

**SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)  
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)  
Mar 18, 2024, 9:05 a.m. to 2:10 p.m.  
WebEx 2490 937 6637**

## **MINUTES**

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

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m., March 18, 2024, with a quorum present and reviewed the agenda (Attachment A – Agenda). Ramunda Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. No changes were requested for the agenda. Alan Myers (ITC) moved to approve the agenda. Steve Gaw (APA) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Ms. Russell reviewed previous meeting draft minutes (Attachment B – 2024030607 Minutes). Derek Brown (Evergy) moved to approve the 03/06-07/24 Minutes. Alan Myers (ITC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

### **AGENDA ITEM 2 – CPP PHASE 1 ENTRY FEE FRAMEWORK**

Chair Raheem wanted to focus today's meeting on the remaining items for approval.

#### **ITEM 2a – REVIEW OF CURRENT APPROVALS**

Chair Raheem reviewed updates to the report from the previous meeting.

#### **ITEM 2b – TECHNICAL ALIGNMENT**

Kelsey Allen presented on the technical assessment. A diagram was added about the invest, connect, and manage (ERIS) or deliver (CRIS) framework for GI customers because this was not included in the paper, and feedback was requested from the group. One member asked which pages we would be referencing in the paper for this motion. He provided edits from his company's internal review of the paper to be incorporated in the customer readiness section. Pg. 39 is a new addition to the paper. It conveyed how the policy will be structured to present in the framework and will be used to stand up the transition study. Chair Raheem would like TWG/ESWG's input on the approach for building this out as a compliment to the cost sharing portion of the entry fee. A member had a concern about if there is enough incentive to go the CRIS route or ERIS route. Chair Raheem responded that this is the only way to complement the cost sharing proposal in a fair approach. He posed the question about if this should be presented to CAWG and who would have responsibility to approve.

*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 asked the group to review the draft motion placed on the screen regarding the technical alignment portion of the document.

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

**Approves establishing an initial framework for the technical assessment approach to complement the cost-sharing and certainty concept, the task force hereby approves the development of the Invest, Connect, and Manage (ERIS) or Deliver (CRIS) framework for GI customers.**

- **Framework Approval:**

- 1. The task force approves the utilization and further development of the Invest, Connect, and Manage (ERIS) or Deliver (CRIS) framework for GI customers.**
- 2. The technical assessment considerations for GI customers, particularly Generator assessments, shall ensure consistency between long-term assessments and annual assessments, including adherence to GI customer assessment assumptions.**

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

#### ITEM 2c – CRIS COST ALLOCATION

Chair Raheem stated that there were concerns of compatibility of CRIS upgrades with FERNs study upgrades. He explained that the staff is looking for opportunities with CAWG to see if there are other options for the CRIS bridge plan direct assignment approach. The desire would be to incentivize CRIS over ERIS to help with resource adequacy requirements. He outlined the three cost allocation options: full base plan funding, incremental base plan funding, and no base plan funding. Chair Raheem requested to hear from the group on which options the team would be recommending to CAWG. He mentioned that there has been discussion that no base plan funding is the least favorable option that we have. He stated that outcome would be for a motion to provide a recommendation to the CAWG. He suggested that the group explore the incremental base plan funding to see if CAWG is interested in approving this. A member suggested revising the language on the presentation slide to remove delegating authority to the CAWG. There was member discussion about the limits on designating resources. It was determined that there will need to be discussion on the limits being imposed. The add-on from ERIS to CRIS in the entry fee will require some discussion. A member agreed that the safe harbor criteria will remain in place. Another member had questions to clarify the cost allocation options on slide 23. Chair Raheem explained that the CRIS adder will be in addition to the general contributions. The remaining portion not paid for by customers will be base plan funding. An SPP staff member suggested changing the language from "the dollars coming from

*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.*

GI customers is a credit to the base plan" to "there would be less credit to the base plan for the GI customers". A member stated that this draft motion only covers the CPP portion of the CRIS and encouraged the staff to keep talking with CAWG about the bridge plan. Chair Raheem stated that the staff will push education materials and work with CAWG to explore options under the bridge plan. A member liked the incremental option but stated that to make it valuable on the load side, it should be able to be dispatched to account for resource adequacy purposes. It would allow for flexibility on the generator side to select the CRIS plan. Currently, if generator connect with ERIS, there would be limited operation until upgrades are made. Chair Raheem stated that the staff needed to determine the plan if a customer selected both service types. He said that the staff would need to figure out how to calculate the LOIS number in the future for CRIS. A member stated that a credited capacity is being brought into the CRIS zone. Another member clarified for assumption that there is no endorsement of funding. A member responded and commented that the incremental base plan funding is the middle ground and an appropriate balance of the two issues. The previous member countered that this option does not meet FERC policy as he saw it. Comment was provided in response to the counter statement.

Chair Raheem asked the group to review the draft motion placed on the screen to recommend the incremental base plan funding option to the CAWG as edited.

