

SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)
July 22, 2024, 9:04 a.m. to 3:48 p.m.
WebEx 2495 877 9261

MINUTES

AGENDA ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER AND ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m., July 22, 2024, with a quorum present. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. Heather Starnes was noted as a proxy for John Krajewski, and Michael Wegner was noted as a proxy for Alan Myers starting at 1:00 p.m. Chair Raheem then reviewed the meeting agenda (Attachment A). Steve Gaw (APA) moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner French (KCC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Ms. Russell reviewed the June 17, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B) and outlined action items. Alan Myers (ITC) moved to approve the previous meeting's minutes. Michael Wise (GSEC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – MOPC & SPC DEBRIEF

Chair Raheem provided a high-level overview of key topics and decisions from MOPC and SPC and plans for next steps. DISIS 2024 phase 1 start and DISIS 2025 waivers were approved at MOPC and will be taken to the Board meeting in early August. The thought was to get Board approval for the filing in mid-August and allow FERC sixty (60) days to make a decision on adjustments for the DISIS 2024 phase 1 start. The other piece was defining an interim path for the DISIS open window to supplement with an interim submission period before the DISIS 2025 open window starts. The plan will be to have a high-level comparison of what you get with and without the waivers (pros & cons) for the Board meeting. Also, a special study was introduced for accelerating DISIS into CPP and to help meet growing resource adequacy requirements. The group will be seeking results in early 2026. Discussions at MOPC indicated interest in a special study to add to the CPP transition study (they have similar timelines but will package with the CPP timeline). A third item discussed was to focus on the scope of the CPP phase 1 filing. SPP will need to be more prescriptive of what will be included in the phase 1 filing of CPP. One member mentioned that there were a lot of abstentions from the joint meeting, so he would encourage us to have additional discussion on the amount of dead zone around what to include in the DISIS cycles and the cutoff in October, then going over a year without being able to put something new into the queue. There are people that want to understand this better and are having some internal discussion within their teams. He suggested having more dialogue before the Board meeting to ensure that there is sufficient support for the current proposal or some alternative with which people are comfortable. Chair Raheem will touch base internally to

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.

encourage more dialogue before the Board meeting. Another member stated that it is worth noting that there was a strong consensus to preserve the integrity of the CPP, and this would be worth mentioning. Chair Raheem responded that it was a key takeaway, and an SPP member stated that we should have staff discussion on which option we should pursue (either the special study or integrating into the CPP transition study). The request was made for this team to weigh in by the September meeting on a preference. It was stated that it needs to be a transparent option that we allow enough time to connect to the system with growing resource adequacy needs. There should be a way to get more confidence with the DISIS studies going into the CPP transition study to show forward-looking costs. SPP will be taking the cutover proposal to GIAG this week as well as the DISIS waiver and will recap to this group at the August meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – CRIS/NRIS+ BRIDGE PLAN VERBAL UPDATE

Steve Purdy provided a brief update on the NRIS+ bridge plan. He stated that progress was being made on redlining the language for the product. The revision request is being finalized, and he will post a draft for this group to review for the August 7th meeting. He communicated that he expects a final posting for comment by August 14th. The plan is to make it to all the stakeholder group meetings in preparation for the October MOPC meeting. One member had a question on keying on the CRIS transition study light load for summer and winter peak asking what the peak is. Steve responded that SPP has numbers that are posted based on using the minimums in light load. The group is leaning towards using peak models because of the nature of deliverability and what that means. The member had a second question on SIR 567, which discusses the grandfathered rights of legacy resources, and how this will be handled. Steve mentioned that this will be done separately and not as part of the CRIS package. Steve stated that this should look like what we agreed to in the bridge plan document. An SPP member mentioned that we could combine this with a generation review. Chair Raheem mentioned that the policy decisions do not need to wait on CPP to gain traction.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – TRANSITION DISIS TO CPP

Chair Raheem provided updates on the alignment of the DISIS study with the CPP transition study and discussed resource adequacy for meeting in-service dates. He highlighted the challenges of stacking DISIS studies with the CPP transition and setting resource adequacy policies amidst changing resources. He identified nine potential points for restudies in DISIS 2024 and emphasized the need for timely generator interconnection study results and decision-making for upgrades. Chair Raheem explained the impact of the 2024 DISIS waiver on the schedule, shifting from the second red row to the bottom blue row. He discussed embedding transmission upgrades to reduce generator costs and avoiding the under-selection of sites in the CPP transition study. Regarding NTC's and readiness criteria, Chair Raheem mentioned pairing standalone studies with ITP for incremental upgrades and setting high entry readiness criteria for generators. He suggested increasing readiness criteria via site control acceptance and network upgrade commitments to improve certainty in the interconnection process. Chair

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.

