

**SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)  
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)  
October 1, 2024, 9:05 a.m. to 3:31 p.m.  
WebEx 2491 959 6108**

## **MINUTES**

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

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m., October 1, 2024, with a quorum present. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. John Krajewski was noted as a proxy for Heather Starnes, Loren Ditsch was noted as a proxy for Steve Hohman until 11:00 a.m., and Nick Parker was noted as a proxy for Chair Sunny Raheem starting at 11:30 a.m. Chair Raheem then reviewed the meeting agenda (Attachment A). Jason Tanner (NextEra) moved to approve the agenda as presented. John Krajewski (NPRB) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Ms. Russell reviewed the September 12, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B) and outlined action items. Steve Gaw (APA) moved to approve the previous meeting's minutes as edited. Jason Tanner (NextEra) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

### **AGENDA ITEM 2 – NUC CALCULATION APPROACHES**

Chair Raheem presented the approach for setting the initial entry fee, now known as the network upgrade contribution (NUC). He introduced the approach at the end of the last meeting but has added some details and plans to take to the CAWG meeting next week but would like feedback before posting the materials. He shared the methodology and quarterly approach to the path to seeking approval for the revision request in the middle of next year. He explained the analytical approach for estimating the cost split to set the initial NUC. He requested feedback on the number of futures needed to drive the initial NUC cost split. He also mentioned the NRIS+ incremental upgrades and if they would be allowed for the Safe Harbor limit. He outlined the next steps of determining the NUC maintenance recommendation with additional input from SPC in October and will share with this group after their feedback. Chair Raheem stated that the biggest outstanding items for finalizing direction to the revision request for the quarterly approach to NUC approval are the long-term assessment split, Z2 impacts, NRIS upgrades, and maintenance. He then reviewed the timeline for working group review and approval. There was member discussion about the concerns of the tariff language development being completed in such an aggressive timeline. Chair Raheem responded that it is a compressed schedule but obtaining agreement of the cost split would make it achievable. He also acknowledged that there are concerns about having enough review time on the front end but wants to continue aiming for this schedule and will plan to check and adjust in the November meeting. Chair Raheem provided an overview of the NUC CPP cycle flow process,

*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.*

establishing the NUC split upfront. He stated that there has been a great deal of discussion of the maintenance to occur between the annual studies to remain proactive. He highlighted the overall annual flow process needed to determine the costs for the customers' financial commitment. He mentioned that the big challenge is meeting the "but for" requirement under FERC Order 2003, which sets the framework for standardized generator interconnection (GI) agreements and procedures. He explained the long-term assessment inputs to the NUC, and that there will be generation expansion and input from the ITP scope to determine what upgrades will be needed under the new technical assessment approach. There was a great deal of member discussion on using the right analysis, but there was agreement that the goal is to come up with a solution that everyone can agree on and which is supported by data. Chair Raheem started talking about the details to approach this type of estimation and explained that there is urgency to get this established because of the timeline of GI studies which will take time to complete, and that CPP will solve timely GI studies starting with the technical assumptions. He highlighted that dispatch is the most critical consistency that we have to build out. He explained that we are leaning towards building the GI portfolio across twenty years similar to the regional planning portfolio. He reiterated that the generator proxy portfolio can help meet the "but for" requirement and estimate costs for network upgrades. Chair Raheem then mentioned that the primary focus of the twenty-year assessment is EHV. He explained that the cost assignment between load and generation will be based on engineering and construction costs. He shared the high-level approach to how the cost estimation is linked to the NUC. He stated that the regional and subregional buckets will be the primary focus of setting the NUC. There was member discussion on needing generation numbers back earlier and understanding the benefits to load coming from the portfolio. Chair Raheem addressed the issue of timing to receive generation data and outlined the data that is available. He then summarized the safeguards for the analytical approach. There was member discussion on the safeguards and what made sense to use. Chair Raheem then initiated discussion on the number of 2025 ITP scope futures and requested feedback on the right number of futures to calculate the NUC amount. There was member discussion on the importance of focusing on the variation of locations between the futures.

*10-min break until 11:10a*

Chair Raheem swapped the order of the next agenda item because the presenter had a later conflict.

