

SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)
November 18, 2024, 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
WebEx 2497 833 6035

MINUTES

AGENDA ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER AND ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m., November 18, 2024, with a quorum present. Staff Secretary Ramunda Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. Heather Starnes was noted as a proxy for John Krajewski. Chair Raheem reviewed the meeting agenda (Attachment A) and provided a high-level summary of the agenda items. Heather Starnes (MEC) moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner French (KCC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. It was noted that approvals were not being recommended for items 4.d. or 6 at this time, but they will be brought back to the December 6 meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Raheem reviewed the consent agenda item for the November 1, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B). Heather Starnes (MEC) moved to approve the motion for the consent agenda item. Alan Myers (ITC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – 2025 MEETINGS

Staff Secretary Russell recapped the previous meeting dates as listed. One member offered his thanks for all the work on the meeting dates. There was some group discussion about other meeting conflicts later in the year. The group discussed who would like to host this group for in-person meetings, and there was discussion on piggybacking on SAWG and partnering with TWG/ESWG for joint meetings. Chair Raheem reminded the group that we needed to have more meetings earlier in the year due to approvals needed from MOPC by Q3 and listed target locations for Q1 to get finalized.

Heather Starnes (MEC) moved to approve the 2025 meeting schedule dates as displayed on the screen.

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

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.

Chair Raheem mentioned that staff will follow up by end of week to confirm the in-person locations for Q1.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – 2026 ITP/CPP TRANSITION STUDY SCOPE UPDATES

- a. Sherri Maxey reviewed the updated scope schedule. She outlined which items were approved in the TWG/ESWG meetings and have approved scope language to add into the document. She outlined what topics would be included in each section. She laid out the plan for requesting approvals in upcoming meetings. Chair Raheem recapped that there is a lot of work going on, and the scope will include models to begin drafting language in the siting manual and ITP manual. He summarized that the scope document will be posted next week.

- b. Colton Stanton reviewed the siting zone allocations. He mentioned that the six LOLE zones will be the same as identified in the FERNS study to use for subregional siting direction in the CPP transition study. He explained that we would use the GI queue data and compare it to the FERNS study data. He explained the GI queue data sets to be used and how the numbers compared across the different zones. He discussed the solar additions (load percent by zone) and compared the FERNS average data to the 2025 ITP siting values and FCITC limited GI requests. One member mentioned that we should look at this from the standpoint of creating additional capacity for interconnection due to what people consider (where demand would be and where open capacity is on the system). He stated that we need to think about how we want to see capacity developed over the 20-year period to give us more cost-effective locations for where generation will be added. Chair Raheem mentioned that we discussed internally to split this evaluation for year 10 and year 20. He stated that the FCITC and generation siting review will help us. One meeting attendee asked what the reason was to do the Kansas split for the transition. Chair Raheem agreed that we should consider Kansas as one generation zone during the CPP transition study. An SPP staff member chimed in that we should see better transfer capability for the upgrades. Colton pointed out that the dashed red line is the load ratio share of each zone in the footprint to see how much generation is being added compared to the current look to use as a reference. Colton then discussed the storage additions with the same comparison. He also discussed the wind additions and showed that there was quite a bit of variance across the data sets. He explained that due to cost restrictions (lower interconnection costs and upgrade costs), there was a lot of load projected for the Southeast zone. One member asked about stability from the Northeast perspective. Chair Raheem mentioned that the FERNS study doesn't have projections of the stability limits in the Northeast. Colton explained the approach to calculate the FCITC limited GI requests. He outlined the options discussed in the ESWG meeting and requested input on assumptions to bring forth as

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.

recommendations. Another meeting attendee mentioned that option one made more sense because developers in the area have done due diligence, so keep it close to the GI queue instead of using the FERNS study data. One member agreed with the attendee to identify the right transmission buildout to facilitate the transmission on the system because it has already been vetted. Another member asked for meeting material to involve during this discussion. Colton mentioned that discussion will continue at the special joint TWG/ESWG meeting being held the following day. He then outlined the siting process changes - two repository postings and new ranking methodology to be developed. Chair Raheem asked if the numbers should be presented at the December GIAG meeting, and one member noted that we should look at this. Chair Raheem summarized that next steps would be to take this to the TWG, ESWG, and GIAG for feedback.

