

**SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)
November 1, 2024, 12:30 p.m. to 4:30 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 12:32 p.m., November 1, 2024, with a quorum present. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. Blake Poole was noted as a proxy for Derek Brown, and Steve Gaw was noted as a proxy for David Mindham starting at 2:00 p.m. Chair Raheem reviewed the meeting agenda (Attachment A) and noted that there would be a change to the structure going forward to streamline the meeting. Alan Myers (ITC) moved to approve the agenda as presented. Steve Gaw (APA) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Raheem reviewed the consent agenda item for the October 1, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B). Heather Starnes (MJMEUC) moved to approve the motion for the consent agenda item. John Krajewski (NPRB) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – MOPC/SPC DEBRIEF

Chair Raheem highlighted three areas under the SCRIPT program and shared that items related to those areas were approved by MOPC - aging infrastructure, high priority study modifications, and HITT T1 NRIS+ implementation. He stated that there is a lot of activity in the 2025 ITP resiliency model updates for the scope inclusion, and staff will start summarizing and bringing to this group for awareness. He affirmed that this effort would require an ITP manual update, and an approval request will be coming to the April MOPC meeting. He explained that this is important as a driver to set the direction for our discussions on staging. He mentioned that the other items discussed were the 2026 ITP/_CPP transition study scope with the futures 1 and 2 numbers and received feedback. He also shared that there was an update on FERC Order 1920. He updated that staff's plan is to develop language based on the current process and policy to meet FERC Order 1920 requirements and a way to safeguard the CPP work as well as work concurrently for parallel filings. He stated that if timing aligns, staff will plan to consolidate the workstreams into one revision request but that it would still require two document filings since FERC Order 1920 is an order compliance filing. One member asked if there was discussion on

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.

an extension of FERC Order 1920 that would allow us to file these together. Chair Raheem responded that we would wait and see if we get an extension. He replied that there are outreach efforts to see if there will be a ruling on this decision, but there are other clarifications needed. He confirmed that we still plan to file by June 2025 but will be reaching out to other RTO's to see their approach. He stated that staff will report back to this group after we get more information from them. Chair Raheem summarized the 4 key topics discussed at RSC - 2026 ITP futures guidance, funding opportunities for 2024 ITP winter weather projects, risk premium at a high level, and FERC Order 1000. One member asked about the staging and where the conversation is about this. Chair Raheem responded that this discussion started at TWG. Staff discussed how to best approach this for the 2025 ITP and will bring to CPPTF to add on to it in the January timeframe after going to the TWG/ESWG. Another member commented on the first member's comments. The second member also asked about an update on HITT C1 to understand what will happen with the NRIS+ discussion and how the cost allocation will work. The member added that the RSC initially passed the HITT C1 zones even though it wasn't unanimous. Chair Raheem stated that we will include the RSC update in an upcoming meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – DISIS WAIVER UPDATE

Chair Raheem updated the group on a late day approval granted for the DISIS waiver requests by FERC. He explained how this will help save costs that will provide a positive outcome in multiple generator interconnection (GI) clusters. He shared that the GI team is working with GIAG to communicate this to the working group exploders. An SPP staff member provided an update on the current DISIS phases and progress in clearing the backlog. One member asked if we would have a policy on what to do with requests once they come in late. The SPP staff member responded that we would own this decision but will encourage early submission. The CPPTF member requested that it be communicated once a determination is made. An update was provided that staff is working on how to develop a DISIS transition plan that launches from the last DISIS. There was a recap of how to transition to a three-phase process from the current DISIS process. Chair Raheem stated that there was a clear, defined cutoff criteria centered around the IFS agreement. He outlined that one clear difference is there will be a much larger financial commitment at the start of the entry fee. He explained that the thought process is that DISIS 2026 can convert to CPP, and there would be a voluntary conversion if interconnection agreements aren't executed by 2026. This would give the customers an option to provide an entry fee and would help finalize the decision if the entry fee is paid. Chair Raheem stated that we still need to determine if the entry fee will apply to any customer or will it have to align with the zones. Staff would come back to this group with the determination. One member asked for clarification on whether the customers going from DISIS 2024 will go into the CPP. Chair Raheem responded that they will be included in the CPP as a prospective customer and commit to the entry fee. An attendee asked if projects studied in the CPP transition study will have some certainty around the network upgrade contribution that will be offered to customers at that time. Chair Raheem responded that we would have to be adaptable because we are picking transmission development zones to prescribe to sites over time; it doesn't have to happen

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.

immediately. He explained that CPP sites are planned for multiple study cycles and will be refreshed for multiple cycles in future years. Another member asked how the FERC Order 1000 projects will work in CPP or if they will be direct assigned. An SPP staff member responded that the entry fee is a general contribution to buildout of the system, and projects will receive NTC's from RTO's that will count as an ITP upgrade as in the current process. A different member noted that if there is an option in 2024 and customers do pay the network upgrade contribution, then how will we handle if they leave part of the payment for funding upgrades - what happens to what was studied in DISIS 2024. Chair Raheem stated that we are developing safeguards around planned sites and those that will be commercially viable.