## **AGENDA ITEM 8 – NRIS+ WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION UPDATE**

Steve Purdy provided a brief update on the status of the NRIS+ bridge plan. He stated that all working groups have approved RR649. He shared that there were no oppositions and one abstention at RTWG related to placement of SWPA facilities and deliverability south. He confirmed that this item is now on the consent agenda for MOPC.

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

### AGENDA ITEM 3 – TOSP UPDATE

Ben Bright provided an overview of the transmission owner selection process (TOSP) planning process changes and explained what occurs in the comparative upgrade process. The competitive bidding process for projects depends on whether they qualify as competitive upgrades or non-competitive upgrades. He explained that the team is focusing on RTO requirements and removal of rights of first refusal (ROFR). He mentioned that there are two applicable tariff sections: O & Y. He outlined the differences between the non-competitive and competitive upgrades and provided more definition and qualifications of being a competitive upgrade. He explained the terms of right of first refusal across the footprint. He pointed out that the states of Arkansas, Kansas, New Mexico, and Missouri do not have right of first refusal (ROFR) rules in place. One member asked if there was a file that provided specifics of the rights of first refusal for people to access. Ben responded that he is going to check. He outlined the qualifications for becoming a Qualified RFP Participant (QRP) were mentioned, including financial and technical criteria. He provided details and more definition of the industry expert panel (IEP) and the role it has in reviewing and scoring RFP proposals before making recommendations to the Board. what is included in the scoring criteria. He explained that the transmission owner selection process task force is reviewing the evaluation process and eliminating the IEP. He stated that the TOSP is comparing processes across the US to determine if SPP can handle the magnitude of projects in a CPP world. Ben explained that the planning process will undergo significant changes to support the new planning process and that the group involved in the planning process is relatively small. He then reviewed the timeline, stating that the process covers twelve months after the Board approves the NTC. There was some member discussion regarding short-term reliability in CPP and the timing of the Board meeting for approval.

The order of the next few presentations shifted due to presenter availability.

### AGENDA ITEM 4 – 2026 ITP/CPP TRANSITION STUDY

- b. This agenda item was swapped with item 4(a). Sherri Maxey provided a quick update on the scope outline and reviewed the schedule. She explained that the schedule showed milestones and topics to be taken to the respective working groups in preparation for January 2025 MOPC approval. A member stated that how we handle the futures is important to the dynamic, and he is wondering how we ensure that CPPTF feedback is in the approval loop. Sherri explained the role that CPPTF will have in this process and that CPPTF will be included in the policy discussions as well as determining incremental work. The same member requested a discussion about how the transition study will incorporate deliverability for resource adequacy needs. He asked to explore the model

*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.*

for sufficient deliverability in the NRIS construct. Sherri outlined the remaining items after January 2025 MOPC with plans to bring working group feedback to MOPC no later than July 2025. She then displayed the high-level outline of the scope document. Sherri provided next steps of bringing information to the working groups in the October round of meetings with a target of obtaining TWG/ESWG approval in the December meeting and MOPC approval in the January 2025 meeting.

*Recessed for 34-min lunch break until 12:40p*

- a. The meeting resumed with Joshua Norton providing an update on annual energy demand forecasts and resource capacity projections. He shared information including projections for wind, solar, and storage capacities from various data sources. He focused on identifying areas of interest and potential ranges for wind, solar, and storage capacities. He highlighted the capacity changes in year 20 for each type of resource. Joshua shared the IRPS survey results and summarized that there is quite a bit of solar, while not as much wind or storage, and mostly gas resources. A member asked about the amount of new generation versus retirements, and Joshua responded that he would provide the requested information. The member commented on needing to know what additional siting to plan for transmission needs in response to a question on the addition of more gas units. There was member discussion on the spread between the futures and the impact to design because a system design is needed that is flexible across load and generation. Members shared their thoughts on being able to provide an approval of this proposal without more information. Chair proxy Parker reminded the group that SPP wanted to get feedback and endorsement from the CPPTF but ultimate voting comes from the TWG and ESGW. One member stated that he wanted to get sign-offs from the primary voting groups while CPPTF remains neutral until they get more comfortable with the numbers, but also commented that he wants to be cooperative in getting to next steps. Another member reminded the group that if CPPTF does not provide input and the vote passes at other working groups, then this group will not be able to go backwards and hold up the process. A third member requested more information on how SPP can determine that generation is being sited in a way that will enable optimized interconnection before the group provides endorsement.
  