15-min break until 11:00a

- c. Joshua Norton reviewed what was presented and approved at the ESWG meeting on the futures data. He outlined the data sources that were used in developing the scenarios. He then reviewed the different scenarios. He outlined the futures in the scenarios and compared them to previous studies. He outlined the next steps for the ESWG approval and plans to take to the January MOPC meeting for approval. One member asked if we already have numbers related to siting zones instead of just percentages to share in order to make a better decision. Joshua mentioned that he could work with Colton on this.
- d. Kelsey Allen presented a streamlined version of the presentation that he gave in the last CPPTF meeting. He recapped the discussion and asked the group to consider what needs to be documented for guidance to get approvals from the working groups. He highlighted the policy items for consideration in the technical design. He reviewed the holistic assessment option of the three assessment types (base ITP/regional planning, consolidated regional planning and GI, and base GI/initial reliability). He detailed the consolidated regional planning and GI (CPP) option. One member agreed that this aligns with what was discussed on deliverability areas and transfer capability and wanted to confirm that we are getting ahead of planning reserve margin (PRM) changes on the GI side. He also asked if targeting megawatt amounts will be included in scoping the CPP transition study. Kelsey responded that there is work in the resiliency space that has not yet been included in this concept. He added that he will look at transfers across the system to generate values for inclusion in the technical assessment design. Kelsey showed graphical representations of the study zones to better demonstrate the transfer generation expansion model (T-GEM) and base generation expansion model (B-GEM) plan. He mentioned that we want to limit the number of models used in the analysis and determine if it meets our objective. Kelsey explained the technical assessment overview and cost responsibility diagram showing the three assessment types.

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.

He showed the listing of optimization ranking analysis. One member mentioned that he had a struggle with the CPP option because of the cost sharing. Kelsey agreed that there will be a lot of work to determine what cost sharing will look like in this CPP bucket construct. He stated that there will be co-optimization across the portfolio. Another member summarized for clarification that if we have economic and reliability projects, then the base ITP would reflect firm service for load; the CPP bucket would show the generation & load that would be needed to maintain inter- and intra- availability, and this option would serve multiple reliability needs; the GI bucket would be reliability as well which is the interconnection customers. Kelsey agreed with the member that we need to find the right nomenclature as well as the right optimization ranking. That member responded that we need to know which customers to target in each. He also mentioned that we need to define what we are trying to preserve and the limits we are trying to maintain. He ended with a suggestion to add ERIS resources and load in the CPP bucket. A third member stated that he is having trouble with digesting this information because he is unclear about what the ranking references (needs, cost sharing, etc.). He also had a question on the optimization ranking and if it is an indication of solving the problem or just the order of coming up with how to solve the needs. Kelsey responded that it is a preference of solutions, but the ranking alone will not be the selection criteria. Kelsey outlined the poll questions for which he is requesting group input.

53-min lunch break until 1:00p

After returning from lunch, Kelsey provided a recap of the questions for which he wants group feedback. Voting ended with thirteen responses to the questions. Kelsey asked for voting rationale feedback from those that voted.

We returned to agenda item 4a to get approval for the scope development schedule plan.

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

SPP staff recommends the CPPTF approve the planned schedule for scope development shown on slides 3-4, as presented.

Heather Starnes (MEC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

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.

