

**SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)  
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)  
August 7, 2024, 8:09 a.m. to 4:40 p.m.  
WebEx 2483 633 7548**

## **MINUTES**

### **AGENDA ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER AND ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 8:09 a.m., August 7, 2024, with a quorum present. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. There were no proxies recorded for this meeting. Chair Raheem reviewed the meeting agenda (Attachment A). Commissioner French (KCC) moved to approve the agenda as presented. John Krajewski (NPRB) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Ms. Russell reviewed the July 22, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B) and outlined action items. John Krajewski (NPRB) moved to approve the previous meeting's minutes. Alan Myers (ITC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

### **AGENDA ITEM 2 – CRIS REVISION REQUEST PREVIEW**

Steve Purdy provided a draft of the CRIS revision request for stakeholder review and input. He reviewed the schedule and explained that he was planning to post the revision request for comments by next Wednesday. If comments were provided during this time, he could make changes without having to go through the formal change process once posted. He targeted a goal of getting this to October MOPC and the Board for approval on October 29, 2024, since this was a recommendation related to HITT. The plan is for this to be stood up by the end of the year. He recapped that the NRIS+ bridge plan was previously approved. He mentioned that there are three different areas of Attachment V that will be impacted (App. 3, Sect. 5, Sect. 8.2), and changes will be required to the GI manual. There were some questions and group discussion on terms and definitions. Steve provided an overview of the expedited process of what the customer would go through to designate a NRIS unit without going through an aggregate study. Steve mentioned the internal discussions that were had regarding Z2. He stated that for new NRIS requests that go through the GI process, we would provide an analysis of Z2 impacts by a future designation and provide an estimate of what credits will be. Once the customer goes through with the designation process, they will submit the Z2 agreement and SPP will study the impact from that resource to that specific load. SPP will provide information to the customer and will allow them to withdraw if decided. We factored in a 90-day advance to go through check boxes and do Z2 analysis. Steve explained that existing generators transitioning to NRIS+ would be included in one of three buckets: existing generators with GIA's included in the transition study, requests within the queue in the process of being studied, and the requests that have not been submitted yet. The revision request will cover the first two

*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.*

buckets. He explained that the resource deliverability amounts and deliverability areas will be included in one central source of information for the network resource deliverability amounts. There was some discussion on how this document would look. Steve then outlined the new NRIS requests submission and evaluation process. He stated that the deposits will be based on the maximum injection capability as well as the financial security, which is consistent with FERC's policy guidance in Order 2023. Steve outlined what the GIA will include, and then he listed which customers would be affected on the effective date of the revised GI transition procedures. He explained that we plan to have discussions with various groups this month and prepare to go to MOPC for approval in October. One member was concerned about having deliverability areas changed and tracking this in the GIA, which would lead to a lot of administrative burden on the GIA's. There were questions and some discussion regarding the different types of customers and if grandfathered generation would have to submit an agreement. Another member stated that he will mark up the document with his comments. He mentioned that given the Board action to delay the open window, we want to set ourselves up for success with transitioning the DISIS. He stated that we need to do this in tandem with the NRIS study and asked if this needed to be added into a business practice. Steve stated that there is not a dramatic change, and we will not be using the DC analysis. Chair Raheem confirmed that we are posting for comments on August 14, so he requested that they be provided by that time. Chair Raheem recapped action items from this discussion. An SPP member confirmed that the GIA is required for initiating or requesting firm service; it is business practice 7500.

*10-min break until 9:24a*

### **AGENDA ITEM 3 – TRANSITION DISIS TO CPP**

Chair Raheem stated that there was discussion at the Board on the DISIS 2024/2025 waiver approach. This was about bringing in study assumptions to the CPP proposal to see how the existing DISIS will tie into this approach. We need to have good assumptions to have a good foundation to establish forward-looking entry fee amounts. He listed the two options for the study that were discussed last time - having a standalone study or expanding the scope of the CPP transition study. He outlined the benefits and challenges of each. He explained a high-level comparison of the two study options in key areas. One member stated that the restudy risk in the transition study approach seemed lower. Chair Raheem responded that it would be lower depending on the siting approach. Another member asked how the studies would be different, and there was a great deal of discussion on this. The questioning member stated a preference for option two but was concerned that we would miss an opportunity to do something sooner rather than later if we waited to file the entry fee next year. A different member stated that we have a chance for more FERC pushback with option two, and another member agreed. Chair Raheem stated that we had an action item to review the GIAG poll results to bring back to this group. He claimed that it was a little surprising that limiting resources was the most important area of focus. This provided confirmation that both groups are leaning towards the same areas. The CPPTF poll results showed that the majority agreed with the GI certainty concern. He