- c. This agenda item was swapped with item 5. Kelsey Allen shared that he presented most of the material at the last CNAT meeting but has added slides at the bottom of the presentation for reference. He shared the current status of the items that are being used in the basis for the technical paper and will be used to develop it. He explained that he planned to bring the basis for the paper to the next CPPTF meeting and then bring feedback to the next CNAT meeting to incorporate and bring the draft paper to the November CPPTF meeting. Kelsey laid out a few questions that required CPPTF feedback and guidance on transmission building. One member stated that we need to look at the

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

portfolio of the previous year's study before doing an assessment for the 2025 ITP, so we can't assume any projects will move forward. Another member agreed with the first member that whether we are facilitating transmission needed, we should look at building a robust system based off an economic look. A third member asked a clarifying question about what standard we should build to and what level we want to provide for ERIS and NRIS – basically wanting to understand where GETs is considered in this. Kelsey responded that we have a separate effort on GETs policy, so there will be discussion on this in coming months and the strategic vision of this in the planning process. He explained that we see this as a stopgap and not an enhancement and would like to see GETs as a short-term solution if we have a need for capacity on the system. No responses were received to the questions posed for feedback.

## AGENDA ITEM 5 – TRI-STATE POLICY DISCUSSION

Ryan Hubbard shared considerations for capacity needs project interconnection as a part of state-regulated resource planning processes. He explained that their current procedures are aligned with FERC Order 2023, and the current eleven-month window in SPP's process will reduce to forty-five (45) days within CPP. Tri-State is currently underway with a planning process in Colorado. Ryan stated that they have identified pathways that can assist with queue entry pathways into CPP. He explained that they are initiating discussion on their process, which is similar to SPP's process, and their options allow for more timely study of the projects. He summarized that this aligns with what is coming out of SAWG and REAL, which is their second highest-ranked priority of enabling LRE generation faster. Tri-State requested the CPPTF to incorporate the approach into the CPP phase 1 filing and review/discuss modification at the November 18, 2024, meeting while inviting SAWG/REAL representatives to participate in the discussion. A member mentioned that this proposal looks like it has promise. He wanted to get more LRE generation online faster but struggles with how to make this fair, so he would like to see if this can dovetail into CPP. Another member asked if there is a date for when projects will enter the queue and when they will enter into the DISIS. Ryan stated that assets in the West would transition to SPP in April 2026 would not be part of a cluster but be part of the base model for 2026 application. A member expounded that we need more dialogue of what CPP is supposed to accomplish. Ryan stated that his concern is that this is more tied to the long-term perspective versus the transition. He stated that it is proposed to be for more than state-regulated entities. Ryan then stated that they want to address what happens in CPP outside of the 45-day window. The same member responded that he would like to understand how adjustment of this will help or hinder getting this accomplished. Another member asked about the West having their own entry fee to align which still needs to be determined. A third member mentioned that he liked this idea but would prefer it not to be through a state-approved plan so that it is non-discriminatory and will help to get through FERC as well. A fourth member stated that this is similar to what MISO added in their last round of queue reform and is concerned about this being non-discriminatory and should maybe have a separate

*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.*

filing. A fifth member responded to the previous conversation regarding resources jumping ahead in the queue. He stated that interconnection service can be planned ahead, but the issue is moving forward without knowing what your interconnection is and that could result in being stuck with upgrade costs of which you were unaware and possibly would have withdrawn. Sarah Ruen chimed in about wanting to provide support and keep this process moving forward.

*5-min break until 2:50p*

## **AGENDA ITEM 6 – SCRIPT C3 COMMON MODEL**

Eddie Watson provided an update on C3.1 - C3.5 common model activities and progress made. He reviewed the common base model set configuration including base reliability model build timing, model shelf-life changes and late data process improvements, and additional modeling needs. He then summarized the common model set dispatch assumptions. He provided updates on initiatives still in progress (C3.3 - C3.5). He stated that he plans to share an update on the open items in future CPPTF meetings. He shared the common model roadmap and milestones achieved to-date. Eddie declared that he will provide an update in the next CPPTF meeting.