Raheem outlined cost-sharing options for the CPP transition, emphasizing high entry readiness criteria and financial securities for generators. Members expressed concerns about one-off studies and recommended incorporating special studies into the transition study, simplifying the process with a clear, time-based flow chart, and addressing incentives and risks for generators moving to a special study. Clarification was sought on whether the primary goal was resource adequacy or facilitating CPP, with suggestions to identify primary and secondary benefits. Cost allocation challenges impacting the CPP proposal were discussed, with a suggestion to address regional and zonal load benefits upfront. The timeline for policy framework approval and filing considerations, including FERC compliance and revision requests, was reviewed. The need for additional options, pros and cons for CPP, and resource adequacy discussions in the August meeting was agreed upon. Clear identification of primary and secondary benefits of the special study was emphasized to avoid CPP filing controversies. Chair Raheem called for a break before moving into the polls.

10-min break until 11:15a

Upon return from break, Chair Raheem asked for feedback from everyone on the call on the special study and DISIS cutover discussion. The group participated in a straw poll featuring three questions. He reiterated that this is non-binding.

No.	Question / Options / Results
1	Do you agree with the current GI certainty concern that staff is concerned about?
	Options: agree or disagree
	Voting Results: agree = 22 of 76, disagree = 4 of 76, no answer = 50 of 76
2	Of the three areas of recommendation, which do you think we should focus on the most? Options – a) increase existing readiness criteria, b) approach to limit restudies, or c) cost sharing approach
	Voting Results: a = 4 of 73, b = 12 of 73, c = 10 of 73, no answer = 47 of 73
3	Are there any additional options we should consider?
	Open discussion option
	Voting Results: to be reviewed and discussed

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.

After concluding the exercise, Chair Raheem stated that we would review the other options and talk through the alternative suggestions as identified in the poll results (for item 3) and will reach out to those who responded. For responses to questions 1 and 2, we will summarize those for our next meeting and focus on the preferred approach to getting the DISIS ready for CPP.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – CPP TARIFF REVISION REQUEST & FERC ORDER 1920 UPDATES

Ramunda provided an update on the CPP revision request timeline and path forward. She reviewed the original timeline that was shared in the April/May meeting and explained action that have been taken to develop the language revision for revision request form. She then shared the updated timeline after incorporating FERC Order 1920 into the schedule, which extended the deadline for the filing to June 2025. She explained the milestone dates that must be met to stay on track for the filing deadline. She shared the mitigation plan to bring in a consultant to assist with drafting the language revisions within the accelerated schedule. She summarized the tariff attachments that will be impacted by the CPP. She also explained how we are including Legal in every step of our plan to ensure that we are aligned. One member with the TOSTF stated that we may also need to look at Attachment Y to be addressed with CPP going forward. Another member asked for an update on the discussion at CAWG on the entry fee development. She reviewed the discussion at MOPC on HITT C1 and alignment with CPP. Chair Raheem mentioned that we need more decision on HITT C1 for how the revision request language will be written. He stated that we will be approaching the subject of establishing methodology for the entry fee and getting CAWG's feedback in the next meeting. The member urged that we work diligently to get this input incorporated. A third member agreed that HITT C1 needs to be done first, then focus on how entry fee will be split between load and generators. A different member mentioned that CPP is going to be large with a lot of topics and moving pieces, and communication is paramount so that there is a clear demarcation between CPP, transition study, and special study. His feedback is to be clear on what feedback goes where.

Chair Raheem provided an update on the gap analysis for FERC Order 1920 as it relates to the current 20-year assessment and CPP direction. He stated that we want to start bundling this together in preparation for the September face-to-face meeting to key in on areas on which we want to make policy determinations. Aging infrastructure is a key topic, and we want to run this by the technical groups. There will be a FERC Order 1920 education at RSC in August for considering 20-year projects for cost allocation. The team will then be able to start diving into the scorecard. Chair Raheem will be asking for feedback on the gaps and how to address them at the September CPPTF meeting. This group would be responsible for determining what to align with CPP or what should be independent.