Chair Raheem swapped the order of the next two agenda items because the content of the first topic would provide insight into the following presentation.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – CPP TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT DIRECTION

Kelsey Allen recapped that he initially introduced the options for what would be included in a study in the last meeting and that today he would outline an option that addresses this holistically. He defined the three categories that range from least restrictive to more restrictive. He highlighted that we want to be in the middle but lean towards category three to focus on how the customers are treated, based on the fact that they have made an investment. He then summarized the technical assessment process flow, and he outlined what policy items to consider. He listed the scenario approaches and explained that we choose to perform in the regional transfer scenarios (inter-DA) where the high-level objective is to ensure generator deliverability to the market within the footprint. He then outlined the sub-regional transfer scenarios (intra-DA), which will ensure generator and load deliverability within the deliverability area. He explained the considerations taken when building out these different approaches. He outlined the three types of assessments - base ITP (which he suggests that we maintain as the current regional planning process), the true CPP analysis (regional planning and GI merger), and the initial reliability assessment (which is the GI process). He summarized how the CPP analysis bucket will cover additional work in the ITP as well as the more robust GI analysis. He covered each of the three assessment options in more detail. He explained that the base ITP option would be a continuation of the current ITP process where costs will be more load-based. He then detailed the CPP option. One member commented that this option will provide more flexibility to allow for more generation in the deliverability area without having to wait for a transmission study and get the system ready for a planning reserve margin that is being forecasted on another side. Kelsey commented that we will maintain customer reliability and stage it out to carry out the resource plan. Chair Raheem noted that it is close to how we do the DISIS dispatch across the footprint. Kelsey responded that we would need to determine the transfer amounts. He affirmed that we are not trying to meet FAC-002 requirements and ramp customers up to 100%. He explained that this would replace the more robust GI analysis and resiliency analysis. Chair Raheem added that we can preserve bandwidths for the entry fee, and it will be more a connect and manage approach. Kelsey resumed with explaining the initial

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.

reliability assessment option. He then showed an illustration which summarized the three assessments. He outlined the project optimization ranking criteria and explained that having a ranking of 1.0 does not always warrant the project being approved. One member asked for clarification on what we are trying to accomplish with the optimization ranking. Kelsey responded that we are bringing SCRIPT 01 into the mix and correlating system needs to ensure that we are meeting all the needs of the system within all the analysis types. He noted that there were very few projects that actually were selected from an economic analysis perspective. Another member mentioned that "allocation" may not be the right word but more like cost "causation". The first member also offered that "utilization" may be another alternative. Kelsey mentioned that we will workshop the correct term to use. Chair Raheem proposed taking a break and returning to take the straw poll.

15-min break until 2:35p

The meeting resumed with Kelsey recapping the three assessment types and reviewed the key takeaways of the suggested approach. He then reviewed the poll questions for the group to participate in a straw poll. One member requested more information on the cost allocation piece and how the split should be related to economic projects. Another member agreed. Chair Raheem requested to move the third poll question to follow his presentation since it's related to the cost. An SPP staff member chimed in to comment on the CPPTF member's question. The member responded that he is communicating that economic projects are being covered by load today but the capacity gets used up, and his selling point for this approach is that there are better ways to share cost so he is requesting more information to better understand. Chair Raheem commented that the member has a good point to wait on the cost related question until after the network upgrade contribution presentation. There was continued group discussion around cost allocation and the right timing for discussion. Kelsey reassured the group that staff is looking at the most cost-effective option and clarified that the annual assessment will be customer-focused.