## **AGENDA ITEM 7 – CPP TARIFF REVISION REQUEST UPDATE**

Staff Secretary Russell presented an update on the CPP tariff revision request language development progress and Attachment O initial draft language changes. She provided an update on the CPP tariff revision request timeline and path forward. She stated that SPP is still reviewing the initial draft language internally and working to obtain internal consensus from the Legal and Regulatory teams before bringing actual tariff language revisions to the working groups. She stepped through the sections that will be impacted and provided an overview of the expected changes. She requested feedback on the approach for the language changes to incorporate into the draft before finalizing and taking before the working groups. No responses or input were received from the group.

## **AGENDA ITEM 9 – FERC ORDER 1920 UPDATE**

Meredith Powell provided a verbal update on FERC Order 1920 compliance. She explained that CPP and FERC Order 1920 filings will be approached on separate tracks in case CPP is not ready to be filed by the June 12, 2025, deadline. She stated that the FERC Order 1920 revision request will be posted in January 2025 with plans to bring to MOPC in April 2025. No questions were received from the group.

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

## AGENDA ITEM 10 – WRAP UP AND ACTION ITEMS

Staff Secretary Russell reviewed the action items from the meeting and discussed upcoming meeting dates:

- Ben to provide a link or file that provides details on what constitutes a right of first refusal (ROFR) in each state for people to access (item 3)
- SPP staff requested to have discussion about how the CPP transition study will incorporate deliverability for resource adequacy needs - asked to explore the model for sufficient deliverability in the NRIS construct (item 4b)
- Josh to provide the amount of generation that is replacing existing gas resources vs. what is new generation (item 4a)
- SPP staff to determine if we have enough gas capacity in the models and how we will decide that we have enough sites in the CPP transition study to enable optimized interconnection (item 4a)
- Tri-State to provide more information on how someone entering the queue early benefits through their process (item 5)
- Staff secretary to post the 2025 proposed meeting schedule for the group to review and be prepared to discuss regarding final dates and in-person locations in the next meeting (item 10) = complete

Staff Secretary Russell reviewed the results of the poll regarding the additional meeting in early November. She presented the three date/time options that received the most responses and stated that the November 1, 2024, at 12:30 – 4:30p CST would be the selection. She asked if there were any oppositions to this selection and none were received.

Staff Secretary Russell then initiated a discussion of the proposed 2025 meeting dates. She shared the list of suggested dates with the group. A member asked about the conflicts that the dates would have with the other working groups. She explained that there was a dedicated effort to get the working group staff secretaries together to identify dates and discuss internally so that we could minimize conflicts as much as possible for members who were involved in multiple working groups. The member expressed his appreciation for being proactive and taking that into account. Chair proxy Parker stated that we would get the list of dates posted as part of the post-meeting materials. Staff Secretary Russell asked for members to review and

*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.*



start thinking about who would be willing to host and which would be date options for in-person meetings so we would be prepared to discuss and decide in the next meeting.

## ADJOURNMENT

Chair proxy Parker adjourned the meeting at 3:31 p.m.

**Attachments:** Agenda, 09/12/24 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)**

**October 1, 2024: 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. CT**

**WebEx: 2491 959 6108 | Password: pBs7vkRSi38**

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

## AGENDA

- 1) **Call to Order and Administrative Items** (15 mins.)
  - a) Administrative Items ..... Ramunda Russell & Sunny Raheem
  - b) Agenda (Approval) ..... Sunny Raheem
  - c) Meeting Minutes ..... Ramunda Russell
    - i) September 12 (Approval)
  
- 2) **NUC (Entry Fee) Calculation Approaches** (60 mins.)..... Sunny Raheem
  
- 3) **TOSP Update** (45 mins.)..... Ben Bright
  
- Break (5-15 mins)*
  
- 4) **2026 ITP/CPP Transition Study Scope Updates** (120 mins.).....SPP Staff
  - a) Futures & Siting Update (60 mins.) .....Joshua Norton
  - b) Scope Update (30 mins.) ..... Sherri Maxey
  - c) CPP Technical Assessment (30 mins) ..... Kelsey Allen
  
- Lunch Break (30-60 mins)*
  
- 5) **Tri-State Policy Discussion** (45 mins.) .....Ryan Hubbard
  
- 6) **SCRIPT C3 Common Model** (45 mins.).....Eddie Watson
  
- Break (5-15 mins)*
  
- 7) **CPP Tariff RR Review - Attachment O Draft** (30 mins.)..... Ramunda Russell
  
