC. An SPP member heard that subregions weren't gaining a lot of traction, and CRIS zones won't change from a study process perspective. SPP will need to figure out a plan forward for HITT C1. One member requested a small group meeting with SPP staff to bounce off alternative ideas on this topic. Another member asked what drives the different dollar amounts in the entry fee. An SPP member responded that it is a stacked entry fee with one fee for the entire footprint, upgrade costs will make up the sub-regional amount on the deliverability area (1/3 and 2/3 distribution), and a direct assignment component. Another member stated that things seem to be struggling to move forward with HITT C1 which will cause more misalignment with costs being built. He asked if we should look at more regionalization. He would like to hear more feedback on the CAWG meeting regarding the specifics of what people can't handle on the initial proposal and what they are worried about to get past the issues. Another SPP member chimed in that we want to bring more economics in with the GI process. He suggested that projects should be regionalized based on how we select them.

AGENDA ITEM 8 – CPP TRANSITION ASSESSMENT

Chair Raheem wanted to have a level set conversation for what needs to be done to calculate the entry fee. He stated that we want to correlate entry fee calculations with how the study should be structured. We must correct size the number of assessments performed under this study. How we approach the three analyses will connect the dots for how the entry fee will be structured. Chair Raheem reviewed the two options to the entry fee calculation approach. After review of option 2, one member interjected that with consolidated load projects, if we're using this with FERC order 1920, we should be checking our design process. Chair Raheem acknowledged that we need to figure out the analysis for designing solutions to maximize benefits and cost-effectiveness for all the needs that we are trying to scope as the member suggested. He then commented that we need to decide on our CRIS protection. There were no questions about the level of CRIS protection needed in the CPP transition study. Chair Raheem outlined the solutions approach and mentioned that this could be part of the framework under the initial reliability approach of SCRIPT 01. An SPP member summarized the order of hierarchy of how to select projects depending on the other needs. A member asked if this would be

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.

included in each step of the CPP. Chair Raheem responded that it would only apply to the long-term assessment 20 years out, but we may want to include benefits that could influence the entry fee. This may remove the need to continue doing a benefits assessment every five years. SPP's preference would be to include every three years the latest market input and criteria of what will be included in the cost assignment. An SPP member mentioned that we may bring a couple of benefits into the assessment. A member stated that we have made project solutions from ten metrics. He summarized that we need to make decisions knowing that there are metrics not being considered. Chair Raheem outlined our draft recommendation for standard groupings. Another member commented that we should set up our models with cost-effective assumptions so that the LOLE zones don't create artificial barriers. He said we should deliver power across CRIS zones and have something to prevent building walls between CRIS zones in case we have a need to power back and forth. FERNs is the best way to evaluate the costs. He commented that we are chasing cost certainty for network upgrades and getting studies performed on time.

AGENDA ITEM 9 – WRAP UP AND ACTION ITEMS

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

- SPP staff to develop a schedule and timeline on how the GI cutover plan aligns with CPP
- SPP staff will bring back to the next meeting a list of must haves vs. nice to haves and a list of items requiring revision requests or FERC filing
- Brattle to request high-level feedback from GI developers and load-serving entities to see if there is something missing from their tool
- SPP staff to develop a bullet item list of how CPP will comply with FERC order 1920 along with outlining the gaps
- SPP staff to figure out a plan forward for HITT C1
- SPP staff to coordinate a small group meeting to bounce off alternative ideas on the entry fee topic
- SPP to figure out analysis for designing solutions to maximize benefits and cost-effectiveness for all the needs that we are trying to scope (how to change ITP assessment that will meet the needs of the CPP transition study)

Chair Raheem provided Membership Updates for the group. Carrie Dixon has taken another position with another company. Jim Jacoby will be retiring at the end of July. SPP would like to continue with a transmission owner and GIAG member to maintain the same type of feedback from personnel in their replacement roles. Chair Raheem asked the group if anyone has questions about the membership process, then to please reach out for details.

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.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Attachments: Agenda, 05/20/24 Minutes, Attendance List

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.

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

June 17, 2024: 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. CT

WebEx: 2483 326 2567 | Password: sY8kU5Z4quC

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

AGENDA

- 1) **Call to Order and Administrative Items** (10 mins.)
 - a) Administrative Items Ramunda Russell & Sunny Raheem
 - b) Agenda ([Approval](#)) Sunny Raheem
 - c) Meeting Minutes Ramunda Russell
 - i) May 20, 2024 ([Approval](#))
 - d) CPPTF Membership Update Sunny Raheem

- 2) **Getting DISIS ready for CPP** (60 mins.) GI Staff & Sunny Raheem
 - a) Current GI timelines and potential risk
 - b) GI cutover plan and timeline

- 3) **SCRIPT C3: Common Model Approach** (30 mins.) Eddie Watson/Lottie Jones
2026 ITP and CPP Transition Study assessment base model approach update

- Break (5-15 mins)*

- 4) **FERC Order 1920 Transmission Planning and Cost Allocation** (15 mins.) SPP Staff
Verbal update on FERC Order 1920 activities.