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.

Recessed for 45-min lunch break until 12:45p

AGENDA ITEM 6 – 2026 ITP/CPP TRANSITION STUDY

Joshua Norton requested feedback for documenting 2026 ITP/CPP transition study scope and would like to consider everyone's thoughts and perspectives. He stated that the ranking and selection of sites have been based on the JTIQ study, and that unplanned sites were not originally included in the 20-year assessment. One member asked about the definition of network upgrades. An SPP member responded that this would be defined as local upgrades or facilities at the point of interconnection (POI). Another member mentioned that we may want to send price signals at spots of terminals for POI because it can be difficult to plan for multiple owners to connect to single POI without the substation becoming huge. He stated that we should plan in advance to tie into an existing network and work with local Transmission Owners and utilities. Chair Raheem stated that this is not captured in our siting process today, and we should add it to our framework. A third member asked how SPP currently manages the different GI guidelines that different utilities have when a developer can build a new substation directed to connect at an existing location. He stated that consistency should be handled in siting plans. A member helped to explain that we should build to balance and optimize certain parts of the system to have counterflow so as not to replace transformers everywhere for contingency. His initial thought was to do a balanced approach and forecast where you want it based on optimizing use of the transmission system. Josh responded that we haven't developed an analytical approach to using the local HV system. Chair Raheem stated that we should go back and look at the full GI queue while trying to balance on kV perspective and how many MW's to connect at different kV levels. Joshua explained that in determining nodal sites for resources, we begin by scoping how much wind and solar storage adjustments to load we expect in the study horizon for the region. The FERNs data should have buildout of zones in the study, so we should start there. Joshua showed what the process would look like. One member agreed that a site repository would be good to start with resource needs by voltage level and then forecast granularity. He explained that we need to understand the implication of connecting multiple owners into a single resource location. Another member asked if this referenced pool surplus. A third member stated that it would be helpful to get a better sense of balance between specific POI's and what allows equivalency of interconnection along a particular area. He commented that it would help him to understand what the bookends are and what we can potentially do with our CPP transition study. He requested to understand how broad we can go with the level of interconnection to have some confidence about substation cost. Chair Raheem mentioned that we can divide this conversation into sections: 1) look at how broad we can go regarding entry fee (regional and subregional components), and 2) determine how narrow we should supplement the broad look to generate the transmission needs out of it. He suggested that we need to have two different conversations and then merge them at the end. He stated that we can start splitting the discussion up from this perspective to help with the discussion. The lack of contingent upgrades in this process can make certain sites look more likely to develop, but

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.

this does not account for restudies and reassignment of upgrades. The same member stated that we need to answer this question and know where it is cost effective to facilitate more interconnection. He claimed that there will be a need to balance a proactive approach to siting that looks further into the future and analyzes if there are better locations. He advocated for a balanced approach because we need to know how to handle the existing queues and understand what we are doing with network upgrades. A different member stated that what was explained in how the current queue should be included makes sense to him, and we will have to assume what is left and determine some methodology of what will move forward and what network upgrades will be built before they come online. He stated that what we put in the transition study will need to be forecasted because this is the basis on which our study was built. Chair Raheem stated that we have key decisions to make on scoping and siting, so we can continue the discussion. He stated that the group needs electrical equivalence to understand the appropriate balance of zonal or nodal siting. Also, we need historical amounts of kV to help setup guiding principles and thresholds that are acceptable for different kV levels. We must be able to answer if the queue is forward-looking enough - how we would look past the current GI queue interest. Joshua will cover some of the same materials in the TWG/ESWG meeting next week and will plan to bring data sources to that meeting though still waiting on final results of FERNS study in mid-August.