- 8) **NRIS+ WG Discussion Update** (5 mins.).....Steve Purdy
  
- 9) **FERC Order 1920 Update** (5 mins.)..... Meredith Powell
  
- 10) **Wrap-Up, Action Items, and Future Meetings** (15 mins.) ..... Ramunda Russell

**Future Meetings**

**Mon, Nov 18, 2024** (9a-4p) WebEx

**Fri, Dec 6, 2024** (9a – 4p) WebEx

**Doodle Poll Results for additional meeting:**

- **November 1 - 12:30p to 4:30p**
- **November 4 – 9:00a to 1:00p**
- **November 4 – 12:30p to 4:30p**

SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)  
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)  
September 12, 2024, 9:05 a.m. to 3:48 p.m.  
WebEx 2499 964 6035

## MINUTES

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

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m., September 12, 2024, with a quorum present. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. Chair Raheem then reviewed the meeting agenda (Attachment A). A member requested an update from the FERC panel discussion related to CPP. Chair Raheem agreed and added item 1E to the agenda. Heather Starnes (MJMEUC) moved to approve the agenda as modified. Alan Myers (ITC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Ms. Russell reviewed the August 7, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B) and outlined action items. John Krajewski (NPRB) moved to approve the previous meeting's minutes. Commissioner French (KCC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Chair Raheem provided a membership update of Jason Tanner (NextEra - Transmission Business Manager & vice-chair of GIAG) being selected for the CPPTF after Carrie Dixon's exit. Jason Tanner provided a few words of why he wanted to be a part of CPPTF. Chair Raheem provided a FERC Panel overview for the group. Key takeaways from the discussion were underscoring the need for a comprehensive solution to address resource adequacy and interregional transfers. In general, there was a pro-CPP sentiment, but alignment with FERC principles remains a concern so there is a need for a strategic alignment. Early engagement with FERC and building broad consensus among stakeholders was noted as being crucial to avoid litigation risks. A member noted that with the new CPP, we are changing so much of the current status quo process that it is imperative to have consensus that builds reasonableness otherwise we risk litigation. Another member commended a CPPTF member, an SPP staff member, and others for carrying the torch and espousing the positives of CPP at such a high-profile conference and the early education which is imperative to its success.

### AGENDA ITEM 2 – NRIS+ REVISION REQUEST APPROVAL

Steve Purdy presented on RR649 – the NRIS+ bridge plan revision request. He mentioned requesting staff comments, which are due on Monday 9/16. He stated that introductory reviews were finished for the following working groups - CPPTF, GIAG, RTWG and TWG – in August and discussion will be held with RCAG this week. No substantive feedback was provided at any of the meetings. This revision request is scheduled for endorsement the week of September 23<sup>rd</sup> at the TWG/ESWG joint meeting in Colorado; therefore, he is on track for presenting at the MOPC and Board meetings in October. Through discussion, it was determined that the GI manual still

needs to be modified and needs cleanup regarding NRIS evaluation. Redlines will be included in comments to post by next Monday, 9/16/2024.

Steve discussed the Z2 calculation issues which included adjustments, stopgap measures, stacking order concerns, and creditable upgrades. Expedited timelines were discussed comparing the current process which has historically been a 5 ½ month study process within a 6-month cycle verses the new plan which will speed the process up to no more than 90 days. Joshua Ross discussed Z2 revenue crediting and stacking system. He mentioned a potential concern with the order of which different impacts are added to the credit stacking tool. He also discussed reverse creditable upgrades.

Steve provided a summary of the stakeholder feedback received on the revision request. He stated that there was a formal response received from Evergy. The main difference was a suggestion that the order of evaluation of ERIS versus NRIS requests be reversed. A member summarized that this is an idea that should achieve expected objectives and make things more efficient. He mentioned that the comments could be rolled out with this revision request or as a revised version of RR626 if the waivers are approved. SPP staff is still reviewing internally. Steve reminded that there are not issues with the comments proposed but just with the timing and the resources needed. Another member mentioned that there is concern that the NRIS+ product will not be available in time to get people the resources that they need. Chair Raheem responded saying that this motion intends to use the queue in the transition study for the short-term considerations and firms for long-term planning, thus the motion is sufficient to meet the needs to allow for evaluation and endorsement of the transmission constraints.

Steve requested that CPPTF affirm that RR649 implements the CRIS bridge plan policy. He also asked if the group wanted to take formal direction to other working groups.

