

**SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)  
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)  
January 21, 2025, 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST**

**NextEra (Florida Power & Light) Corporate Office  
700 Universe Blvd  
Juno Beach, FL 33408**

## **MINUTES**

### **DAY 1**

*Lunch 12:00 – 12:30 pm and started meeting at approximately 12:30 pm*

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

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 12:32 p.m., January 21, 2025, with a quorum. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of the meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. Bernie Liu was noted as a proxy for Jarred Cooley, Loren Ditsch was noted as a proxy for Steve Hohman, and John Krajewski served as proxy for Commissioner Andrew French (until mid-afternoon) & Heather Starnes when she had to step away. Chair Raheem then reviewed the agenda (Attachment A) and provided a high-level summary of the agenda items including all key items being requested for approvals (entry fee & DISIS transition to CPP). Steve Gaw (APA) moved to approve the agenda as modified. Bernie Liu (SPS) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 2 – CONSENT AGENDA**

Chair Raheem reviewed the consent agenda items for the draft meeting minutes from the December 6, 2024, meeting and January 2, 2025, joint meeting (Attachments B & C). Heather Starnes (MEC) moved to approve the motion for the consent agenda items. John Krajewski (NPRB) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 3 – ORG SURVEY RESULTS & ACTION PLAN REVIEW**

Staff Secretary Russell reviewed the organization effectiveness survey results from 2024 and outlined the 2025 action plans to address the lower scored areas that received below a 4.0 rating. At the conclusion of the presentation, Chair Raheem asked if there were any areas that staff may have missed. He also stated that we would do a round robin to summarize actions

*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.*

taken and note any other items on which we needed to focus. He asked if there were any other comments and if so, then please provide those to staff.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4 – 2025 CPPTF WORK PLAN OVERVIEW**

Nick Parker recapped the CPPTF meeting schedule for this year. He then outlined the CPPTF goals for 2025. He reviewed the table with the key milestones and dates that staff would need approval to be ready for July MOPC. He listed the critical areas that will be covered in each quarter. One member asked if there would be an education session planned for MOPC and suggested that it be advertised well in advance. He also asked if there would be any RSC and Board education provided. He shared his concern that we may not get approvals for this plan. Chair Raheem mentioned that he and another member have already started talking with RSC and currently have a standing agenda item to provide updates on CPP. He stated that there are also meetings being held with FERC on a monthly basis. He reiterated that education will be key. He explained that one critical item regarding tariff changes is determining the best approach for understanding redlines. He clarified that making the filing by Q4 2025 could make this process effective for DISIS 2026. The same member commented about the cost going into generation plans, and the importance of SPP to be proactive in the membership being comfortable with the money that is being requested. An SPP member asked if a DISIS 2026 timeline would be realistic. The member responded that he is not concerned about that timeline; the key is training and education. Chair Raheem stated that staff would follow up on the work plan and determine the training strategy as a group.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5 – 2026 ITP/CPP TRANSITION ASSESSMENT SCOPE PHASE 2 WORK PLAN**

Sherri Maxey reviewed the updates for the scope and outlined the plan for phase 2 work. She mentioned the new models to be developed and what would be shared with TWG/ESWG in next week's meeting. She outlined the new areas of the scope that were noted in blue text on the next few slides. She then reviewed the scope plan timeline and the target for completing this by March 7, 2025. One member stated that staff did not need to use acronyms in the presentation as well as provide a detailed explanation of what is being explained to external groups. Another member added that this could be done as part of the education. Chair Raheem confirmed that staff should share the purpose of the models and what we need to accomplish with them. He also mentioned that the new models for the final assessment will need to go through a couple of rounds of working group review, and this will drive the ability to gain approval by July MOPC. Sherri stated that this would help to get other document changes incorporated, and this would only be a part of the larger timeline. Chair Raheem put a plug in for attending the CNAT meetings. Sherri stated that those will need to be scheduled for 2025. An SPP member suggested that more float should be added into the schedule to prepare for bottlenecks and tight schedule implications, and the comment was noted.

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

## AGENDA ITEM 6 – ENTRY FEE APPROACH

Chair Raheem stated that the group needs to approve the data collection and transmission usage calculation to derive the ERIS flat fee. He mentioned that the group has shown interest in simplifying the approach to the calculation and have it be less volatile from the 20Y assessment. He commented that the group would walk through why we're doing the entry fee along with the timeline. He explained that we are at a critical point to get policy framework for CAWG and RSC feedback while drafting the revision request approach around this formula, so we either need to continue down this path or figure out a new plan going forward. He stated that we would close out the discussion with the entry fee terminology and request group's feedback on what to call it. He stated that we have feedback from SPC and need to understand what the maintenance looks like. He reviewed that CPP is an approach where there are not a lot of win-win situations, but this is one where the generation customers have more cost certainty, regional customers have more reliability and more efficient processes, generation developers get a lot fewer restudies, and end users get optimized transmission solutions. Chair Raheem reviewed the policy schedule and outlined what is ahead for getting the filing completed. He explained that one challenge is the entry fee calculation in 2026 and having a sanity check for costs without running a full study to determine if the formula is feasible. He explained that numbers may change depending on how much change is envisioned in the technical study process. He encouraged the group to not take the numbers as the actual estimates when making decisions. He laid out the plan to partner with CAWG on approving the entry fee formula as well as the RSC approach. He gave kudos to the members that were helping to take this information to staff and the RSC behind the scenes. Chair Raheem explained that we need to ensure that we are building out the right transmission and ensure generators can connect to the grid quicker by eliminating restudies. He outlined the generator interconnection approaches and the separation into three different categories. He explained that we are in category three with a more restrictive ERIS study process, which identifies the upgrades to prevent compounding issues in the future. One member suggested adding non-RTO regions to category two because one-third of the country falls into this category. Chair Raheem reviewed the invest, connect, and manage or deliver technical framework. He listed out the inputs and outputs for the CPP cycle approach. An SPP member asked why the NRIS adder is taken into account for the 10Y assessment for inputs if network upgrades are more than 10Y assets. Chair Raheem clarified that the 10Y look is more for refinement of costs, but staff will look at NRIS protection in 20Y assessment. He then explained the annual CPP process flow. There was some discussion regarding the timing of the GIA assignment and how affected system studies will play out in the process. Chair Raheem asked if there is a higher level of agreement that could be brought in during the entry fee and if there is a way to ease the uncertainty. One member stated that the key component is needing a GIA before committing to an entry fee, but Chair is concerned about getting a GIA before an entry fee commitment ready. There was group discussion on several facets of the entry fee. One member had a concern about clear conveyance of what load gets in exchange for giving generators cost certainty. Another member stated that he wants the process to be successful but is requesting a reasonable level of certainty.

*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.*

*12-min break until 2:45 pm EST*

Chair Raheem resumed and stated that we need to understand the entry fee and describe our approach to the formula. He explained that the group is leaning towards a flat fee calculation which is simple and repeatable. He mentioned that the affected system upgrades are not part of the equation but does have significant impacts. He summarized that cost certainty is in the four assessments for planned sites. He stated that the transfers assessment is new to the reliability look and will take the place of the regional transfers assessments in the GI DISIS analysis. He described how the assessments are part of the calculation for the EHV and HV fees. He explained that the charge will increase for direct assignment of unplanned sites. Chair Raheem compared the ratio between existing and future generation and how it helps to determine a calibrated baseline of how much of the system is being used by future generation. He explained how this determines the ERIS flat fee calculation. There was some group discussion concerning ERIS and the calculation. One member provided clarification of what is included in the formula by explaining what comprises the numerator and denominator. Another member asked about the accreditation amounts. Chair responded that variations were made on the accreditation-based approach. Information was shared about preliminary checks made on performance-based accreditation. Chair Raheem shared a disclaimer regarding the entry fee estimation. He reviewed transmission cost inputs that were benchmarked against the largest ITP portfolio. He conveyed that a second test estimating placeholders for ERIS and NRIS cost adders would help to identify any potential cost gaps that existed from the benchmark to better align with the CPP technical approach. He outlined the all-in estimates for potential entry fees under different scenarios with up to three inputs (ERIS, NRIS, and affected system). There was a good amount of group discussion on entry fee estimation.