AGENDA ITEM 7 – ENTRY FEE: NRIS AND SUB-REGIONAL APPROACH

Chair Raheem stated that this topic is picking up some of the entry fee discussions as encountered while writing the revision request as potential consideration for sub-regional cost allocation if CAWG moves forward with HITT C1 for adjustment to subregional consideration. The proposal is if we can use the subregion alternative 1B to define sub-regions and if we can support this from the entry fee perspective. The main difference from CRIS deliverability areas is five vs. three sub-regions. He questioned if we can work with five sub-regions as a way to set the entry fee - still identify a way of having three zones but collect the entry fee in five sub-regions. If we have upgrades in the five subregions that cross over to three CRIS deliverability areas, then will need to find a way to align the costs. He shared a list of challenges if we don't do a more aggregated approach to the five sub-regions. Chair Raheem would like feedback on whether the group is interested and supportive of pursuing five subregions with five entry fees and would be supportive of this framework from a CPP entry fee perspective. Three members agreed that this would be the best way to go, and there was no opposition to this direction. He reviewed how upgrades would maintain deliverability, which is in the ITP process. In CPP service-type inclusions, the generator replacement would be separate from a service request. He described the generator replacement request process today and showed the proposed entry fee recommendation. A member stated that he read the recommendation to mean that we are assessing stability by definition with intent to focus on MW over the baseline. He responded that material modification should apply here, and we should write out what we mean. Another member asked if this required an additional study or going back into the GI process. Chair

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.

mentioned that a replacement request gets reviewed if above the material requirement. The incremental amount goes to a new GI request. Technical changes are evaluated for material impact on the system in the replacement study. It is believed that upgrades that are identified are cost assigned beyond mitigating the material requirement issue, and this will be confirmed. The same member thinks it will be beneficial to run this to ground. A different member asked if the customer would be allowed to provide a cure to remove the material modification impact or if they would just be forced to the next queue without being able to provide a fix. Chair Raheem stated that he believed they can pay to fix it or revert back to original figures, but not sure so will note to bring back a response. In surplus interconnection service, this was carved out of the CPP phase 1 analysis and is a standalone. Chair Raheem asked if clarification was needed on the scenario. One member asked if surplus service would generate any upgrades and if this was a matter of timing of when this occurs. Chair Raheem stated that it must be clear that if entering surplus then it is a standalone but if entering an amount through the CPP process then they will be subject to an entry fee. Another member responded that they shouldn't be subject to an entry fee if surplus is met. Chair Raheem concluded the discussion of this item.

13-min break until 2:40p

AGENDA ITEM 8 – CPP TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

Kelsey stated that this is what we focus on in the CNAT. He mentioned that we will continue development of the recommendations for the transition study and how to do analysis in CPP moving forward. There will be more discussion on the identification of needs, solution development, portfolio development, and entry fee calculations. He updated that he has started working on a white paper and some options of how to approach this. The draft is under development but there may be additional options to consider as discussions continue. He listed out current key items to address in the near-term. He provided a recap of the solutions side of considering SCRIPT 01 evaluation. He outlined a hierarchical approach to addressing system issues. This recommendation was developed before the entry fee concept was approved. He confirmed that we will continue discussions in the CNAT meetings. He explained what the high-level base model flow looks like. He explained that we build the BR prime model from a topology standpoint. He reviewed how service is reflected in the capacity energy model. Kelsey summarized the data that was taken from a dispatch and resource inclusion perspective to show different options for building the base model. He reminded that what is shown is not an all-inclusive list but was developed from discussions with CNAT. The table outlined potential options allowing for more options to be added. The dispatch approach does not leverage PROMOD outputs like we do for market Powerflow models today but uses the same routine as for base reliability models, which is not security constrained. Units can be dispatched on a deliverability area level. One member summarized the table of options as the first three options

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.