The poll was conducted and there were limited responses (only received 6 of 43). Chair Raheem noted that we will correlate this to the entry fee in the next presentation. He summarized that there seems to be an overall consensus of the approach for the technical assessment.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – NUC (ENTRY FEE) DESIGN GUIDANCE

Chair Raheem explained that we need information from the group on ways to estimate the network upgrade contribution (NUC) methodology to be defined in the tariff language. He explained that the methodology needs some level of numbers calculated to frame up if we're headed in the right direction with the technical assessment and the different components that go into calculating the GI customer costs or if different cost considerations should be included in the entry fee calculation. He stated that the actual number will be determined by the technical assessment but this will ensure that safeguards are in place. He outlined the cost

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.

estimation inputs to the network upgrade contribution and reminded the group of what comprises the network upgrade contribution. He defined the framework for ERIS and NRIS and provided an understanding of all of our costs. He referenced the STEP report for review of how many total upgrades we have and the cost to build them. Chair Raheem mentioned that we need a simpler approach to HV buildout for GI customers. One member mentioned that generators want to contribute more so that there is more load available. He stated that we must find the sweet spot of cost contribution and that is not how people have previously connected to the system. An attendee commented that we need to look at how early cost projections have been done in addition to a contingency adder for cost overruns. Chair Raheem responded that we will address this as part of the network upgrade contribution (entry fee) maintenance policy. Another member disagreed about what we are trying to solve and stated that taking high commercial viability as a data point is incorrect. Chair Raheem shared that there have been consistent comments that \$100 - \$125/kW is a good historical indicator that this amount could serve as the ceiling to dictate commercial viability for SPP. He reviewed the elements of the entry fee. He explained that the average all-in costs are decreasing the closer we get to execution because the system is changing on an annual basis. He stated that the two broad bookends for determining the NUC/entry fee is the cost from the DISIS stage results and what is built from GI. He summarized that this number would include the regional, sub-regional, and direct assigned cost. One member cautioned against showing that the later stage number will still show viability and putting up the at-risk number. Chair Raheem mentioned that the median later stage number is around \$65/kW. Another member requested clarification on what drives the later stage withdrawals. Chair Raheem wanted to draw attention to the stability and ERIS indicators. He outlined the conceptual approach – the economic and base reliability piece would be load allocated with a floor contribution to HV for GI customers for ITP and joint transfers assessment and shared the high-level approach of the inputs for the NUC/entry fee. He then shared the flat fee conceptual approach. He explained that his initial approach was driven by the same way that we justified highway/byway, which was a usage concept. One member asked for clarification on whether the flat fee was a floor amount. Chair Raheem explained what was included in determining the flat fee. Another member wanted clarification on why the number would be due to the load growth. Chair Raheem responded that we haven't built the load for the transmission. An SPP staff member further clarified the assumptions that were made to get these numbers. The CPPTF member then asked why not use the 2024 ITP. Chair Raheem responded that it was easier to use the 2025 ITP because it was underway. The member commented that he doesn't understand how much is needed for load and that he supports this high number but needs to identify that this includes zero reliability. A third member asked for further clarification. Chair Raheem stated that this is a reliability-only look in the 2025 ITP and dialed down the ITF's from 25% down to 3%. The SPP staff member added that this also includes EHV. Chair Raheem shared a sample flat fee calculation as an example and explained how it would establish a justified way to estimate an adder to local but-for contributions. He then revealed how the initial entry fee is starting to look and explained how to determine the fee. One member asked if the fee would only be applied for certain conditions. Chair Raheem responded that we want system-wide stability conditions and if load or other generators do not benefit, then it would be identified as a direct assigned cost. There

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.

was continued discussion on this item and more information that will be shared in the next meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 7 – WRAP UP, ACTION ITEMS, AND 2025 MEETINGS

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

- Staff will start summarizing the 2025 ITP resiliency efforts and bringing updates to this group for awareness (item 3)
- Staff will report back to this group on the outreach efforts to other RTO's to understand how they are approaching their compliance with FERC O1920 (item 3)
- Staff will share this list of risks with this group for feedback on approaches to mitigating the risks and confirm whether we have the categories identified correctly (item 3)
- Staff will come back to this group with the determination on whether the entry fee will apply to any customer or will it have to align with the zones (item 4)
- Staff will continue working to develop safeguards around planned sites (item 4)
- Staff Secretary will update with minor edits in the technical assessment presentation and repost after the meeting (item 6)
- Staff will have more discussion on the best term to use in the technical assessment related to cost - allocation/causation/utilization/facilitation/etc. (item 6)
- Staff will look at the time-value of money and add to the slide showing GI all-in costs for the next meeting (item 5)
- Staff will bring a list of justification points around the formula (confidence, justification, risks associated) and if it should be treated as a floor or the contribution (item 5)
- CPPTF group to bring feedback for 2025 proposed meeting dates to finalize and approve in next meeting (item 7)

Staff Secretary Russell then initiated continued discussion of the proposed 2025 meeting dates. She shared the posted list of suggested dates with the group, which included one date change that was requested due to a changed TWG meeting date. Several members asked about conflicts that the dates would have with 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. Based on date conflicts identified, notes were taken to follow up with respective working groups in an effort to minimize the conflicts. Staff Secretary Russell asked for members to review the dates and think about who would be willing to host the in-person meetings and in which months so we would be prepared to discuss and approve final dates in the next meeting. Chair Raheem mentioned that we may want to consider having several in-person meetings earlier in the year just because of the topics that need decisions made to take to the April and July MOPC meetings.