**Steve Gaw (APA) moved to approve the motion as presented on the screen:**

- **Affirm that RR649 implements the CRIS Bridge Plan policy.**
- **Urge reviewing organizational groups to complete their reviews expeditiously and with respect to their individual scopes.**

**Heather Starnes (MJMEUC) seconded, and there was discussion noted. One member still had concerns about deliverability and SWPA placement. The member wanted to consider the decision of not splitting deliverability zones. A note was made to include this in the recommendation report. Following discussion, the motion passed unanimously.**

Steve recapped next steps: formal comments are needed by Monday 9/16, and the revision request will be going to GIAG on next Wednesday 9/18, TWG on Tuesday 9/24, and RTWG on 9/26 for final input before going to MOPC in October.

*12-minute break until 11:00a*

### AGENDA ITEM 3 – 2026 ITP/CPP TRANSITION STUDY UPDATE

- a. Josh Norton began the presentation on the Futures and Siting Approach by recapping the higher-level approval recommendations for the day: requesting endorsement for the use of FERNs data results and the number of futures for use in the CPP transition study and 2026 ITP. He explained the data sources utilized in the study scenarios, including FERNs as the primary source and the others used for input. One member raised questions on data categories, specifically transportation and data centers. The response to stakeholder was that data centers are included to some degree, but hydrogen load was not considered due to high uncertainty. Another member raised concerns about balancing the short-term GI queue considerations with long-term FERNs data. Staff response was that FERNs is primarily used for long term vision while the GI queue is used for short-term vision. A different member commented that he liked the direction with the incorporation of the FERNs data and how to transition in the short-term. He suggested adding language on using the current GI queue. After further group discussion, the motion was made for approving the language on the screen with included changes.

**Alan Myers (ITC) moved to approve the motion as modified on the screen:**

**CPPTF endorses using FERNs study to initially inform sub regional siting direction (in conjunction with the existing GI queue) and continue to develop siting process for nodal siting in the CPP transition study.**

**Steve Gaw (APA) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Josh Norton continued with his presentation stating that per FERC Order 1920, there is a requirement for three scenarios every five years, equating to six scenarios every ten years. He stated that the compliance filing will be due next summer, but the CPP 20-year scenarios may not be available initially. As such, Josh proposed that CPPTF endorse the use of up to three futures in the CPP transition study which includes the 20Y assessment and 2026 ITP.

A member asked if the proposal was for two futures for the transition study and up to five thereafter. An SPP staff member confirmed that this was the case. Chair Raheem explained that the CPP proposal would include at least seven scenarios within a five-year period, exceeding the three scenarios required by FERC Order 1920. The same member expressed reservations about relying on semantic arguments for compliance and suggested that doing three futures from the start might be cleaner.

There was continued discussion between SPP staff and members with one member urging that the regulatory department be consulted to ensure compliance with FERC Order 1920 and suggested using three futures in the initial study for compliance with FERC. Chair

Raheem proposed endorsing the use of up to three futures, with the third future being a delta from futures one and two.

**Alan Myers (ITC) moved to approve the motion as modified on the screen:**

**CPPTF endorses the use of up to 3 futures in CPP Transition Study (which includes the 20Y Assessment and 2026 ITP).**

**Steve Gaw (APA) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

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

After lunch, Josh continued discussion on nodal siting. He requested a thorough stakeholder review of the data set which can be used for future iterations of what to include in the database. He highlighted the type of feedback that would be beneficial. He explained that the ultimate goal is to have incremental cost for expanding substations to interconnect more generation. He asked what would help stakeholders to determine their best points for interconnection and how we can ask the best questions to get to the detail we need. One member recommended advertising heavily our need for a detailed review of sites with granularity. Another member recommended involving the GIAG group, which was met with agreement from the group. Josh then continued the discussion with land use assessment and development stating that there is plenty of land for development. Several members raised points around land use and development including certain areas within footprints that present significant challenges for siting generation. It was suggested that SPP should look to previous input provided on land availability and asked stakeholders to validate and update the previous input. Josh then initiated discussion that some substations may be more feasible for initial connections due to existing space. A member raised the argument that land availability to reach a substation can sometimes be a significant constraint, not just the space at the substation itself. The same member also shared that the feasibility of generator lead lines to the site can pose a major challenge and urged that the cost of adding a substation be looked at holistically.