Agenda item 6 was not concluded on day 1, so the remaining content carried over to day 2.

## **WRAP UP FOR THE DAY**

Chair Raheem provided a preview of the approvals that were being sought the next morning. Once approved, he stated that the approved policy direction would be added into the tariff revision request redlines and used to prepare for discussions with RSC. He explained that additional discussion would be needed on entry fee maintenance, including cost change risks, and entry fee new terminology. He stated that staff would be requesting a vote on entry fee maintenance in the February meeting.

After reviewing the action items captured, Chair Raheem adjourned for the day at 4:48 p.m. EST.

*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 (SPP)  
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)  
January 22, 2025, 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. EST**

**NextEra (Florida Power & Light) Corporate Office  
700 Universe Blvd  
Juno Beach, FL 33408**

## **MINUTES**

### **DAY 2**

*Breakfast 8:00 – 8:30 am and started meeting at approximately 8:30 am*

#### **RETURN TO ORDER**

Chair Raheem resumed the meeting at 8:30 am with a quorum. Staff Secretary Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. She then reviewed the proxies for the meeting. Bernie Liu was noted as a proxy for Jarred Cooley, Loren Ditsch was noted as a proxy for Steve Hohman. John Krajewski served as a proxy for Heather Starnes when she had to step away, and Steve Gaw was a proxy for David Mindham starting at 10:00 am. Chair Raheem reviewed today's agenda items and mentioned that we would be swapping the order of agenda items 7 & 8. He recapped the items going for approval under the entry fee discussion (agenda item 6).

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6 – ENTRY FEE APPROACH**

Agenda item 6 was resumed from Day 1. Chair Raheem shared the updates to slides on the entry fee estimates and all-in costs based on comments from the previous day's meeting. He requested feedback from the group on the numbers for all-in costs for the entry fee estimates. One member asked if the low numbers are accurate reflections of what to expect going forward and the level of confidence that we have in the range. Chair Raheem mentioned that we had the resource mix from the 2024 ITP which involved renewables with a lower accreditation score which was adjusted for the current ITP. There was continued group discussion on accredited capacity. Another member had a question around ERIS fundability and asked where the NRIS+ designation will be. Chair Raheem responded that the service type can be selected in open window and can commit during entry fee. A third member asked if there was a price disparity and mentioned that we should be able to answer the question across SPP. He also suggested identifying an upper limit and not going beyond it; then, consider the generation mixes and find

*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.*

the minimum value to support that. The first member is concerned that LRE's will want to have a cushion. A different member asked if he could use CPP to make an NRIS+ only request as an online generator. Chair Raheem responded that the generator would get assigned a GIA. One member stated that resources without firm service could pay a fee and maybe wait for network upgrades to fully get this. A member mentioned that this would be a huge benefit. Another member asked if there were two price structures being created for deliverability of NRIS. Chair Raheem stated that firm service request was carved out in phase two. He stated that a challenge is to build out the technical study to line out with the aggregate process, and policy structure could help with that. He offered that he doesn't know if it will be ready for CPP, which could come down to a timing challenge. The member clarified that until we bring it in, we will have two different prices and a way to address this is to make the services comparable - one will be a flat fee and the other is participant-funded. Chair Raheem covered the transmission costs input recommendation. He suggested doing a 10-year portfolio look across the planning horizon and asked for group feedback about which transmission portfolio to use to calculate the entry fee and the generation expansion. One member stated that the 20-year portfolio should be used, and targeting Y10 should be the plan. He suggested that we need to manage when the entry fee is no longer applicable and when to hold back on NRIS. Another member pushed back on the comments because he thinks that this is a self-regulating process. Chair Raheem stated that we looked at FERNS and did a MW injection to see what the system would handle, which is above the 3 GW install rate. A third member asked about a potential mismatch of the 10Y and 20Y portfolio look. A different member had similar concerns about taking a 20Y portfolio but only charging to 10Y worth of that and thinks that this will be hard to accept. The third member then commented that this will create an avenue for challenge with agreement from another member. One member summarized that the 20Y portfolio determines the dollar amount but the resources are what we can count on to support the rate. Chair Raheem stated that the more we lean on the 20Y assumptions, there will be a stronger effort to enhance the maintenance of the entry fee. He further explained that if we use the 10Y, there will be self-correction through the annual process. An SPP member asked what the terms actually mean, and the response was that 10Y is what is online at Y10 and 20Y is what will be online by Y20. Chair Raheem responded that staff has confidence in the 10Y forecast and not limited to just Y10. A member asked if there was a difference in the cost prediction for Y10 and Y20, and Chair Raheem responded that it will likely end up being a wash. Another member asked if there was a noticeable difference in the portfolio over the horizon and what the true-up process looks like. Chair Raheem responded that with the 3-year evaluation, it will course correct the entry fee. He explained that using the 10Y numbers with a 20Y portfolio will reduce the entry fee and amount of maintenance needed within each annual cluster. The member offered that he thinks the next group in will be impacted. Another member claimed that there may be a need for true-up, and the rate needs to be weighted between the 10Y and 20Y numbers appropriately, then use that as the justification for the number selected. There was continued group discussion on the generation number. Chair Raheem stated that staff will regroup on the recommendation for the generation expansion MW number for assigning the \$/kW. He then moved to the recommendations for the entry fee formula. He stated that the group needs to make a decision on the formula for building out the revision request language and to carry discussion forward

*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.*



with cost allocation groups with more defined direction from CPPTF. A member made a single motion for the three approval requests for today based on staff recommendation.

*8-min break until 9:50 am EST*

**Derek Brown (Evergy) moved to approve the motion for the three approval requests based on staff recommendation as presented and modified on the screen:**

**SPP staff recommends that CPPTF adopts the recommendations as modified on slides 50, 51, and 53 to develop the ERIS Flat Fee approach.**

**John Krajewski (NPRB) seconded, and the motion passed after some general discussion on the formula itself and uncertainty on how to utilize the Y10 portfolio number.**

Chair Raheem stated that these approvals will help with being able to move the ball forward with continued tariff revision request language development. He recognized that we need to finish determining the scope for the maintenance piece of the entry fee.

## **AGENDA ITEM 8 – ERAS PROPOSAL COORDINATION & READINESS CRITERIA CHANGES**

Steve Purdy stated that we would need to have coordination of what comes out of this ERAS process and CPP. He provided an overview of ERAS highlighting key points, summarizing the study process, and stating how impacts would be managed. He summarized outstanding issues that require external communication and internal coordination. He stepped through the approval process highlighting where we are currently and next steps. He listed out the additional ERAS readiness criteria. One member asked if the proposed 2-year COD will be considered by MOPC or REAL to be eligible for ERAS. Steve responded that we need to determine what will change based on a transfer from DISIS to ERAS. The same member mentioned that we may want to include this in the revision request. He then stated that his company has provided CAWG with the improvement of eligibility of upgrades that come out of ERAS. An SPP staff member asked if this was related to base plan funding regarding NRIS, and the member responded yes. Another member agreed with the previous member's comment and provided an additional consideration about the ability to be included post-DP2 if there is a delay in the initial study based on getting interconnection resources online in DISIS 2024. Steve stated that this could be done with stakeholder approval. An SPP member asked for clarification on the key point of maximum capacity submitted based on LRE's load projections and resources to meet PRM. He asked how the load cutoff point would be determined. Steve responded with

*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.*

using the load forecast, and the member asked if we could revisit this for further discussion. Another SPP member asked about timing if there are delays related to the DISIS 2024 study start. A second member asked about timeline of addressing outstanding issues. Steve stated that staff will build the revision request based on approved policy, and the remaining discussion will take place in the Board meeting. The same member asked if staff was going to take a position on the issues because it will have an impact on the final product. Chair Raheem responded that staff would share comments on ERAS with CPPTF.