- e. Caitlin Shank recapped that FERC approved DISIS waivers to extend the close of DISIS 2024 cluster window to 3/1/2025 and delay the start of phase 1 until 9/1/2025. One member asked what would be impacted by the 5/1/2026 dates. Caitlin responded that DISIS 2023 and prior would fall under the current DISIS process, and starting with 2024 DISIS will be the transition point into CPP. She explained that Decision Point 2 (DP2) would be delayed because of expecting a delay of the network upgrade contribution (NUC). A meeting attendee asked that if there is a delay of DP2 past 5/1/2025, will the options still be the same. He asked if there could be clarity of words added to the slide. Another meeting attendee commented that clarity is needed on the options if the DP2 date gets delayed. He also asked if there is an option to stay in the original 2024 DISIS without being forced into the CPP study. Caitlin responded that remaining in the DISIS will be agreement to transition to CPP. Chair Raheem explained that we will look at sites from the study to then look at the queue of customers and also look at siting to estimate the network upgrades. He explained that if DISIS is not ready by the effective date of CPP, then the customers will have the option (or requirement) to move over to CPP. The first meeting attendee commented that having it voluntary is needed at this stage in the decision. One member agreed with both meeting attendees and pointed out that we need to think through consequences from a legal perspective. He stated that we need to understand what answers are needed to mitigate risk of voluntary transition to CPP. Caitlin agreed that allowing clusters to diverge will make things complicated. The member then asked what the decision timeline is to come up with a plan of action to address this. Chair Raheem responded that we need this to be able to develop the tariff revision request. The same member asked if we could show what the risks are of doing this in 2024 compared to other options. Another member had additional concerns about the timing of this because people entered into 2024 DISIS with the plan of getting interconnection quicker and if transitioning could add one year to the plan, then it could cause an issue. A third meeting attendee asked if the 2024 DISIS DP1 and DP2 will happen as usual. A third meeting attendee stated that this is helpful to SPP because we get more data but it doesn't incentivize customers to enter into the queue request, so the attendee is asking for more information to make a more informed decision. Caitlin responded that an incentive is that customers would take the points of interconnection (POI's) for the 5-year models, and 2026 DISIS and beyond would take the optimal POI slots which would be to look at using the planning horizons as the queue. Another member reiterated that in order to stop the restudies, you will need to have a transition. He suggested that staff should develop the transition procedures to hold people harmless and provide the same level of certainty. Chair Raheem responded that part of POI demands includes DISIS 2024 as we know it today and will get updated as we finalize the queue next year. A different meeting attendee had concerns regarding timing and wants to know why transition can't occur at the start of 2025 and just complete DISIS 2024 as planned. Chair Raheem responded that the purpose of the transition is to reduce the restudies from 2024 but it would be a cleaner transition to enter into 2025 or 2026. One member asked how we would handle customers who drop out of the 2024 DISIS and if it was worth the risk of the other factors. Caitlin resumed with explaining the queue priority. She also outlined a list of risks under the voluntary approach for joining CPP. Chair Raheem mentioned that we

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.

should lay out responses to two options for next meeting. For the option showing a transition to 2024 DISIS, we need to show an example of what would happen to the remaining two customers and how the cost certainty would be determined.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – NUC (ENTRY FEE) APPROACHES

Chair Raheem resumed discussion from the last meeting. He stated that we would preview the types of cost sharing between generation and load. He requested feedback on the EHV flat fee approach and benefit-to-cost (B/C) uplift approach. He summarized a good indicator of what customers would pay historically. He reiterated that the \$125/kW is a good ceiling but average costs are \$65/kW, and one-third of the customers are connecting at or below \$15/kW. He depicted a scattered plot that equates to decisions at the time of NUC commitment. He explained that there was a wide cost range, and the average cost is around \$46/kW. One member asked if a similar snapshot was being created for phase two. Chair Raheem stated that at DP2, we are seeing higher costs (\$65 - \$85/kW) but they are due to other requests dropping out or some other reason. He mentioned that we could bring the DP2 cost snapshot back to the group. He then showed a visual of how much contribution is expected for different types of upgrades. The thought was that the displayed cost assignment would be mostly assigned to load. The transfer assessments would be a combination of GI contribution customers. The B/C measures would continue in the CPP approach. For projects that don't meet the B/C ratio = 1.0, it would need to be determined if GI customers can contribute the cost needed to bring the B/C ratio up to 1.0. A meeting attendee asked for clarification that if load in the ITP study has a greater than 1.0 B/C ratio, then the upgrade would be paid for by the customer. Another member still had questions about how to co-optimize and where the cost sharing comes into play. A third member asked about EHV vs. HV designations on the GI side. Chair Raheem responded not to make it so dependent on the usage. He explained how to calculate using the ERIS EHV flat fee approach and outlined the inputs used in the calculation. He then explained the justification for using the ERIS EHV flat fee. A meeting attendee asked if the flows (7.7%) are firm resources delivering to firm load or if there is a price difference and non-firm energy flows is included. Chair Raheem explained that this was done in ProMod and includes both firm and non-firm load. One member asked if the flows associated with load is demand combined with resources assigned to load in other models. Chair Raheem responded that this usage looks at all future generators in the resource plan and their utilization on the system. Another member asked if there was a breakout into smaller regions. Chair Raheem responded that EHV was not broken down into small subregions. The same member then asked how the concept for the EHV flat fee drives developers to find the most economical and beneficial generation locations. Chair Raheem responded that this is included in the NUC and would be added to incremental upgrades needed if a generator is trying to interconnect at a suboptimal location. These would be the guardrails included in the entry fee components. Chair Raheem stated that there should be another slide describing what a suboptimal cost looks like. He then asked if there were thoughts on this approach. A meeting attendee asked if there is more low-cost generation that SPP would like to access, then the standard flat rate wouldn't apply so how is this taken into