- d. The discussion on the technical assessment was moved to the next item due to the presenter's travels. Kelsey mentioned that we are discussing items at the bi-weekly CNAT meetings. He stated that he will provide more in the white paper. The main focus areas in the presentation include: the need for strong technical assessments, model development with an emphasis on integrating economic analysis and addressing generation shortfalls, the importance of deliverability and resource adequacy in future models through NRIS+, the need for clear separation between load and interconnection costs in resource planning, and transitioning to a simple economic dispatch model for better reliability. One member

responded favorably to the presentation, including his rationale for FERC. He cautioned that at eye level approach, this is something worth spending time on and resources. Another member shared that there is a struggle within the market to balance the supply side (DISIS) and demand side (ITP), and he sees value in exploring the idea of using economics to address power flow limitations and setting benefit-to-cost ratios. Key takeaways from this conversation include creating a white paper with well-formed recommendations to be presented by Kelsey Allen at a future meeting, develop a comprehensive recommendation for the modified base reliability model, create a proposal for stability analysis, and explore the idea of using economic dispatch to address power flow limitations.

Chair Raheem stated that we have decisions to make for the rest of the day's agenda. He proposed to shift the scope update, DISIS transition, and TOSP discussions to the next meeting.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4 – NETWORK UPGRADE CONTRIBUTION CALCULATION APPROACH**

This agenda item was swapped in order with item 5. Chair Raheem wanted to get feedback on the discussion to build out option two. He recapped where the group left off on the entry fee discussion, and then presented the skeleton plan for option two. He stated that it is important to create a balanced approach to cost sharing over time between generation and load, as well as the need for simplicity, transparency, benefit, and predictability. He also introduced the terminology change from “entry fee” to “network upgrade contribution”. He established that there is a need for development of criteria for identifying local upgrades and that this information is needed for calculating generator portfolio cost and ensuring economic model efficiency. He explained that ERS analysis will look at local upgrades while NRIS portfolios will ensure deliverability across deliverability areas. He stated that challenges to this will include common baselines for cost estimates and policy decisions for generator interconnections.

The general communication from members regarding this presentation was positive but with caution to use guard rails, and the need for documentation and rationale for the approach.

Chair Raheem stated that we will keep building this out to help with justification for the cost split. It puts more responsibility on drilling the cost down into the studies once completed.

#### **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 stated that the team is making solid progress with developing language revisions in the initial three attachments (O, V, and new one on cost allocation). She mentioned that the team is close to having an initial draft ready to bring to the CPPTF for initial review and that this is targeted for the October CPPTF meeting if we can get it finalized by the posting deadline. She stated that the next attachment that is expected to be brought before the team is Attachment V. She

explained that we have some work to do on the new attachment being developed for the cost allocation mechanism and structure. The team still needs input from the HITT C1 decision and will incorporate aspects of the technical assessment once complete.

She highlighted that a FERC Order 1920 update will be brought to the October meeting.

## **AGENDA ITEM 6 – TOSP UPDATE (DEFERRED TO OCTOBER MEETING)**

## **AGENDA ITEM 7 – WRAP UP, ACTION ITEMS, AND FUTURE MEETINGS**

Ms. Russell reviewed the action items from the meeting:

- SPP staff is recommended to prepare a plan - develop a strategic policy track for FERC - to bring back to CPPTF
- SPP staff to continue having discussion on Evergy's proposal outside of CPP proposal
- SPP staff to continue working on NRIS+ in CPP proposal and determine if a long-term plan is needed for NRIS+
- SPP staff to get clarity from the Regulatory team on the impact of the # futures with O1920 compliance within the transition study or subsequent study
- SPP staff will get GIAG input from stakeholders on proposed siting locations
- SPP staff will get more input on the interconnection and siting in upcoming workshops
- SPP staff will keep building out this option to help with justification for the cost split
- SPP staff to send out a doodle poll for responses on meeting the first week of Nov. = complete

There was also discussion about having an additional meeting between the October and November meeting dates. After group discussion, it was suggested to send out a doodle poll for responses targeting the first week of November.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