## **AGENDA ITEM 7 – DISIS TRANSITION TO CPP OPTION 1B READINESS CRITERIA**

Jennifer Swierczek stated that staff was seeking two approvals to draft CPP tariff redlines – sunset the DISIS process making DISIS 2024 the last study and establish readiness criteria for CPP. She stated that staff believes the best approach is to make two filings with sunsetting the DISIS 2024 restudies and having DISIS 2026 revision request filing with the other CPP redlines. One member asked for more understanding of the relationship between the transition study and open window under CPP on the timeline. The member mentioned that we need to show better alignment of the truncated process and open window to provide a clearer picture. An SPP member asked at what point the unplanned sites will be known. Chair Raheem responded that the planned sites should be known by June 2025. The SPP member then asked how the hosting capacity tool will be used. Chair responded that the first iteration of it will give information to DISIS customers, and the next phase will be CPP-ready. He stated that it will be available for end-users and used for siting selection internally. Jennifer reviewed the key points of the initiative timeline. She recapped that the first approval request is around option 1B of limiting restudies and requested input from the group on where we are with the provisions of reducing restudies. One member asked how ERAS will align with this. Chair Raheem stated that there is a timing question that must be addressed with CPP. The member also asked if it would be a disadvantage to being included in DISIS 2024. Jennifer responded that we don't know at this time. The member commented that ERAS complicates everything. Another member asked for clarity on the last provision. Jennifer responded that ITP upgrades won't be available to prior queued requests at some point. A third member explained that proposed changes would allow for DISIS 2024 to utilize up to 2025 ITP, while ERAS is relevant to 2024 ITP. The first member commented that this explanation clarified the difference. Chair Raheem stated that this is contingent upon the timing of ERAS approval. The second member asked if network upgrades from ITP would go into the next DISIS. The third member responded that when finalized, it will go into whichever study is restarted. He stated that the question is what to do with studies in two different queues. He also summarized that there will be three different timelines to balance: DISIS 2024, ERAS, and 2026 ITP. The first member asked how this would be managed. The third member explained that this would be an extension of what we do today. There was continued group discussion on ERAS impact. A member asked what happens if there are equipment changes to capacity ratings, etc. Chair Raheem stated that once there is commitment to the entry fee, then the cost should carry forward despite any changes because this is the offset for cost certainty and doesn't have the same flexibility as under the current DISIS. The member

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



suggested to evaluate if there is anything different in the process of what we do today and for staff to be ready to answer how we would address capacity changes, especially if they increase. Another member stated that CPP should allow for more flexibility since this is pre-planning. Jennifer reviewed all four of the reduction of restudies provisions with the group. A different member mentioned that we should focus on how to incentivize behavior. A fourth member stated that the approach under the second provision (automatic penalty) may actually increase restudies and cause them to be done later in the process. One member generally supports all recommendations because they help reduce the potential for waterfall later. Jennifer asked if there were any other ideas on how to reduce restudies to get to CPP. One member commented to get to restudies in the GIA's. An SPP member asked about the timing of filings and changing things mid-flight. Jennifer reminded about the alignment of this with the CPP tariff revision request filing. Jennifer then reviewed the administrative items. One member stated that it would be helpful to understand how staff thinks this will all work. Another member does not understand what the guardrails will be around these today. Chair Raheem stated that we need to pinpoint our readiness criteria around site control and should determine who meets the requirements by keeping it time-based. The same member stated that sometimes milestones and readiness will work against the developers resulting in encouraging bad behavior, and staff should be mindful of that. Jennifer reviewed the readiness criteria progress summary. The member highlighted that there were CPP requirements that resulted in unnecessary expenses. Chair Raheem summarized the differences between the proposed and current requirements: they are more definitive for the generating plant, they increase site control for the gen lead, and the alternative option is of higher thresholds than what we have today. The member confirmed that he is not opposed to the readiness criteria but just thinks that it won't accomplish the goal. Chair stated that we will continue discussion and have some discussion points for staff to build out before the next meeting.

Chair Raheem requested a conversation with the developers to narrow down the viable options or determine if there are other alternatives.

## **AGENDA ITEM 9 - ORDER 1920 COMPLIANCE UPDATE**

Chair Raheem informed the group that we are stagnant on this matter until RSC makes some other decisions. He mentioned that staff will bring this update to the next meeting.

## **AGENDA ITEM 10 - CPP TARIFF RR PRELIMINARY REDLINES REVIEW**

Chair Raheem mentioned that we will set up additional meetings to focus on this topic. Staff will set up a google poll for future workshop dates.

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

## AGENDA ITEM 11 - WRAP-UP, ACTION ITEMS, AND FUTURE MEETINGS

Chair Raheem and Ms. Russell reviewed action items from the meeting:

- Staff to follow up on the 2025 work plan and determine the training strategy as a group (item 4)
- Staff to schedule CNAT meetings for 2025 (item 5)
- Staff to cleanup slide 11 to more clearly convey how NRIS will be incorporated and evaluated (item 6)
- Staff to figure out how affected system studies will play out with CPP and discuss ways to mitigate this risk of not being able to back out at this point (item 6)
- Staff to figure out how to interconnect in unplanned areas and how this will be handled (item 6)
- Staff to brainstorm on the key component of needing a GIA before committing to an entry fee and the key financing components that require a legally binding agreement and what is needed to move forward at a specified cost level (item 6)
- Staff to clarify the data collection boxes on slide 20 (item 6)
- Staff to determine what data is required for peak seasons (item 6)
- Staff to revise slide 40 to include all 4 trend lines (item 6) = completed for 1/22 meeting
- Staff will regroup on the recommendation for the generation expansion MW number for assigning the \$/kW & bring to the February meeting (item 6)
- Staff Secretary to post updated/modified entry fee presentation in post-meeting materials (item 6) = completed
- Staff will share comments on ERAS with CPPTF (item 8) = completed
- Staff to show better alignment of the truncated process and open window timing to provide a clearer picture (item 7)
- Staff to be ready to answer how we would address capacity changes, especially if they increase (item 7)
- Staff to provide a mechanism for how we think this will work around prioritization (item 7)
- Staff to develop our readiness criteria around site control, etc. (item 7)
- Staff Secretary to set up a google poll for future RR redlines Feb workshops (item 10) = completed
- Staff Secretary to schedule special CPPTF meeting on 2/6 from 1:30 - 5p CST (item 11) = completed
- Staff Secretary to send out list of topics early ahead of posting the agenda for the 2/6 meeting = completed

Chair Raheem outlined the plan for the special meetings that will be needed to review the tariff revision request draft language. It would involve weekly 2 – 3 hour page-turn sessions starting in February. He then facilitated the round robin discussion getting thoughts on the meeting and

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



noting items/requests for the next meeting. Two items captured were the DISIS transition readiness criteria and a FERC Order 1920 update.

## ADJOURNMENT

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 12:02 p.m. EST

**Attachments: Agenda, 12/06/2024 Minutes & 01/02/2025 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)**

NextEra (Florida Power & Light) Corporate Office  
700 Universe Blvd  
Juno Beach, FL 33408

January 21, 2025: 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST  
January 22, 2025: 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. EST

[Webex Registration](#)

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

## AGENDA

### DAY 1

*Lunch (12:00 – 12:30 pm) and start meeting at approximately 12:30 pm*

- 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 – December 6, 2024 ([Approval](#))
  - b) Meeting Minutes – January 2, 2025 ([Approval](#))
- 3) **Org Survey Results & Action Plan Review** (15 mins.).....Ramunda Russell & Sunny Raheem
- 4) **2025 CPPTF Work Plan Overview** (30 mins.).....Nick Parker
- 5) **2026 ITP/CPP Transition Assessment Scope Phase 2 Work Plan** (30 mins)..... Sherri Maxey

*Break (5-15 mins)*

- 6) **Entry Fee Approach** (180 mins)..... Sunny Raheem
  - a) Entry Fee Data Collection and Inputs ([Approval](#))
  - b) ERIS Flat Fee Formula Framework ([Approval](#))
  - c) Generation Expansion MW Number for Flat Fee Formula Framework ([Approval](#))

d) Transmission Costs for Flat Fee Framework ([Approval](#))