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.

account. Chair Raheem stated that this was trying to justify a cost from a regional perspective to show use from generators on how they utilize the EHV system from an 8760 simulation. He stated that we would discuss this internally. Another member mentioned that it would be beneficial to estimate a proxy in each category that would show an interconnection cost in the area including the JTIQ number. Chair Raheem reminded that the future benefit for GI customers must be realistic.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – SCRIPT C3 COMMON MODEL

Eddie Watson provided an overview of the SCRIPT C3 model description. He summarized the common base model set configuration and explained the proposed changes. He explained what has been completed and what is currently in progress in a status update.

AGENDA ITEM 7 – CPP TARIFF RR REVIEW - ATTACHMENT O REVIEW

Staff Secretary Russell summarized the progress on the Attachment O language revisions. She explained that the language changes were developed in alignment with the current tariff format. The request was made to get staff's feedback on the redlines made to date. She then provided the gameplan for getting the language developed, bringing it to the group for review, and outlining next steps to get this to the MOPC for approval to initiate the FERC filing in mid-2025. She reported that a month-by-month schedule will be built with target dates to share in the December 6 meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 8 – WRAP UP, ACTION ITEMS, AND 2025 MEETINGS

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

- Staff secretary to find out how long meeting recordings are stored in Webex = complete
- Staff secretary to reach out to Jason Tanner for hosting 1/21-1/22/2025 meeting in FL = complete
- Josh and Colton to work on developing numbers related to siting zones vs. load percentages to share for the group to be able to make a decision (item 4c)
- Kelsey and staff to create a better version of slide 12 in upcoming war room session that more clearly outlines the objectives (item 4d)
- SPP staff to provide what the risks are of voluntary transition in 2024 compared to other options (item 4e)
- SPP staff to develop the transition procedures to hold people harmless and provide the same level of certainty (item 4e)

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

- SPP staff to develop an additional slide describing what a suboptimal cost looks like (item 5)
- SPP staff requested to develop a table/chart to show proxy estimations in each category that would show an interconnection cost in the area, including the JTIQ number (item 5)
- SPP staff to follow-up and include model set approval in the scope item (item 6)
- Ramunda to build a month-by-month revision request schedule with target dates to share in the Dec. 6 meeting (item 7)

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 4:01 p.m.

Attachments: Agenda, 11/1/24 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 18, 2024: 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. CT
WebEx: 2497 833 6035 | Password: iTBFyJHu328

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 - November 1 ([Approval](#))

- 3) **2025 Meetings** ([Approval](#)) (15 mins) Ramunda Russell

- Break (5-15 mins)*

- 4) **2026 ITP/CPP Transition Study Scope Updates** (225 mins.) SPP Staff
 - a) Scope Update & Plan ([Approval](#)) (30 mins.) Sherri Maxey
 - b) Siting Discussion (45 mins.) Colton Stanton
 - c) Futures Update (15 mins.) Joshua Norton
 - d) CPP Technical Assessment Document ([Approval](#)) (90 mins) Kelsey Allen
 - e) DISIS Transition to CPP (45 mins.) Caitlin Shank

- Lunch Break (30-60 mins)*

- 5) **NUC (Entry Fee) Approaches** (60 mins.) Sunny Raheem

- Break (5-15 mins)*

- 6) **SCRIPT C3 Common Model** ([Approval](#)) (45 mins.) Eddie Watson

- 7) **CPP Tariff RR Review - Attachment O Review** (20 mins.) Ramunda Russell

- 3) **Wrap-Up, Action Items, and Future Meetings** (10 mins.) Ramunda Russell

Future Meetings

Fri, Dec 6, 2024 (9a – 4p) WebEx

Thur, Jan 2, 2025 (10a-5p)..... WebEx

**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/PPP 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 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 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 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 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 ERS 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 ITP'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 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.