*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.*

observed that many did not vote but thinks that it was because this was a new concept, and many were still wrapping their heads around this. He listed the open feedback that was captured from the last poll question and placed comments in four main categories. Chair Raheem summarized the challenges and solutions of the transition study. He then forecasted how many more restudies we would have to provide certainty under the dark green box and additional analysis that would be performed in upcoming studies. He explained a high-level flow of the DISIS process with a waterfall effect of results feeding into the subsequent phases. He then provided an overview of how to perform the siting process. There was discussion on why we were using an energy metric instead of a capacity metric for a storage unit. It was suggested that we need more clarity on renewable calculation basis. Chair Raheem moved on to summarize that the customer dropout rate is 45 - 55% for each DISIS study and expect that this will continue for those that have high-cost assignments. He stated that we expect some to still drop out based on the cost assignment coming out of our study. He noted that Future 2 totals include spot load additions from resiliency conditions. There was discussion on developers signing agreements with upgrade costs and the associated withdrawal risk. Chair Raheem outlined the assumptions used to develop option two of the study. He summarized the goals for option two and listed out the key decisions needed. He stated that our option under this approach was the entry fee recommendation that would carry over to the CPP process. He outlined the three stages of the CPP filing to determine the assumptions that will be included in the transition study. There was group discussion on what to include in the base model and the dependency of solutions on the GIA. Chair Raheem stated that we need to decide if we will honor high-cost assignments out of GIA. He stated that we are factoring in cost assignment into the ITP process. Chair Raheem mentioned that we may want to look at a lower cutoff point at the average cost of \$65/kW vs. the \$125/kW ceiling. There was a lot of group discussion on the timing of when to add in upgrades. An SPP member suggested that we may need to identify if there is another point in which to include the upgrades. One member stated that an important piece is to include a larger pool of resources that are less certain and have more site selection inclusion criteria on which to build, and another member agreed.

*15-min break until 11:25a*

After break, Chair Raheem started discussing requests not at DP2 and when they could convert to CPP. He summarized the problem statement (what consideration will be given to land use analysis and what will be factored into the transition study) and the siting modification recommendation. He outlined the two policy decisions to be made: make a recommendation on whether we are ready to move forward with option two which will be incorporating into the transition study and which DISIS the entry fee applies to, which could be 2024 and if CPP is delayed, it would also apply to 2025. Chair Raheem asked for input from the developers on if we should put the shared network upgrade agreement in DP2. Concerns were shared regarding pushback from FERC and the approval timeline. There was discussion on the timing of finalizing the model set to keep the 2026 ITP on schedule. There was an update provided on the FERNS

*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.*

study and an explanation of what the data will provide as well as how to incorporate it. Chair Raheem asked the group if they were ready to narrow down to one study option. One member stated his preference of option two because it is a blended approach with CPP and the FERC filing process. He declared that voting on this option will allow us to make quick decisions on simple items and then select items that need more discussion. Another member agreed, but believed there is more needed on the DISIS blending. The suggestion was made to move forward with a motion.

Motion	Outcome
Motion Language	I move to approve the draft motion regarding further development of option two as displayed on slide 5 and eliminating the development of option one.
Motion	S Gaw
Second	A Myers
Discussion	A Myers stated that we needed to hash out more details to move forward with CPP alignment. His concern was the risk around option one. Chair Raheem stated that this would push us to make a determination on entry fee.
Vote - In favor	All
Vote - Opposed	None
Vote - Abstain	None

Motion passed. Chair Raheem stated that before the September meeting, we would develop option two for the study in a paper and vote on the details of this section of the scope.

*50-min lunch break until 1:00p*

*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 returning from lunch break, Chair Raheem wanted to determine if the group was comfortable with the three stages to build out the recommendation. One member asked for clarification on if Chair Raheem wanted to vote on the structure and then how to handle them. This structure would be used to build out the recommendations. Another member asked when there would be decisions made. Chair Raheem confirmed that this would be needed by the September meeting. The first member asked if we were firm enough on stage one to move forward with a recommendation so we can plan on further discussion for the other two stages. Chair Raheem asked if there was more discussion needed on stage one. There was no response. He stated that we now have direction on this item, and no motion was needed.