**DAY 2**

*Breakfast (8:00 – 8:30 am) and start meeting at approximately 8:30 am*

7) **DISIS Transition to CPP Option 1B Readiness Criteria** ([Approval](#)) (45 mins.) ..... Jennifer Swierczek

8) **ERAS Proposal Coordination & Readiness Criteria Changes** (45 mins.) ..... Steve Purdy

*Break (5-15 mins)*

9) **Order 1920 Compliance Update** (15 mins)..... SPP Staff

10) **CPP Tariff RR Preliminary Redlines Review** (60 mins.).....Ramunda Russell

11) **Wrap-Up, Action Items, and Future Meetings** (5 minutes) ..... Ramunda Russell

<b><u>Future Meetings</u></b>	
<b>Wed, Feb. 19, 2025</b> (9a-4p).....	WebEx
<b>Wed, Mar. 19, 2025</b> (8a-5p).....	Little Rock, AR
<b>Tue, Apr. 22, 2025</b> (9a-4p).....	WebEx
<b>Thur, May 22, 2025</b> (9a-4p).....	WebEx

**SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)  
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)  
December 06, 2024, 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.  
WebEx 2482 737 9441**

## **MINUTES**

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

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m., December 6, 2024, with a quorum present. Staff Secretary Ramunda Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. There were no proxies noted for this meeting. Chair Raheem reviewed the meeting agenda (Attachment A) and provided a high-level summary of the agenda items including all of the items requesting approvals. Steve Gaw (APA) moved to approve the agenda as presented. Heather Starnes (MEC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

### **AGENDA ITEM 2 – CONSENT AGENDA**

Chair Raheem reviewed the consent agenda item for the November 18, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B). John Krajewski (NPRB) moved to approve the motion for the consent agenda item. Heather Starnes (MEC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

### **AGENDA ITEM 3 – NUC (ENTRY FEE) APPROACH DISCUSSION**

Chair Raheem reviewed the two different approaches for the network upgrade contribution (NUC)/entry fee. He recommended considering a volume-based usage instead of a single snapshot. He explained that it could provide more valuable consideration that will avoid large swings in the initial entry fee. He summarized that the guiding principles are to keep it simple and based on benefit and commercial viability because it's an indicator of what customers are willing to pay. He reviewed the load and generation benefits that will be included in the benefit calculation-based approach. For future integration, he stated that we still need to look at the FERC Order 1920 benefits that could play into the entry fee. He explained that the difference in the two approaches is that we would apply a benefit-cost justification but it won't be a direct contribution to GI customers. The plan would be to use an energy utilization ratio rather than a precise measurement of benefits. One member commented that he prefers something simpler and more stable that can be justified. Another member agreed that keeping it simple is better but be able to ensure comparison of cost assignment versus benefits because FERC will require that, and it will be easier to get approved and in place. Chair Raheem reviewed the draft language and how to ensure that we are aligned on how the costs will flow under the different charge types under the CPP components. After Chair Raheem outlined the three buckets of the



entry fee structure, there was discussion regarding unplanned generation, how utilities with retired assets would be treated, and a request to provide transparency about where to interconnect in the planned areas so customers can avoid planning to interconnect in unplanned areas. Chair Raheem stated that staff will screen for this in the 20Y assessments. One member asked if flows were excluded in the calculation, and an SPP member responded that it would be bi-directional. He also mentioned that these numbers don't include 69 kV (only includes 100 - 300kV) which aligns with the entry fee that is only 400 kV and above. Another member asked for clarification about taking into account sites with a generator that has paid for direct assigned upgrades and where there is extra generation capacity at that site but it's not accounted for in current agreements and another generator uses it, if there will be some accounting change for that. Chair Raheem responded that it depends on the concurrent revision request that establishes the amounts for grandfathered resources with rights before the process. If approved and established, it will simplify our entry fee approach because the generation sites load will be recognized and will only have to pay for load over the approved generation levels. The same member mentioned that we need to take into account the older sites that have extra capacity and that they are not assigned the same level of fees as a new greenfield site. Chair Raheem stated that planning for capacity at existing sites will be reviewed internally, and staff will provide a complete package of how that will work. After showing an example of an ERIS flat fee which calculated EHV and HV usage separately, Chair Raheem asked for thoughts on running additional analysis. He shared examples of what costs would look like under different options. Another member stated that is helpful to understand all of the impacts. He asked if there was an estimate from the limited affected systems study that provides additional costs on top of JTIQ. Chair Raheem responded that we assumed it to be zero because there is no way to determine this. He commented that this level of information will allow us to make progress, and analysis is helpful in supporting a conclusion that will help to get people on board. He stated that we will take a deeper dive in the January 2, 2025, meeting and determine if we are ready to have exploratory conversations with GIAG and get feedback from CAWG and the developer community. A third member asked if this was determined on a portfolio basis, zone by zone basis, or facility by facility basis. Chair Raheem responded that it would be on a portfolio basis, the EHV would be on a regional basis, and the subregional would be on a five pricing zone basis. He added that everyone would be paying the same EHV/regional fee but different fees will be paid on a subregional basis. A meeting participant asked when referring to historical contributions of GI customers, if the low values were because of non-firm interconnections and how viable the historical interconnection costs are. Chair Raheem mentioned that it is just a good reference point, but construction is based off the \$7.7B portfolio. A member asked to explain at high level the drivers for the entry fee changing in Y5 vs. Y20 and how it relates to growth rates in terms of added incremental generation. Chair Raheem stated that there are 4-6 GW showing to be connected annually in the EMS and markets process. The member followed up with which is the right number to set the entry fee. Chair Raheem responded that this will be an achievable, reasonable entry fee over the 20Y study horizon, and we may need to look at transmission needs within the Y5 or Y10 assessment. He explained that Y5 doesn't have enough head room for the amount of load growth, so Y10 may be the better number for the cost per kW. He added that we need to evaluate a DP on which year forecast to base the NUC because

Y5 seems too close. Another member stated that we may want to look at Y10 and compare to the Y5 and Y20 to see if enough is captured.

*9-min break until 10:50a*

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

- a. Objectives & Outcomes - Chair Raheem mentioned that we want to layout the policy on the approvals. He explained that, for the scope, we want to identify the policy items that are critical for the CPP assessment to continue work for model development and the start of the assessment. He stated that there are two phases for scope approval - phase 1 is for approvals for the high-level framework for the technical assessment in January, and phase 2 for scope approvals will be in July. He explained that we will also be laying out the workplan for the CPPTF, which will be shared in the January 21, 2025, meeting. He reviewed the model development scope approvals as well as the technical assessment scope approvals being requested. He stated that we will be using the scope as a vehicle to get policy decisions made to use as the starting point for ITP manual redlines in 2025.
- b. SCRIPT C3 Common Model Recommendations - Eddie Watson provided an update on the C3 common model progress. He reviewed the background of addressing the common model activities. He provided detailed explanations of each segment (C3.1 - C3.5). He outlined additional modeling needs and provided an overview of the ITP, CPP, and GI modeling options included in the technical assessment. Eddie reviewed the recommendation that is being brought to the group today. One member stated that he is supportive of the 10.3 waiver but asked about next steps with the MPM. Eddie responded that there will be internal discussions and will bring a response back to the working groups. There was continued discussion about an MPM delay and waiver request. Chair Raheem stated that we need to lay out a workplan on when requested items will be brought back to CPPTF. Another member had general questions on the models outlined and what would be needed from a deliverable standpoint in the deliverability areas, specifically if the models provide insight into whether there is sufficient deliverability to provide load to meet the modeled requirements. An SPP staff member responded that the T-GEM construct will set the structure for where we will be from the deliverability aspect. Two members brought up points about this being presented to the primary working groups first. Chair Raheem stated that we need to modify the recommendation slide to state that the CPPTF approval is contingent upon the MDAG and TWG approval.