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



ADJOURNMENT

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 4:31 p.m.

Attachments: Agenda, 10/1/24 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)**

November 1, 2024: 12:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. CT
WebEx: 2493 544 0516 | Password: jmJfuRji446

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

AGENDA

- 1) **Call to Order and Administrative Items** (10 mins.)
 - a) Administrative Items Ramunda Russell & Sunny Raheem
 - b) Agenda ([Approval](#)) Sunny Raheem
 - 2) **Consent Agenda** (5 mins.) Sunny Raheem
 - a) Meeting Minutes – October 1 ([Approval](#))
 - 3) **MOPC/SPC Debrief** (10 mins.) Sunny Raheem
 - 4) **DISIS Waiver Update** (15 mins.) Sunny Raheem
 - 5) **NUC (Entry Fee) Design Guidance** (90 mins.) Sunny Raheem
- Break (5-15 mins)*
- 6) **CPP Technical Assessment Direction** (90 mins.) Kelsey Allen
 - 7) **Wrap-Up, Action Items, and 2025 Meetings** (15 mins.) Ramunda Russell

<u>Future Meetings</u>	
Mon, Nov 18, 2024 (9a-4p).....	WebEx
Fri, Dec 6, 2024 (9a – 4p).....	WebEx

*Proposed Joint TWG/ESWG/CPPTF Meeting on Jan. 2, 2025

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, 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.

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 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 ESWG. 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 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 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.

AGENDA ITEM 10 – WRAP UP, ACTION ITEMS, AND FUTURE MEETINGS

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 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.

CPPTF ATTENDANCE LIST, NOVEMBER 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	Andrew French*	KCC
4	David Mindham*	EDPR
5	Heather Starnes*	MJMEUC
6	Jarred Cooley SPS*	SPS
7	Jason Tanner*	NextEra
8	John Krajewski*	NPRB
9	Michael Wise*	
10	Steve Gaw*	APA
11	Ramunda Russell (Secretary)*	SPP
12	Ahmed Magdi	EPE
13	Ala Wadi	LU
14	Annie Minondo	NRDC
15	Arash Ghodsian	INVENERGY
16	Austin Baccus	SPP
17	Brad Lafler - CES	CES
18	Brian Rounds	AESL
19	Bruce Doll	OPPD
20	Calvin Daniels	WFEC
21	Casey Cathey	SPP
22	Charles Locke	SPP
23	Chris Jamieson	SPP
24	Christiana Ivanova	Sun2o
25	Clifford Franklin	Sunflower
26	Conf 1C Room 132	SPP
27	Conor McKenzie	AEU
28	Curtis Miller	WFEC
29	Denise Martin	SPP
30	Diana Gastelum	GPISD
31	Don Frerking-SPP	SPP
32	Greg Wannier	Sierra Club

33	Hannah Jones - EPE	EPE
34	Jay Caspary	TGA
35	Jennifer Swierczek	SPP
36	Joe Fultz	GRDA
37	Joshua Norton	SPP
38	Kelsey Allen	SPP
39	Lane Sisung	Sisung
40	Lee Elliott Invenergy	INVENERGY
41	Lottie Jones	SPP
42	Marisa Choate	SPP
43	Mark Whitson	SPP
44	Megan Damron	SPP
45	Natasha Henderson	SPP
46	Naved Khan	SPP
47	Nick Parker	SPP
48	Nigel Dunham	ACE
49	Rachael Dziewiatkowski	ITC
50	Reene Miranda	XCEL
51	Regan Fink	PGR
52	Riley Davis NWPS	NWPS
53	Ryan Benton OG&E	OG&E
54	Shawnee Claiborn-Pinto	PUCT
55	Sherri Maxey	SPP
56	Shilpi Sunil Kumar AES CE	ASE CE
57	Susanna Padilla	SPP
58	Temujin Roach	EDFR