#### AGENDA ITEM 4 – ENTRY FEE DISCUSSION

Chair Raheem recapped where we left off on the entry fee discussion. He stated that we will need to file the entry fee as part of the revision request. He showed the system split calculation that was in the entry fee framework document. He noted that more than half of firm service going through the aggregate study can get base plan funding up to the Safe Harbor limit. He stated that we wanted feedback on the entry fee methodology approach. He briefly covered the cost split and stated that the majority of upgrades in the expansion plan are base plan funded. He reminded of the cost allocation rules that we have - we are blending the DISIS GI process with the ITP process, which have different cost objectives. He stated that we are trying to find a way to setup the entry fee early. He outlined the potential approach and identified the three main challenges. One member was concerned with higher transmission cost and not energy cost. Another member was concerned about if we have base funded everything now and may not need as much, if we needed some normalization so we wouldn't end up with a low baseline after the cost spent in the transition study. A different member stated that we should align with FERC Order 1920 benefit metrics as much as possible to put us in a good position with FERC. A member confirmed that the long-term solution is CPP, but we still need to focus on the near-term ITP. Chair Raheem outlined the system split calculation and stated that the adjustment factor is the multiplier. He claimed that this proposed approach is within tolerance for what we believe is success. There was discussion about the average cost number used and wanted confirmation that the number is skewed and is also based on historical and not future. There was explanation of the JTIQ calculation. One member stated that the cost recovery is truly 30 - 50% higher and the comparison of cost is not accurate, and he is concerned that we are creating incentives for a dead zone. Another member offered that the JTIQ approach could be problematic. A different member touched on firm vs. non-firm distinction and wanted to make sure that this is clear for FERC compliance filing. There was a question about the 50/50 split being used, and there was a response that this split could price everyone out while the 70/30 split is a snapshot that is a rough estimate from the ITP data reference. There was group discussion on being detailed in our filing next spring and whether we were on the right track. A few members agreed, while others are concerned about the calculation. A suggestion was made to develop a framework that will show savings instead of a generation and load portfolio and use this to justify a cost savings vs. a generation/load benefit to take to FERC. A member

*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.*

explained the system split idea and suggested that we use the transmission construction as a baseline for the cost split and use the remaining 30% to meet everyone's needs. Another member stated that SPP needs to take into account the "roughly commensurate" number from a litigation standpoint and be prepared to ensure that we address the standard. A third member is concerned that he will be paying twice: JTIQ and entry fee. Chair Raheem stated that we need to identify a list of calculations. We need to determine a split, and it may be done multiple ways. He suggested that we list out the calculations after break so staff can begin moving forward.

*15-min break until 2:38p*

Chair Raheem resumed the meeting with the group outlining calculation approaches in lieu of the system split. There was group discussion with one member proposing that we need two separate lists (NRIS+ list based on RA needs of LRE's and others interconnecting that may not get there on being designated). He also suggested that we solve for ensuring deliverability in year 5 and year 10 for LRE's to get ahead of doing transmission to deliver LRE requirements (identify data inputs and final outcomes and what develops a portfolio). Chair Raheem stated that we must at least have the methodology for the filing, but don't know how we can proof test it if we don't have numbers. Another member suggested a more forward-looking way to calculate the system split by doing it after the resource plan. There was a lot of group discussion between members and SPP members. One member suggested a test number to make people feel more comfortable. Chair Raheem stated that we have enough to put together a draft calculation internally based on group input, and an SPP member agreed. A member suggested developing a FERC Order 1920 benefits approach. The SPP member stated that we need to layout all of the benefits. Chair Raheem stated that the big challenge is doing this by the new siting approach. He confirmed that SPP would work on other approaches and bring back to the September meeting.

## **AGENDA ITEM 5 – 2026 ITP/CPP TRANSITION ASSESSMENT**

- b. Sherri Maxey shared the overview of the initial scope outline and requested feedback on any noted gaps. She stated that a couple of items were added under the MEM. A new item was included for HVDC considerations. One member flagged three items for consideration: deliverability in NRIS+ zones and if we should ensure resource adequacy needs as part of transmission services (do we move forward with CRIS transition study upgrades?), whether congestion hedging modeling will change, and if FERC Order 1920 is included. An SPP member asked what our gameplan is for the first CPP cycle and if we know what we will include in the next three annual assessments. He stated that we would stick to futures and reliability scenarios for the 2028 and 2029 assessments (as #2 and #3 of the first CPP cycle). Chair Raheem stated that the 2027 assessment would

*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.*



likely be reliability only because we can't apply an entry fee to the 2027 timeline. A member mentioned that this will emphasize the point that NTC's should be considered out of the transition study. Sherri will add these comments to future internal conversations and meetings to continue developing the language. Another member mentioned that we should add where we need waivers in the deliverables. Chair Raheem mentioned that we can include, where applicable, in the scope.