**Jared Cooley (SPS) moved to approve the motion as presented on the screen:**

**CPPTF approves the policy direction for the SCRIPT C3 Common Model CPP Transition modeling policy recommendations for the 2026 ITP & CPP Transition Assessments scope document, as follows:**

- **SCRIPT C3.1: The deadline for submitting Section 10.3 model change requests will be July 31, 2025**
- **SCRIPT C3.2: Common Model Set Dispatch Assumptions as outlined on slides 10-11**
- **SCRIPT C3.3: A waiver for the ITP Manual, Section 2.3.2, for the MPMs**

**Derek Brown (Eversource) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Raheem stated that the recommendation is now ready to go to the TWG/ESWG and the MDAG for approval. Eddie shared that it would go before TWG/ESWG on 12/11/2024 and MDAG on 12/12/2024 for their respective items.

Chair changed the order of the next two presentations due to presenter availability.

- d. Short Circuit Ratio Screening - Doug Bowman explained key points about system strength and short circuit ratio (SCR). He summarized the purpose of the short-circuit ratio (SCR) screening. He defined the SCR metric which measures the relative strength of the bus at the inverter-based resources (IBR's) point of interconnection (POI) and identifies weak points close to IBR's. He stated that for the purpose of the scope, we are using the value of 3.0, and an SCR below this value will be considered during solution evaluation and development. He asserted that this value is also being used for electro-magnetic transient (EMT) analysis. He explained that the weighted SCR will also be evaluated, and this metric considers a high penetration of IBR's in a general area. He clarified that the value of 3.0 will be used in this instance as well. He explained the benefits of using the grid strength assessment tool (GSAT) that SPP will be utilizing. One member asked how detailed this will be when using it in CPP. Doug stated that there were two ways to use the GSAT tool – to look at existing IBR's in the system and calculate what the SCR of the bus will be and then assess how much short-circuit maximum available power (SCMVA) is at the location so a generation resource can look at the assessment to determine that there is not enough available where they want to interconnect. He stated that this would be used for customers that want to interconnect at a certain POI to be able to evaluate the information. The same member asked if this information that can be provided about the general grid can pinpoint how to make the area more secure. Chair Raheem clarified that whether this information should trigger added transmission will be part of the scope approvals coming in phase 2. The same member added that it would be useful to use this tool to forecast where there may be future areas of issue within generation siting. Chair Raheem offered that we could run a model with the CPP in mind. An SPP staff member added that from a long-term assessment standpoint

where we don't have customer data, this could be used to select better locations and proxy potential transmission upgrades. Another member asked if this assessment would be tied into the 20Y model that is driving the network upgrades to help drive siting generation and transmission buildout in the right areas. Chair Raheem responded that we would use this in the 20Y assessment and do a deeper dive in the annual assessment to screen for EMT and have GI customer data for a transient stability look as well.

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

- c. CPP Technical Assessment Discussion - Kelsey Allen reviewed the CPP transition study scope document to show where we are with the model development portion (section 3) of the technical assessment. He explained setting the B-GEMs as the baseline for the transfer assessment. He mentioned the use of load assumptions and recommended including these to plan appropriately. He stated that there would be twelve base models, and the B-GEMS would be used to build the transfer models from there. He explained that the model set will consist of two scenario types. He reviewed the dispatch methodology of the inter- and intra-deliverability areas transfers - using economic dispatch for conventional generation and scaling for renewables. Kelsey mentioned that we could treat all resources as NRIS and ERIS types. The NRIS+ service would require twelve models, and the ERIS service would require seventy-two models (sixty for HVER and twelve for LVER). He explained that we would have a steady-state version of the models. He outlined that for the year 20 models, they would be developed from the 10Y summer and winter sets. Kelsey asked for direction on general scope approval. One member stated his support for the general models but has a question about pulling this into the scope which means pulling this into the annual NERC requirement. There was a question about whether this will satisfy annual TPL requirements. An SPP staff member responded on the sensitivity models and how they will be used for TPL. Kelsey stated that this is written to expand, and the TPL scope goes above and beyond. The same member responded that ITP and TPL are linked, and the base model assumptions are the same. He was basically suggesting that the common model should be the base and not the B-GEM/T-GEM. Chair Raheem commented that we can add a table to the scope to spell out which model sets are used for what purposes to address the concern. The same member suggested having more in-depth discussion about if stability studies are needed to support the entry fee, which goes into scope development in the models which ties to compliance.

**Derek Brown (Eversource) moved to approve the motion as presented on the screen:**

**SPP Staff recommends CPPTF approve the policy direction outlined below, and as described in the 2026 ITP & CPP Transition Assessment scope, for the CPP Transition**

**Assessment (20YR) model framework & recommendation, as well as the technical analysis and framework.**

**Model Framework & Recommendation:**

**Recommendations for building L-GIM, B-GEM, and T-GEM models to streamline the protection of NRIS+ (B-GEM), set the foundation for resiliency conditions (T-GEM), and evaluate local generator interconnection constraints (L-GIM)**

**Incremental CPP Models (~90 models per Future)**

- **Local GI outlet: Local Generation Interconnection Models (L-GIM)**
- **Base assessment: Base Generation Expansion Models (B-GEM)**
- **Transfers assessment: Transfers Generation Expansion Models (T-GEM)**

**Technical Analysis Framework:**

**Recommendations for use of CPP model framework under the Invest, Connect, and Manage (ERIS) and Deliver (NRIS+)**

**GI and ITP Grid Strength Evaluation through Short Circuit Ratio (SCR) screenings to identify potentially “weak” areas of the transmission system.**

(refer to Recommendations slide for detail layout)

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

An SPP staff member added that we will meet Monday to get the purpose table created and included in the scope document for TWG/ESWG review next week.

- e. Scope Update and Document Review - Sherri Maxey updated on where we are with the scope development. She shared that she revised the schedule to capture each of the identified scope items. She outlined the items going to January and July MOPC meetings for approval. Following schedule review, she stepped through each section of the scope document. She reminded the group that we will be requesting approval for this scope document in the January 2, 2025, joint meeting and requested that the group provide any comments or feedback as soon as possible.

*10-min break until 2:10p*

## AGENDA ITEM 5 – DISIS TRANSITION TO CPP UPDATE

Caitlin Shank reviewed the current plan for transitioning DISIS into CPP. She outlined the three options developed for the transition approach. She explained that the first option is the cleanest approach and the preference for CPPTF to consider. She then explained the next two options. She highlighted that option three would be the most difficult alternative to achieve just because of the levels of difficulty involved. She outlined the different items to consider. She provided the recommendation for CPPTF to approve option one and to remove options two and three for varying reasons. One member stated that option one generally reflects what people have stated is easier to manage, but he asked what would be done regarding potential harm if someone leaves during this time. He also asked for clarification about removing the harm test. There was significant group discussion around the specific details of options one and two. The same member commented that we are going in the right direction with option one as long as we don't go into too much detail with alternative 1b. Another member restated for clarification that after the first restudy, customers can go to the decision point (DP) and then make a real decision because staying in past DP2 will make it hard to get the deposit back from a restudy later. He asked if staff was ok with withdrawals up to DP2 but not after, and staff response was yes. He then asked what the next steps would be. Caitlin responded that a revision request (RR) would be necessary. Chair Raheem emphasized that the penalty-free withdrawals were purposely staged to encourage early withdrawal, so we can make adjustments going forward with CPP studies.

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

**CPPTF Recommendation - CPPTF supports option 1 and the exploration of the development of provisions limiting restudies, and the removal of options 2 and 3.**

**John Krajewski (NPRB) seconded, and there was discussion about including this language in the current CPP tariff RR language that is in development for early 2025 approval and timing in general. Following the discussion, the motion passed.**



A different member had a concern about potential delay of the RR language development and how it could impact generators being able to make adjustments. The first member added comments regarding the timing. Another member wants to ensure that there is a way to limit restudies. Chair Raheem agreed that we are taking analytical information from the generator interconnection (GI) study, and it could impact CPP on-going. He stated that we will have more specific provisions to limit restudies to bring to this group at the next meeting.