are how to setup the base case model (base protection of service and how to dispatch the system). The second option is protection of service plus a plan to forecast future resources with load. He also added that the shortfall process will link what is done in the market economic model with what is done in ITP base reliability model to make them better and link up with in CPP to have the same assumptions for forecasting resources. Kelsey communicated that we are looking at advanced ways to build transmission. He also explained that we need to make sure there is consistency between annual and long-term assessments. He outlined that in the generator interconnection approach, option 1 is the current DISIS analysis, option 2 is a robust flowgate analysis, and option 3 is the refined ERIS and CRIS analysis. He reviewed how we would dispatch across the footprint for the transfers. NRIS+ transfers would be kept in the deliverability areas and transferred across the LOLE zones. Kelsey walked through the options for how to approach dispatch for study purposes. He noted that for options with a) & b) segments, both options would have to be performed together. At this time, SPP's preference would be to keep ERIS/NRIS together and have NRIS be an incremental product but it is not finalized. Kelsey explained the purpose of transfer options for ERIS and NRIS/CRIS/NRIS+. He described the criteria for identification of applicable constraints that result in transmission reinforcement. One member recognized that doing something different has a lot of options. He affirmed that the team will need to be able to articulate which upgrades are driven by existing service that has been granted, ERIS and NRIS interconnection, and when they are needed from a time standpoint. He also stated that the team will need to be able to explain how and why we came to a conclusion from a risk and technical standpoint. We will need to be able to explain if the level of interconnection service is selected at the beginning or if it can be dropped later because it will determine how large the study could get. Kelsey outlined next steps which include having continued discussions at CNAT. He stated that there will also be a white paper that will be focused on GI and changes to the traditional ITP process. The necessary pieces could be taken to fill in the scope for the transition study and use for governing document updates. One member had a question on timing. He asked if we would adjust analysis to rule out some of the options in the special study, and with NRIS that is supposed to be in place by October 1 if it would be done like the transition study and then changed in the special study. There was a concern about a lot of network upgrades being identified. Kelsey stated that we won't have as much analysis as in the transition study. System issues would be identified. The member noted a concern about being set up for NRIS to fail. Kelsey stated that he will continue on the white paper and plans for an update to be brought to the next CPPTF meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 9 – WRAP UP AND ACTION ITEMS

Chair Raheem and Ms. Russell reviewed the upcoming meeting dates (noting the registration close for the in-person meeting on August 7, 2024, in St Louis) and action items from the meeting:

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.

- SPP staff to have more dialogue before Board meeting to ensure that there is sufficient support for current proposal or some alternate that people are comfortable with on DISIS windows. Chair Raheem to touch base internally to see if we can have more dialogue before Board meeting - will recap GIAG discussion on the DISIS waivers to this group at the August meeting (item 2)
- SPP staff to develop high-level comparison of what you get with and without waivers (pros & cons) for Board meeting
- SPP staff will continue discussion on the DISIS waivers (results of meeting with GIAG).
- Steve to finalize the CRIS RR and post a draft for CPPTF to review for 8/7 meeting (item 3)
- SPP staff to work on wording in the last bullet on slide 5 of the transition DISIS to CPP pres. (item 4)
- SIR 567 follow-up with GI team to see how timing aligns with CPP policy development
- SPP staff to develop additional options & pros/cons outlined for what path we will develop and identify for resource adequacy for CPPTF discussion
- SPP staff will review the results of the straw polls and determine next steps
- Chair Raheem will ask CPPTF for feedback on the gaps between FERC Order 1920 & CPP and how to address them at the Sept meeting (item 5)
- Joshua will plan to bring requested data to next month's CPPTF meeting (item 6).
- Will evaluate if we need to modify the September meeting to virtual only on 9/12 because of FERC workshop being held on 9/10 - 9/11 from 9a - 5p

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 3:48 p.m.

Attachments: Agenda, 06/17/24 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)

July 22, 2024: 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. CT

WebEx: 2495 877 9261 | Password: 3PuZGUUn9z8

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

AGENDA

- 1) **Call to Order and Administrative Items** (20 mins.)
 - a) Administrative Items Ramunda Russell & Sunny Raheem
 - b) Agenda ([Approval](#)) Sunny Raheem
 - c) Meeting Minutes Ramunda Russell
 - i) June 17, 2024 ([Approval](#))
 - d) Q2 Stakeholder Survey Ramunda Russell
 - 2) **MOPC and SPC Debrief** (30 mins.) Sunny Raheem
 - 3) **CRIS (NRIS+) Bridge Plan Verbal Update** (10 mins.) Steve Purdy
 - 4) **Transition DISIS to CPP** (90 mins.) GI Staff, Natasha, & Sunny
 - 5) **FERC Order 1920 and CPP Tariff RR Update** (45 mins.) SPP Staff, Ramunda
- Break (5-15 mins)*
- 6) **2026 ITP/CPP Transition Study** (60 mins.) Joshua Norton
 - a) Futures and Scope Development
 - b) Generation Expansion and Siting Options and Next Steps
- Lunch (30-60 mins)*
- 7) **Entry Fee: NRIS & Subregional Approach** (45 mins.) Sunny Raheem
 - 8) **CPP Transition Assessment** (90 mins.) Kelsey Allen
 - 9) **Wrap-Up, Action Items, and Future Meetings** (5 mins.) Ramunda Russell