- a. Joshua Norton led the futures and siting approach discussion. He explained what the FERNS data will include and shared the timeline of when data is expected to be taken to ESWG. He listed the three data demands and showed that the main data source is the EIA. He outlined options for determining the number of futures. One member asked for clarification on the use of two or three futures. There was clarification that after the transition study, it is open to multiple futures with a minimum of three every three years. The suggestion was made to adjust the first bullet in the green area to say that there would be two futures for the transition study. Joshua reviewed the seven "categories of factors" regulations to be included and stated that a drivers table for futures will be developed to include in the scope. He showed what would be pulled from our data sources to use in the CPP transition study. We need to determine where the resources will be placed within the zones and define what we want to receive and what would be helpful. One member asked which group would be taking the lead on the stakeholder review. Joshua responded that the ESWG has been reviewing this for the ITP. The member agreed with continuing to have ESWG to lead the effort. Joshua continued with showing the table for the zonal level within the scope. One member warned against placing a wall with the LOLE zones and is concerned that we reinforce constraints because we aren't creating flow across the zones. Another member countered the point by not wanting to limit expansion but recognizing the constraints in place today to optimize the existing futures system. A different member stated that we should make optimal use of the FERNS study to break down constraints within the footprint if it is developed as advertised. An SPP member agreed that the FERNS data will be the best look that we have had and stated that we have plans to check the FERNS numbers. He explained that we have a point of interconnection demand in the current GI plan and will use it to perform a check of the granularity scope. A concern was raised about national databases and generalized scoring being used within the FERNS study and stated that we need more granularity in each state or zone. Joshua outlined three options for how to allocate a subregional entry fee. One member suggested that allocating evenly per MW should be the goal. He stated that when determining the applicability of the entry fee, we should have analytics to support - look at flow across facilities to determine eligibility and allow for flexibility for changes in the 20Y assessment. Another member agreed and added that transparency in where to interconnect would be a plus but was not sure if a screening study would help with this. The first member added that being too specific on where to forecast will defeat the purpose, and we need to make sure that there is engineering analysis or enough flexibility built into the entry fee. Another SPP member stated that we need to hone in on the definition of suboptimal and electrical

*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.*

equivalence. He proposed that we need to get to where we are applying the same entry fee to all customers in the region and to align with the structure of five entry fees to five subregions.

Chair Raheem stated that we should add the remaining three items to the CNAT meeting for discussion and guidance. The last item for CPP technical approach would be discussed in tomorrow's CNAT meeting.

## AGENDA ITEM 6 – WRAP UP AND ACTION ITEMS

Chair Raheem and Ms. Russell reviewed the upcoming meeting dates (noting the September meeting change from in-person to web conference due to the FERC workshop taking place on September 10 – 11, 2024) and action items from the meeting:

- Steve will send a link to GlobalScape out to the group for the transition study results for NRIS+ (item 2). = complete
- SPP will look at light load case and how it's applied to deliverability amounts - pick up in 2026 ITP discussion
- SPP to follow-up on request to verify if there is a concern with sharing the interconnection contacts prior to having the GIA executed (item 3)
- SPP to see if there is another point in which to include the upgrades
- SPP to develop option 2 for the special study in a paper and vote on the details of this section of the scope in the September meeting

## ADJOURNMENT

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

**Attachments:** Agenda, 07/22/24 Minutes, Attendance List



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

August 7, 2024: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. CT  
WebEx: 2483 633 7548 | Password: prC93mkmp5u

*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) (**Approval**)
  
- 2) **CRIS Revision Request Preview** (30 mins.) ..... Steve Purdy
  
- 3) **Transition DISIS to CPP** (120 mins.) ..... Jennifer, Natasha, & Sunny  
*Break (5-15 mins)*
  
- 4) **Entry Fee Discussion** (60 mins.) ..... Sunny Raheem  
*Lunch (30-60 mins)*
  