## **AGENDA ITEM 6 – CPP TARIFF RR PATH FORWARD**

Staff Secretary Russell recapped prior discussions and feedback received that influenced staff's decision to re-evaluate the original timeline that was previously provided to aim towards an April MOPC approval for the revision request. She shared and reviewed the newly revised plan and timeline that would target obtaining July MOPC approval with a September 2025 FERC filing goal. She outlined the requested review and approval dates for CPPTF as well as each of the impacted stakeholder groups. One member shared that we need to set the stage for CPP being a new way of doing business and reflecting that in the tariff language. He added that with the new FERC filing date, if there would be plans to incorporate FERC Order 1920 language and prepare for a single filing. SPP staff members responded that this is still in consideration, but there is no path forward to moving in that direction at this time because the impact of the FERC response to MISO is unknown. The member shared that it could be a relevant consideration into the equation.

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

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

- Staff will provide a complete package of how to plan for existing gen sites that have extra capacity (item 3)
- Staff to evaluate a decision point on which year's forecast to base the NUC - will bring slides back to the group next meeting (item 3)
- Staff to lay out the workplan for the scope approvals coming to CPPTF, which will be shared in the 1/21 meeting (item 4a)
- Staff to lay out a workplan on when requested items will be brought back to CPPTF on the model recommendations (item 4b)
- Staff to add a table to the scope to spell out which model sets are used for what purposes in ITP & TPL (item 4c) = complete

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 3:22 p.m.

**SOUTHWEST POWER POOL  
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE,  
ECONOMIC STUDIES WORKING GROUP & TRANSMISSION WORKING GROUP  
JOINT MEETING  
January 2, 2025  
Net Conference**

## SUMMARY OF MOTIONS AND ACTION ITEMS

[LINK TO MATERIALS](#)

### ACTIONS TAKEN

#### APPROVED

- [RR660](#) (SIR567) BP7250 GI Legacy Generation Values EXPEDITED, contingent upon RTWG approval via email vote (TWG)
- 2026 ITP & CPP Transition Assessment - Scope
  - Scope language – VOM value and startup energy requirement for generator prototypes (ESWG)
  - Scope document – Phase 1, as presented and modified (CPPTF/ESWG/TWG)
- 2025 ITP Assessment
  - Scope changes to Section 3 adding new Resiliency Needs Criteria & Resiliency Needs Assessment processes, as modified (ESWG/TWG)
  - Voltage Stability Scope update (TWG)
  - Target Area Scope update, as modified (ESWG/TWG)
- TWG Action Item 221 – approved the assumptions and requirements proposed for the ESR load assessment with mitigation option 2 (see slide 11), with the caveat that continued work will be performed to evaluate the need for stability analysis based on an ESR’s operating status, whether charging or injecting power. (TWG)

**SOUTHWEST POWER POOL  
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE,  
ECONOMIC STUDIES WORKING GROUP & TRANSMISSION WORKING GROUP  
JOINT MEETING**

January 2, 2025  
Net Conference

**MINUTES**

[LINK TO MATERIALS](#)

**AGENDA ITEM 1 – ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

The Consolidated Planning Process Task Force (CPPTF) Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. CT. The following members were in attendance or represented by proxy:

**CPPTF**

Sunny Raheem, SPP (Chair)  
Adam McKinnie, Missouri PSC (MPSC)  
Andrew French, Kansas Corporation Commission (KCC)  
Alan Myers, ITC Holdings, Inc. (ITC)  
David Mindham, EDP Renewables (EDP)  
Derek Brown, Evergy  
Heather Starnes, Missouri Joint Municipal EUC (MJMEUC)  
Jarred Cooley, SPS/Xcel Energy (SPS/Xcel)  
Jason Tanner, NextEra Energy Resources, LLC (NextEra)  
John Krajewski, Nebraska Power Review Board (NPRB)  
Michael Wise, Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Inc. (GSEC)  
Steve Gaw, Advanced Power Alliance (APA)  
Steve Hohman, Omaha Public Power District (OPPD)

**Proxies:**

Bernie Liu for Jarred Cooley (SPS/Xcel)  
Michael Wegner for Alan Myers (ITC)  
Mike Swan for Steve Hohman (OPPD)

The Economic Studies Working Group (ESWG) Chair Calvin Daniels called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. CT. The following members were in attendance or represented by proxy:

**ESWG**

Calvin Daniels, Western Farmers Electric Cooperative (WFEC) (Chair)  
Jordan Schmick, SPS/Xcel Energy (Vice Chair)  
Derek Brown, Evergy  
~~Gayle Nansel, Western Area Power Administration-Upper Great Plains Region (WAPA-UGPR)~~

Hassan Hayat, American Electric Power (AEP)  
Jeremy Severson, Basin Electric Power Cooperative (BEPC)  
Jerry Bradshaw, City Utility of Springfield (CUS)  
~~Jody Holland, GridLiance High Plains LLC (GHP)~~  
John Knofczynski, East River Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. (EREPC)  
Kurt Stradley, Lincoln Electric System (LES)  
Maggie Kristian, NG Renewables Energy Marketing LLC (NGR)  
Michael Watt, Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority (OMPA)  
Michael Wegner, ITC Great Plains LLC (ITC)  
Ryan Benton, Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company (OG&E)  
Steve Gaw, APA  
Steve Hohman, OPPD  
Tim Owens, Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD)

Proxies:

Mike Swan as proxy for Steve Hohman (OPPD)  
Reene' Miranda as proxy for Jordan Schmick (SPS/Xcel)

The Transmission Working Group (TWG) Chair Derek Brown called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. CT. The following members were in attendance or represented by proxy:

**TWG**

Derek Brown, Evergy (Chair)  
Scott Benson, LES (Vice Chair)  
Adam Snapp, OG&E  
Andrew Berg, Missouri River Energy Services (MRES)  
Arash Ghodsian, Invenergy, as proxy for Grain Belt Express LLC (Invenergy/GBX)  
Clifford Franklin, Sunflower Electric Power Corporation (SEPC)  
~~Gayle Nansel, WAPA-UGPR~~  
~~James Ging, Kansas Power Pool Energy (KPP)~~  
Jason Shook, GDS Associates, as proxy for East Texas Electric Cooperative (GDS/ETEC)  
Jerry Bradshaw, CUS  
Jim McAvoy, OMPA  
Joe Fultz, Grand River Dam Authority (GRDA)  
John Knofczynski, EREPC  
Kalun Kelley, WFEC  
Matthew McGee, AEP  
Michael Mueller, Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation (AECC)  
Michael Wegner, ITC  
~~Nate Morris, Liberty Utilities (Liberty)~~  
Nathan McNeil, Midwest Energy, Inc. (MIDW)  
Noman Williams, GHP  
Phil Westby, BEPC  
Randy Lindstrom, NPPD

Reene' Miranda, Xcel/SPS  
Steve Hohman, OPPD  
Temujin Roach, EDF Renewables (EDF)

Proxies:  
Lee Elliott as proxy for Arash Ghodsian (Invenergy/GBX)  
Mike Swan as proxy for Steve Hohman (OPPD)

Sherri Maxey, Susanna Padilla, and Megan Damron confirmed there was a quorum present for all groups. Susanna Padilla provided the antitrust statement. Sherri Maxey reviewed the agenda, and Calvin Daniels and Derek Brown asked if there were any changes.

#### CPPTF

**The agenda was adopted by general consent.**

#### ESWG

**The agenda was adopted by general consent.**

#### TWG

**The agenda was adopted by general consent.**

#### AGENDA ITEM 2 – [RR660](#) (SIR567) BP7250 GI LEGACY GENERATION VALUES (EXPEDITED) (APPROVAL) (TWG)

Francesco Havas and Divakar Arora (SPP) returned to seek approval of RR660 BP7250 updates to develop a process and calculations to use to establish the interconnection service amounts for legacy/grandfathered generator units; initial discussion at the 12/10 TWG meeting. The RR was posted on 12/11/2024 (No comment period as TWG approved expedited status 12/10); (Primary WG: TWG; Secondary WG: RTWG – reviewed 12/19); goal is Jan. MOPC.