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



**CPPTF ATTENDANCE LIST, OCTOBER 1, 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	Adam McKinnie*	MPSC
4	Andrew French*	KCC
5	David Mindham*	EDPR
6	Derek Brown*	Evergy
7	Jarred Cooley SPS*	SPS
8	Jason Tanner*	NextEra
9	John Krajewski*	NPRB
10	Steve Gaw*	APA
11	Steve Hohman*	OPPD
12	Ramunda Russell (Secretary)*	SPP
13	Nick Parker+	SPP
14	Loren Ditsch+	OPPD
15	Aaron Stemplewicz	Earth Justice
16	Adam Schieffer	OPPD
17	Adam Snapp	OGE
18	Ala Wadi	LU
19	Alyssa Culver	SPP
20	Andrew Daro	NPPD
21	Angela Sartori	SPP
22	Annie Minondo	NRDC
23	Austin Baccus	SPP
24	Baccari, Louis	NextEra
25	Ben Bright	SPP
26	Bernie Liu	Xcel
27	Brian Pedersen	NextEra
28	Bridget Sparks	AES
29	Bruce Doll	OPPD
30	Caitlin Shank	SPP
31	Call-in User_5	
32	Call-in User_6	

33	Call-in User_7	
34	Call-in User_8	
35	Calvin Daniels	WFEC
36	Carly Masenthin	KCC
37	Casey Cathey	SPP
38	Charles Locke	SPP
39	Chris Cranford	SPP
40	Chris Jamieson	SPP
41	Chris Lyons	CES
42	Chris Stolz	PGR
43	Cindy Ireland	Ark.gov
44	Clifford Franklin	Sunflower
45	Conf 1F Room 117	SPP
46	Conor McKenzie	AEU
47	Dana Shelton	STONEPIGMAN
48	Denise Martin	SPP
49	Dennis Reed	MWRC
50	Derek Sunderman	SE
51	Devon Pehrson	NGR
52	Diana Gastelum	GPISD
53	Don Frerking-SPP	SPP
54	Doug Kouskouris	AEP
55	Eddie Watson	SPP
56	Fernando Osorio	Nira
57	Gayle Freier	SPP
58	Greg Wannier	Sierra Club
59	Jake Chapman	Sisung
60	Jake Weinberg	GA
61	Jason Chaplin	OCC
62	Jay Caspary	TGA
63	Jennifer Swierczek	SPP
64	Joe Fultz	GRDA
65	Joe Price	Samsung
66	John O’Dell	SPP
67	Jonathan Goldsworthy	ITC
68	Jonathan Lubobo	BEPC
69	Joshua Norton	SPP
70	Justin Grady	KCC
71	Kalun Kelley	WFEC
72	Kass Portra	WAPA

73	Kelsey Allen	SPP
74	Lane Sisung	Sisung
75	Lee Elliott Invenergy	INVENERGY
76	Lisa Barrett	AEU
77	Lisa Tormoen Hickey	IEA
78	Lottie Jones	SPP
79	Maggie Kristian	NGR
80	Marie Thompson	SoCo
81	Marisa Choate	SPP
82	Matt Alvarado IUB	IUB
83	Matt Powell	
84	Maurisa Hughes	SPP
85	Maya Nevels	APA
86	Megan Damron	SPP
87	Meredith Powell	SPP
88	Michael Wegner	ITC
89	Nathan Pearce	Sunflower
90	Natasha Henderson	SPP
91	Naved Khan	SPP
92	Neeya Toleman	Viridon
93	Nick Abraham	ITC
94	Nicole Wagner	SPP
95	Nitin Kushwaha	NGR
96	Olivia Hough	CU
97	Ray Ward	WAPA
98	Richard Seide	Grid Strategies
99	Robert Pick	NPPD
100	Ryan Benton OG&E	OG&E
101	Ryan Hubbard TSGT	TSGT
102	Ryan Reynolds	SPP
103	Ryan Yokley	Sunflower
104	Sarah Ruen Tri-State	TSGT
105	Shawnee Claiborn-Pinto	PUCT
106	Sherri Maxey	SPP
107	Shilpi Sunil Kumar AES CE	ASE CE
108	Steve Purdy	SPP
109	Susanna Padilla	SPP
110	Temujin Roach	EDFR
111	Tyler Berton	AES
112	Victoria Doyle	SPP

113	Walt Shumate	SBC Global
114	Wei, Kenneth	NextEra
115	Wells, Jeff	NextEra
116	Zea Flores	WAPA