- 5) **CPP Tariff Revision Request Update** (30 mins.) Ramunda Russell

- Lunch (30 - 60 mins)*

- 6) **Entry Fee Framework** (60 mins.) Sunny Raheem
 - a) SPC Action Item: Draft presentation review
 - b) Subregional Cost Allocation Approach

- 7) **FERNS Study Update** (60 mins.) Afshin/Brattle
Update on progress on generation expansion, demand data on unconventional load studies, and land availability study.

Break (5-15 mins)

- 8) **CPP Transition Assessment** (60 mins.)..... Kelsey Allen and Sunny Raheem
 - a) *CPP Entry Fee Calculation Approach Review (APC, GI only, System needs)*
 - b) *SCRIPT O1: Holistic Transmission Solutions Recap*
 - c) *GI Assessment Decisions to meet SCRIPT O1*

- 9) **Wrap-Up, Action Items, and Future Meetings** (5 minutes) Ramunda Russell
Review of documented takeaways, action items, and discussion of potential additional meetings as well as meeting duration for future sessions.

Future Meetings

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)
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 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 be carried forward. Both 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 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 to bridge the timing gap before network upgrades are in-service; 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 area, 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 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 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 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 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 Power flow with the Base Model benchmark to see if there is a potential time savings. SPP staff are 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 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 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 through 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 DAs 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 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 would 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 it under two or three future approaches. He explained that FERNS doesn't have a baseline future, so this may be where we need guidance from SPC.

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)

CPPTF ATTENDANCE LIST, JUNE 17, 2024

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

#	Name	Organization
1	Sunny Raheem (Chair)*	SPP
2	Adam McKinnie*	MPSC
3	Alan Myers*	ITC
4	Andrew French*	KCC
5	David Mindham*	EDPR
6	Denise Buffington+	Evergy
7	Heather Starnes*	MJMEUC
8	Jarred Cooley SPS*	SPS
9	Jim Jacoby*	AEP
10	John Krajewski*	NPRB
11	Steve Gaw*	APA
12	Steve Hohman*	OPPD
13	Ramunda Russell (Secretary)*	SPP
14	Adam Schieffer	OPPD
15	Adam Snapp	OGE
16	Afshin Salehian	SPP
17	Angie Anderson	Sunflower
18	Austin Baccus	SPP
19	Bernie Liu	Xcel
20	Betty Fung	SPEARMINT
21	Brian Rounds	AESL
22	Bruce Doll	OPPD
23	Jim Krajecki	CES
24	Call-in User_2	
25	Call-in User_4	
26	Call-in User_6	
27	Call-in User_7	
28	Call-in User_9	
29	Call-in User_11	
30	Call-in User_12	
31	Calvin Daniels	WFEC
32	Casey Cathey	SPP
33	Charles Locke	SPP

34	Chris Cranford	SPP
35	Chris Jamieson	SPP
36	Chris Lyons	CES
37	Cindy Ireland	AR.GOV
38	Clifford Franklin	Sunflower
39	Conf 1F Room 117	SPP
40	Conor McKenzie	ADVANCED ENERGY
41	Curtis Miller	WFEC
42	Dana Shelton	STONEPIGMAN
43	David Bromberg	PST
44	Denise Martin	SPP
45	Derek Sunderman	SE
46	Devon Pehrson	NGR
47	Don Frerking-SPP	SPP
48	Eddie Watson	SPP
49	Eugene Mauk	JKEC
50	Hannes Pfeifenberger Brattle	Brattle
51	Hari Singh	Core
52	Jake Weinberg	GA
53	James Thomas	Radia
54	Jodi Walters	EDPR
55	Jonathan Surls	EE
56	Justin Grady	KCC
57	Kate Peters Brattle	Brattle
58	Katherine Rogers	SPP
59	Kelsey Allen	SPP
60	Kim O’Guinn	SPP
61	Kirk Hall	SPP
62	Lee Elliott Invenergy	INVENERGY
63	Lisa Barrett	ADVANCED ENERGY
64	Loren Ditsch	OPPD
65	Maggie Kristian	NGR
66	Marisa Choate	SPP
67	Matt Alvarado IUB	IUB
68	Maya Nevels	Power Alliance
69	Megan Damron	SPP
70	Meredith Powell	SPP
71	Natalie McIntire	NRDC
72	Natasha Henderson	SPP
73	Naved Khan	SPP

74	Nick Abraham	ITC
75	Nigel Dunham	ACE
76	Nitin Kushwaha	NGR
77	Rafik Halim	NGR
78	Robert Pick	NPPD
79	Rodney Massman	PSC
80	Ryan Benton OG&E	OG&E
81	Ryan Hubbard TSGT	TSGT
82	Ryan Koch	BEPC
83	Ryan Yokley	Sunflower
84	Sam Willett	Brattle
85	Shari Albrecht	KCC
86	Shawnee Claiborn-Pinto	PUC TX
87	Sherri Maxey	SPP
88	Shilpi Sunil Kumar AES CE	ASE CE
89	Shubh Tandon	MEPPI
90	Steve Purdy	SPP
91	Tessie Kentner	SPP
92	Toleman, Neeya	NEXTERA
93	Tyler Berton	AES