#### TWG

**Andrew Berg (MRES) made a motion, seconded by Adam Snapp (OGE), for the TWG to approve RR660, as presented, contingent upon RTWG approval via email vote. The motion was approved unanimously via voice vote.**

*Note: RTWG approved via email vote on 1/7/2025; RR660 on Jan. MOPC Consent Agenda.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 3AI – 2026 ITP & CPP TRANSITION ASSESSMENT: SCOPE DEVELOPMENT – VOM CTS (APPROVAL) (ESWG)

Joshua Norton (SPP) provided an update to the group and discussed the proposed scope approach based on previous stakeholder feedback received and requested approval of the variable O&M value of \$0.85 for CT units and the startup energy requirement as 234.19, 1698.96,

and 4628.60 MMBtu for CT, CC, and ST Coal generator prototypes respectively for inclusion in the scope document.

#### ESWG

**Tim Owens (OPPD) made a motion, seconded by Derek Brown (Evergy), for the ESGW to approve the variable O&M value and startup energy requirement for generator prototypes for the 2026 ITP & CPP Transition Assessment. The motion was approved unanimously via voice vote.**

#### AGENDA ITEM 3AII – 2026 ITP & CPP TRANSITION ASSESSMENT: SCOPE DEVELOPMENT – SCOPE UPDATE – PHASE 1 (APPROVAL) (ESWG/TWG)

Sherri Maxey and Kelsey Allen (SPP) reviewed updates to the scope based on Evergy's comments received and made minor changes. Sherri reviewed the overall scope schedule and reviewed the timeline of work, and approval of the scope document – phase 1 was requested. Note: Draft scope was previously reviewed at 12/6 CPPTF and 12/11 Joint ESGW-TWG.

#### ESWG

**Derek Brown (Evergy) made a motion, seconded by Steve Gaw (APA), for the ESGW to approve the 2026 ITP & CPP Transition Assessment Scope – phase 1 document up to needs assessment, as presented and modified. The motion was approved with one abstention (Reene' Miranda as proxy for Jordan Schmick, SPS/Xcel) via voice vote.**

#### Voting Rationale:

##### **Reene' Miranda as proxy for Jordan Schmick (SPS/Xcel) – Abstain**

*"SPS abstained from the motion not because it opposed the scope but because of the changes made during the joint meeting, SPS believes additional time for review of the scope document would have been beneficial considering the limited review time due."*

#### CPPTF

**John Krajewski (NPRB) made a motion, seconded by Heather Starnes (MJMEUC), for the CPPTF to approve the 2026 ITP & CPP Transition Assessment Scope – phase 1 document up to needs assessment, as presented and modified, as meeting the policy direction approved for the CPP technical assessment. The motion was approved with one abstention (Bernie Liu as proxy for Jarred Cooley, SPS/Xcel) via voice vote.**

#### Voting Rationale:

**Bernie Liu as proxy for Jarred Cooley (SPS/Xcel) – Abstain**



*“SPS abstained from the motion not because it opposed the scope but because of the changes made during the joint meeting, SPS believes additional time for review of the scope document would have been beneficial considering the limited review time due.”*

#### TWG

**Michael Wegner (ITC) made a motion, seconded by Temujin Roach (EDF), for the TWG to approve the 2026 ITP & CPP Transition Assessment Scope – phase 1 document up to needs assessment, as presented and modified. The motion was approved with one abstention (Renee’ Miranda, SPS/Xcel) via voice vote.**

#### **Voting Rationale:**

##### **Reene’ Miranda (SPS/Xcel) – Abstain**

*“SPS abstained from the motion not because it opposed the scope but because of the changes made during the joint meeting, SPS believes additional time for review of the scope document would have been beneficial considering the limited review time due.”*

#### AGENDA ITEM 4A – 2025 ITP ASSESSMENT – SCOPE & ITP MANUAL RESILIENCY UPDATE (APPROVAL) (ESWG/TWG)

Austin Baccus (SPP) presented updates to the 2025 ITP Scope as well as ITP Manual language for review related to both the 2025 ITP portfolio delivery targets and resiliency project staging improvements. The group discussed these topics and made modifications. Stakeholders were encouraged to reach out to Austin if they would be interested in attending the Resiliency Strike Team (RST) meetings ([abbaccus@spp.org](mailto:abbaccus@spp.org)).

#### ESWG

**Michael Wegner (ITC) made a motion, seconded by Steve Gaw (APA), for the ESWG to approve the 2025 ITP Scope changes to Section 3 adding new Resiliency Needs Criteria and Resiliency Needs Assessment processes to the 2025 ITP, as modified. The motion was approved unanimously via voice vote.**

#### TWG

**Michael Wegner (ITC) made a motion, seconded by Scott Benson (LES), for the TWG to approve the 2025 ITP Scope changes to Section 3 adding new Resiliency Needs Criteria and Resiliency Needs Assessment processes to the 2025 ITP, as modified. The motion was approved with one abstention (Noman Williams, GHP) via voice vote.**

AGENDA ITEM 4B – 2025 ITP ASSESSMENT – VOLTAGE STABILITY SCOPE UPDATE (APPROVAL) (TWG)

William Eckert (SPP) reviewed and discussed with the group the proposed 2025 ITP scope language change for the voltage stability milestone based on resiliency analysis and requested approval.

TWG

**Scott Benson (LES) made a motion, seconded by Temujin Roach (EDF), for the TWG to approve the 2025 ITP Stability Assessment scope language as shown below:**

- ***A voltage stability assessment will be conducted using the final consolidated portfolio to assess the megawatt transfer limit per a scenario to be approved by the TWG at a future date.***
- ***The transfer limit will be determined by examining voltage performance during power transfers.***

**The motion was approved unanimously via voice vote.**

AGENDA ITEM 4C – 2025 ITP ASSESSMENT – TARGET AERA SCOPE UPDATE (APPROVAL) (ESWG/TWG)

Maurisa Hughes (SPP) shared proposed scope language describing the planned analysis of the Southeastern SPP target area in the 2025 ITP for approval.

ESWG

**Steve Gaw (APA) made a motion, seconded by Hassan Hayat (AEP), for the ESWG to approve the updates to the 2025 ITP Scope pertaining to the Southeastern SPP target area as presented on slides 4 and 5 of the presentation, as modified. The motion was approved unanimously via voice vote.**

TWG

**Matthew McGee (AEP) made a motion, seconded by Jason Shook (GDS/ETEC), for the TWG to approve the updates to the 2025 ITP Scope pertaining to the Southeastern SPP target area as presented on slides 4 and 5 of the presentation, as modified. The motion was approved unanimously via voice vote.**

AGENDA ITEM 5 – TWG ACTION ITEM 221 SCOPE (APPROVAL) (TWG)

Caitlin Shank (SPP) updated the TWG on the study scope for the batteries as load resource study and addressed the follow-up items related to TWG Action Item 221 based on feedback received at the last couple of meetings. The updated scope was discussed with the group, as well as the

next steps, and approval of the scope of work was requested to begin revision request work Q1 2025.

#### TWG

**Reene' Miranda (SPS/Xcel) made a motion, seconded by Temujin Roach (EDF), for the TWG to approve the assumptions and requirements proposed for the ESR load assessment with mitigation option 2 (see slide 11), with the caveat that continued work will be performed to evaluate the need for stability analysis based on an ESR's operating status, whether charging or injecting power. The motion was approved via voice vote with two opposed (Temujin Roach (EDF) and Lee Elliott, as proxy for Arash Ghodsian (Invenergy/GBX)).**

#### **Voting Rationale:**

##### **Lee Elliott, as proxy for Arash Ghodsian (Invenergy/GBX) – Oppose**

*"Reasons for the no vote:*

- *Concerned about the retroactive impacts.*
- *Really want MWG weighing in prior to the vote*
- *Let markets and operations override the restriction if it does not compromise reliability*
- *Allow the GIA to be amended to remove the limitation if they procure transmission service."*

##### **Temujin Roach (EDF Renewables) – Oppose**

*"Concurred with concerns listed by Invenergy as logic for vote in opposition."*

#### AGENDA ITEM 6 – CPP LONG-TERM ENTRY FEE CONTRIBUTION (ALL)

Sunny Raheem (SPP) provided an abbreviated update and educational review of the Entry Fee methodology and approach, as well as a timeline and next steps.