- 5) **2026 ITP | CPP Transition Assessment**
  - a) **Futures and Siting Approach** (60 mins.) ..... Joshua Norton
  - b) **Scope Review** (30 mins.) ..... Joshua Norton & Sherri Maxey
  - c) **CPP Technical Approach** (120 mins.) ..... Kelsey Allen  
*Break (5-15 mins)*
  
- 6) **Wrap-Up, Action Items, and Future Meetings** (5 mins.) ..... Ramunda Russell

**Future Meetings**

<b>*Thur, Sept. 12, 2024</b> (9a-4p).....	WebEx
<b>Tue, Oct 1, 2024</b> (9a-4p).....	WebEx
<b>Mon, Nov. 18, 2024</b> (9a-4p).....	WebEx

\*changing from in-person to virtual meeting due to FERC workshop being held on Sept. 10 - 11, 2024

**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 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 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. He communicated that he expects a final posting for comment by August 14<sup>th</sup>. 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 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

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.

*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 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 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 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:

- 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.

**CPPTF ATTENDANCE LIST, AUGUST 7, 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 Wise*	GSEC
10	Steve Gaw*	APA
11	Steve Hohman*	OPPD
12	Ramunda Russell (Secretary)*	SPP
13	Adam McKinnie	PSC
14	Adam Snapp	OG&E
15	Afshin Salehian	SPP
16	Alyssa Culver	SPP
17	Amy Newton	CU
18	Anthony Rotar	Volar
19	Austin Baccus	SPP
20	Austin Morman	SPP
21	Bernie Liu	Xcel
22	Brad Lafler	CES
23	Brenda Fite	SPP
24	Brett Furuness	Utilicast
25	Brian Drumm	ITC
26	Brian Rounds	AES
27	Bridget Sparks	AES
28	Call-in User_4	
29	Call-in User_5	
30	Call-in User_7	
31	Carly Masenthin	KCC
32	Casey Cathey	SPP
33	Chan Lee	SE



34	Charles Locke	SPP
35	Chris Jamieson	SPP
36	Chris Lyons	CES
37	Chris Stolz	PGR
38	Clifford Franklin	Sunflower
39	Conor McKenzie	AEU
40	Curtis Miller	WFEC
41	Dana Shelton	STONEPIGMAN
42	Deni Golden	SPP
43	Denise Buffington	Evergy
44	Denise Martin	SPP
45	Derek Sunderman	SE
46	Devon Pehrson	NGR
47	Diana Gastelum	GPISD
48	Don Frerking-SPP	SPP
49	Doug Kouskouris AEP	AEP
50	Eddie Watson	SPP
51	Gayle Nansel	WAPA
52	Heather Starnes	HLO
53	James Peters	SPP
54	Jason Mazigian	BEPC
55	Jay Caspary	TGA
56	Jennifer Solomon	NextERA
57	Jeff Wells	NextERA
58	Jennifer Swierczek	SPP
59	Jerry Bradshaw	CU
60	Jodi Walters	EDPR
61	John Knofczynski	East River
62	John O'Dell	SPP
63	John Stephens	CU
64	John Vara - GSEC	GSEC
65	Jonathan Surls	EE
66	Jordan Skillern	WFEC
67	Joshua Norton	SPP
68	Joshua Ross	SPP
69	Justin Grady	KCC
70	Kalun Kelley - WFEC	WFEC
71	Kelsey Allen	SPP
72	Kirk Hall	SPP
73	Lee Elliott Invenergy	INVENERGY

74	Loren Ditsch	OPPD
75	Maggie Kristian	NGR
76	Marisa Choate	SPP
77	Matt Alvarado IUB	IUB
78	Maya Nevels	APA
79	Meredith Powell	SPP
80	Michael Wegner	ITC
81	Natasha Henderson	SPP
82	Naved Khan	SPP
83	Nick Parker	SPP
84	Nicole Wagner	SPP
85	Nigel Dunham	ACE
86	Paul Antony	GA
87	Preston Blinsky	BEPC
88	Regan Fink	PGR
89	Richard Ross	AEP
90	Ron Chartier	Sunflower
91	Ryan Benton OG&E	OG&E
92	Ryan Yokley	Sunflower
93	Samuel Utomi	Leeward
94	Sherri Maxey	SPP
95	Shilpi Sunil Kumar AES CE	ASE CE
96	Simon Cherucheril	PGR
97	Steve Purdy	SPP
98	Susanna Padilla	SPP
99	Tandon, Shubham	MEPPI
100	Temujin Roach	EDF
101	Tyler Berton	AES
102	Vaibhav Bilagi, RWE	RWE