ADJOURNMENT

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

CPPTF ATTENDANCE LIST, NOVEMBER 18, 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*	PSC
4	Andrew French*	KCC
5	David Mindham*	EDPR
6	Derek Brown*	Evergy
7	Heather Starnes*	MEC
8	Jarred Cooley SPS*	SPS
9	Jason Tanner*	NextEra
10	Steve Gaw*	APA
11	Steve Hohman	OPPD
12	Ramunda Russell (Secretary)*	SPP
13	Aaron Stemplewicz	EJ
14	Adam Snapp	OG&E
15	Afshin Salehian	SPP
16	Ala Wadi	LU
17	Andrew Daro	NPPD
18	Angie Anderson	Sunflower
19	Annie Minondo	NRDC
20	Austin Baccus	SPP
21	Bernie Liu	XCEL
22	Bridget Sparks	AES
23	Britney Lloyd	SPP
24	Caitlin Shank	SPP
25	Call-in User_2	
26	Call-in User_4	
27	Calvin Daniels	WFEC
28	Carly Masenthin	KCC
29	Casey Cathey	SPP
30	Charles Locke	SPP
31	Chris Davis	SPP
32	Chris Jamieson	SPP

33	Chris Lyons	CES
34	Chris Stolz	PGR
35	Clifford Franklin	Sunflower
36	Colton Stanton	SPP
37	Conf 1F Room 117	SPP
38	Conor McKenzie	AEU
39	Curtis Miller	WFEC
40	Dana Shelton	Stone Pigman
41	Dee Edmondson	SPP
42	Deni Golden	SPP
43	Denise Martin	SPP
44	Dennis Reed	MWRC
45	Derek Sunderman	SE
46	Devon Pehrson	NGR
47	Don Frerking-SPP	SPP
48	Doug Kouskouris	AEP
49	Dugan Marieb	PGR
50	Eddie Watson	SPP
51	Greg Wannier	Sierra Club
52	Hannah Jones - EPE	EPE
53	Jason Chaplin	OCC
54	Jay Caspary	TGA
55	Jim Hotovy	NPPD
56	Joe Fultz	GRDA
57	Jonathan Fidrych	TSGT
58	Jonathan Goldsworthy	ITC
59	Joshua Norton	SPP
60	Joshua Pilgrim	SPP
61	Justin Grady	KCC
62	Kalun Kelley - WFEC	WFEC
63	Kelsey Allen	SPP
64	Kim O'Guinn	SPP
65	Lane Sisung	Sisung
66	Lee Elliott Invenergy	INVENERGY
67	Loren Ditsch	OPPD
68	Lottie Jones	SPP
69	Marisa Choate	SPP
70	Mark Whitson	SPP
71	Matt Alvarado - Iowa	IOWA
72	Matt Prorok, GPI/NGH	GPISD

73	Megan Damron	SPP
74	Meredith Powell	SPP
75	Michael Wegner ITC	ITC
76	Natasha Henderson	SPP
77	Nathan Pearce	Sunflower
78	Naved Khan	SPP
79	Nick Abraham	ITC
80	Nick Parker	SPP
81	Paul Antony	GA
82	Rachael Dziejatkowski	ITC
83	Ray Ward	WAPA
84	Regan Fink	PGR
85	Rishabh Gupta	PST
86	Ryan Benton OG&E	OG&E
87	Ryan Yokley	Sunflower
88	Sherri Maxey	SPP
89	Shilpi Sunil Kumar AES CE	ASE CE
90	Tyler Berton	AES
91	Vaibhav Bilagi, RWE	RWE
92	Kenneth Wei	NextEra
93	Jeff Wells	NextEra