Future Meetings

*Wed, Aug 7, 2024 (8a – 5p).....	St. Louis
Wed - Thur, Sept. 11-12, 2024 (12p-5p / 8a-12p).....	Little Rock
Tue, Oct 1, 2024 (9a-4p).....	WebEx

*In-person registration close on 7/26 at 8:00a CST

**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 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 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 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. 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 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 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 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 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.

ADJOURNMENT

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

CPPTF ATTENDANCE LIST, JULY 22, 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	David Mindham*	EDPR
5	Derek Brown*	Evergy
6	Heather Starnes*	MJMEUC
7	Jarred Cooley SPS*	SPS
8	John Krajewski*	NPRB
9	Michael Wegner+	ITC
10	Michael Wise*	GSEC
11	Steve Gaw*	APA
12	Steve Hohman*	OPPD
13	Ramunda Russell (Secretary)*	SPP
14	Adam Mummert	1898
15	Adam Schieffer	OPPD
16	Afshin Salehian	SPP
17	Ala Wadi	LU
18	Amber Joyce	MDU
19	Andrea Harrison	WFEC
20	Andrew Berg	MRE
21	Austin Baccus	SPP
22	Bernie Liu	Xcel
23	Brad Cochran	OGE
24	Brad Lafler	CES
25	Bridget Sparks	AES
26	Bruce Doll	OPPD
27	Call-in User_10	
28	Call-in User_2	
29	Call-in User_3	
30	Call-in User_4	
31	Call-in User_6	
32	Call-in User_7	
33	Call-in User_8	

34	Call-in User_9	
35	Carly Masenthin	KCC
36	Charles Locke	SPP
37	Chris Jamieson	SPP
38	Clifford Franklin	Sunflower
39	Conf 1F Room 117	SPP
40	Conor McKenzie	AEU
41	Dana Shelton	STONEPIGMAN
42	Deni Golden	SPP
43	Denise Buffington	Evergy
44	Denise Martin	SPP
45	Devon Pehrson	NGR
46	Don Frerking-SPP	SPP
47	Greg Rislov	SD
48	Jason Mazigian	BEPC
49	Jason Tanner	NextERA
50	Jay Caspary	TGA
51	Jeff Wells	NextERA
52	Jennifer Swierczek	SPP
53	Jodi Walters	EDPR
54	John O'Dell	SPP
55	John Stephens	CU
56	Jonathan Goldsworthy	ITC
57	Joshua Norton	SPP
58	Justin Grady	KCC
59	Kelsey Allen	SPP
60	Lee Elliott Invenergy	INVENERGY
61	Loren Ditsch	OPPD
62	Maggie Kristian	NGR
63	Marie Thompson	SoCo
64	Marisa Choate	SPP
65	Mark Miller	1898
66	Matt Alvarado IUB	IUB
67	Megan Damron	SPP
68	Melissa Seymour	Sun2O
69	Meredith Powell	SPP
70	Natasha Henderson	SPP
71	Naved Khan	SPP
72	Nick Abraham	ITC
73	Nitin Kushwaha	NGR

74	Olivia Hough	CU
75	Paul Antony	GA
76	Philip Westby	BEPC
77	Preston Blinsky	BEPC
78	Regan Fink	PGR
79	Rich Germinder	PSC
80	Richard Ross	AEP
81	Robert Pick	NPPD
82	Ryan Benton OG&E	OG&E
83	Ryan Hubbard TSGT	TSGT
84	Ryan Koch	BEPC
85	Ryan Yokley	Sunflower
86	Samuel Utomi	Leeward
87	Shari Albrecht	KCC
88	Sherri Maxey	SPP
89	Shilpi Sunil Kumar AES CE	ASE CE
90	Simon Cherucheril	PGR
91	Steve Purdy	SPP
92	Tammy Bright	SPP
93	Tandon, Shubham	MEPPI
94	Tessie Kentner	SPP
95	Toleman, Neeya	NEXTERA
96	Tyler Berton	AES