#### AGENDA ITEM 7 – SCRIPT DQ7 (ESWG/TWG)

*This agenda item was posted for informational purposes only due to time constraints.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 8 – DRAFT RR (SIR721) IEEE 2800 ADOPTION – PHASE 1 (TWG)

*This agenda item was posted for informational purposes only due to time constraints.*

**Note:** This item was an update on the draft revision request for changes to IEEE 2800's Appendix G to Appendix 6, 8, 13, and 14 to Attachment V redlines, timelines, and next steps. **Stakeholder feedback is requested by January 10, 2025, to move forward.** (Primary WG: TWG; Secondary WG: RTWG); goal is April MOPC.

**CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE,  
ECONOMIC STUDIES WORKING GROUP & TRANSMISSION WORKING GROUP  
JOINT MEETING**

January 2, 2025

AGENDA ITEM 9 – CLOSING ITEMS

There were no action items taken by any of the groups.

With no other new business, Sunny Raheem, CPPTF Chair, Calvin Daniels, ESWG Chair, and Derek Brown, TWG Chair, adjourned the meeting at 5:04 p.m. CT on Thursday, January 2, 2025.

**EMAIL ITEMS**

There were no email voting items since the prior meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ramunda Russell, CPPTF Secretary

Susanna Padilla, ESWG Secretary

Sherri Maxey, TWG Secretary

**CPPTF ATTENDANCE LIST, JANUARY 21 - 22, 2025**

Attendance list from WebEx registration & In-Person. Symbols: \* denotes CPPTF Member and † denotes proxy.

#	Name	Organization	Day 1	Day 2
1	Alan Myers*	ITC	Y	Y
2	Andrew French*	KCC	Y	Y
3	David Mindham*	EDP	Y	Y
4	Derek Brown*	Evergy	Y	Y
5	Jason Tanner*	NEXTERA	Y	Y
6	Heather Starnes*	MJMEUC	Y	Y
7	Bernie Liu+	Xcel	Y	Y
8	Michael Wise*	GSEC	Y	Y
9	John Krajewski*	NPRB	Y	Y
10	Ramunda Russell (Secretary)*	SPP	Y	Y
11	Steve Gaw*	APA	Y	Y
12	Loren Ditsch+	OPPD	Y	Y
13	Sunny Raheem (Chair)*	SPP	Y	Y
14	Adam Mummert	1898	Y	Y
15	Adam Schieffer	OPPD		Y
16	Adam Snapp	OGE	Y	Y
17	Ahmed Magdi	EPE	Y	Y
18	Al sudani, Wisam	WAPA	Y	
19	Ala Wadi	LU	Y	Y
20	Alyssa Culver	SPP	Y	
21	Amanda King	EPE	Y	
22	Andrew Daro	NPPD	Y	Y
23	Annie Minondo	NRDC	Y	Y
24	Beverly Laios	AEP	Y	Y
25	Brad Cochran	OGE	Y	Y
26	Brad Lafler	CES	Y	
27	Brenda Fite	SPP	Y	Y
28	Brian Daschbach	LS Power	Y	
29	Brian Korpics	NLE	Y	
30	Brian Rounds	AESL	Y	Y
31	Bridget Sparks	AES	Y	
32	Britney Lloyd	SPP	Y	Y

33	Brooke Keene	SPP		Y
34	Bruce Doll	OPPD		Y
35	Caitlin Shank	SPP	Y	Y
36	Call-in User_2	#N/A	Y	Y
37	Call-in User_3	#N/A	Y	
38	Calvin Daniels	WFEC	Y	Y
39	Carly Masenthin	KCC	Y	Y
40	Casey Cathey	SPP	Y	
41	Charles Locke	SPP	Y	Y
42	Chris Jamieson	SPP	Y	Y
43	Chris Lyons	CES	Y	Y
44	Chris Matos	Google	Y	Y
45	Cindy Ireland	ARK	Y	Y
46	Clifford Franklin	Sunflower	Y	Y
47	Curtis Miller	WFEC	Y	Y
48	Dana Shelton	STONEPIGMAN	Y	Y
49	Dara Solomon	SPP		Y
50	Deni Golden	SPP	Y	Y
51	Denise Martin	SPP	Y	Y
52	Dennis Constien	SWPA		Y
53	Dennis Reed	MWRC	Y	Y
54	Derek Sunderman	SE	Y	
55	Don Frerking	SPP	Y	Y
56	Dylan Haas	MWE	Y	Y
57	Eddie Watson	SPP	Y	Y
58	Giulia Volini	Aneden		Y
59	Greg Rislov	State		Y
60	Greg Wannier	SC	Y	Y
61	JB-E1100-VC		Y	Y
62	J Keller	WAPA	Y	
63	Jake Chapman	Sisung	Y	Y
64	James Peters	SPP		Y
65	Jason Chaplin	OCC	Y	
66	Jay Caspary	TGA	Y	Y
67	Jennifer Solomon	NextEra	Y	Y
68	Jennifer Swierczek	SPP	Y	Y
69	Jessica Meyer	LES	Y	Y
70	Joe Fultz	GRDA	Y	Y
71	Joe Price	Samsung	Y	Y
72	John Knofczynski	ER	Y	Y

73	John Miller	CE	Y	Y
74	Jon Langford	Orsted	Y	
75	Jonathan Goldsworthy	ITC	Y	
76	Jordan Skillern	WFEC	Y	Y
77	Joshua Pilgrim	SPP	Y	Y
78	Justin Grady	KCC	Y	Y
79	Kalun Kelley	WFEC	Y	Y
80	Katherine Rogers	SPP	Y	Y
81	Kelsey Allen	SPP	Y	Y
82	Kirk Hall	SPP	Y	Y
83	LaKeitha Rinks	ARK	Y	Y
84	Lee Elliott Invenergy	INVENERGY	Y	Y
85	Lottie Jones	SPP	Y	Y
86	Margaret Kristian	NGR	Y	
87	Marisa Choate	SPP	Y	Y
88	Mark Whitson	SPP	Y	Y
89	Matt Alvarado IUB	IUB	Y	Y
90	Maya Nevels	Power Alliance	Y	Y
91	Megan Damron	SPP	Y	Y
92	Meredith Powell	SPP	Y	Y
93	Michael Wegner	ITC	Y	Y
94	Mike Gahimer	AE	Y	Y
95	Natasha Henderson	SPP	Y	
96	Nathan Davis	LU	Y	Y
97	Naved Khan	SPP	Y	Y
98	Neeya Toleman	Viridon	Y	
99	Nick Abraham	ITC	Y	Y
100	Nick Parker	SPP	Y	
101	Nicole Wagner	SPP		Y
102	Olu Fagbemi	Aneden	Y	
103	Paul Antony	Gabel Assoc.	Y	Y
104	Phil Westby	BEPC	Y	
105	Rachael Dziewiatkowski	ITC	Y	Y
106	Ray Ward	WAPA	Y	Y
107	Regan Fink	PGR	Y	
108	Richard Ross	AEP	Y	
109	Robert Lane	Sisung	Y	Y
110	Ryan Benton	OG&E	Y	
111	Ryan Tuter	OMPA	Y	Y
112	Scott Holland	SWPA	Y	



113	Shawnee Claiborn-Pinto PUCT	PUCT	Y	Y
114	Sherri Maxey	SPP	Y	Y
115	Shilpi Sunil Kumar AES CE	ASE CE	Y	Y
116	Stephanie Yamamoto	Aneden	Y	
117	Steve Purdy	SPP		Y
118	Susanna Padilla	SPP	Y	
119	Tessie Kentner	SPP		Y
120	Tiffany Wu	MEG	Y	
121	Tyler Berton	AES	Y	
122	Walt Shumate	SBC	Y	
123	Mason Fontenot	SPP	Y	Y
124	Matthew Stoltz	Yahoo		Y
125	Reene Miranda	Xcel	Y	Y
126	Jeff Wells	NextEra	Y	Y
127	Conor McKenzie	AEU	Y	Y