**John Krajewski (NPRB) moved to approve the draft motion as shown on the screen:**

**Approves the initial exploration of Incremental Base Plan Funding by the CAWG to determine its appropriateness for the CPP Entry Fee framework.**

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

*The group recessed for a 10-minute break and resumed at 10:51a*

#### ITEM 2d – GI CUSTOMER READINESS

Chair Raheem stated that the group will review the readiness requirement to get into the open window to submit the request and the commitment point for the entry fee. He reviewed the GI readiness criteria objectives. He outlined the key items for CPP scope and schedule success. He noted that there are slides on intra-queue priority later in the deck. He reviewed the comparisons that an SPP staff member prepared to show the key highlights in the current state vs. the desired state. He discussed the GI analysis comparisons between current state and desired state. He provided an overview of the entry fee document recommendations. He stated that there will be more data validation from Grid Unity. The group will need to determine if there are milestones needed past financial commitment. The group will also need to have a

*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.*

strong stance on technical data and modeling requirements. This group will need to determine if the requests are moving us forward with the readiness criteria. A member stated that the group needs to outline coordination upfront. Another member stated that the group needs to have more stringent criteria and needs to allow more time for scoping calls to identify the more optimal places on the system before the projects advance through the queue. Chair Raheem agreed that the group will need to add timeline revisions in the entry fee framework. Chair Raheem reviewed the readiness criteria to get into the open window. A member stated that we needed to have the transmission owner confirm that they are within the interconnection area or give them the flexibility to move if there is a POI change outside of their control. Another member agreed and stated that staff should have plans for how to coordinate the interconnection of multiple requests at a particular site. This would be like a pre-screen for the facility. A member stated that the PPA is worthless. He stated that no organization can give a definitive authorization. Large companies could provide definitive financing internally but this would weed out the smaller developers. The definitive execution of contract does not hold anyone. Chair Raheem claimed that staff would need to determine if there is something outside of financial securities to show that this is viable. The member stated that getting the entry fee right will eliminate the need for any of these. Another member questioned if there were aspects of order 2023 that would tie our hands to where we need to get an exception. Chair Raheem stated that SPP staff will need to outline how this sets the bar higher than FERC requirements, and that is what will be included in the FERC education for our current process and under the CPP process. Discussion was had among the members regarding comments on the PE-certified layout diagram. It was stated that good analysis was needed during the pre-screen process on where to connect and how much it would cost. This would need to be locked down early somehow and not reduce the requests that have the entry fee applicable to them because of being tied to the order 1000 process. It was declared that you must have certainty on the models and needs window; if not, that will need to be tied down in the next window. A question was posed about how to get certainty in the study schedule without locking down early upfront. A member agreed with another member on this and also had a question on base funding eligibility. The suggestion was made to have SPP staff to develop eligibility requirements. Chair Raheem reviewed the readiness criteria for the entry fee commitment point. There was member discussion on this topic. Chair Raheem stated that the motion language may need to be revised based on the group discussion. He reviewed the draft motion and claimed that it will be modified based on the development milestones. He suggested that the group break out into feedback on the financial security proposal and see if everyone is open to explore the other milestones as we progress in the study process. He posed the question about whether the group could agree to lock down the understanding of financial security and site control and leave door open for further discussion later. A member suggested that the motion be broken down even further by adding more language for consideration on the financial security. There was member discussion on this recommendation. One member asked if staff was ok with editorial comments being added in the tables. He stated that one option would be to place TBD on site milestones upon buildout based on future recommendations from CPPTF if that was ok with the group. Chair Raheem stated that the group should move the financial security portion forward and buildout the rest in the future. Two members suggested to remove the language

*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.*

out of the motion at the current time. Chair Raheem proposed that he would revise the draft motion for the areas close to agreement and include flexibility in the language for refinement of the remaining items over the lunch break.

*The group recessed for lunch for 45 minutes following this agenda item – returned at 1:00p*

The revised draft motion was displayed for the group to review and ask questions. A member implored the group to think about how we could justify this motion once it gets to FERC. Chair Raheem stated that this will be key in our outreach to FERC as well as the high degree of cost commitment.

Chair Raheem asked the group to review the draft motion placed on the screen regarding GI customer financial readiness language as edited.

**John Krajewski (NPRB) moved to approve the draft motion as shown on the screen:**

**Hereby approves the GI customer readiness language motion to initiate the revision request process and ensure clarity within the CPP process.**

- 1. Approval of GI Readiness Criteria for Financial Commitment: Motion to approve the GI readiness criteria to be applied both at the open window and at the time of the entry fee commitment.**
  - 1. CPP Open Window: The greater of 1) 20% of the applicable Regional Entry Fee Rate (\$/MW) or \$4,000/MW**
  - 2. CPP Entry Fee Commitment: 100% of applicable Regional, 100% of Sub-Regional, and 20% Direct Costs Entry-Fee Rate (\$/MW) at risk**
- 2. Flexibility Clause: If the level of certainty regarding entry fee costs needs to be adjusted, the group may revise the readiness criteria as part of the revision request accordingly for additional readiness criteria beyond today's GI DISIS standard for site control, development milestones, or technical data.**

**Alan Myers (ITC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

ITEM 2e – FULL DOCUMENT APPROVAL

Chair Raheem stepped through the next items to show what needed to be approved as part of the overall paper.

*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.*

- a. Intra-queue priority – this was additional readiness that gives priority to sites for the 20-year assessment; currently, the paper gives rights to who is ready first; there is no draft motion slide for this item – action can be taken as part of the full paper approval. A member felt that option 1 is the least discriminatory option from a FERC standpoint.
- b. Entry fee maintenance – the entry fee will be refreshed every three years with the latest forecasts and review of initial sites; there won't be a need to update past this at this point. A member stated that the group should consider updating this annually through standardized cost of money updates or the amount of cost review (interest rates, construction cost, etc.). He suggested that the staff needed to report on this annually - include network upgrades that have been initiated for construction, revenue credits, and long-term projections under the entry fee. Another member requested clarification on what needed to be done about under-subscription and over-subscription cost. Chair Raheem responded that the three-year approach would allow for right-sizing the study, and staff could kick off the study again in the third year. A member stated that staff needed to determine annual standard course of business updates related to cost estimates.
- c. Cross sub-regional area upgrades – a team participant stated that there are too many unknowns to start out with a three-year assessment period. A member requested that the staff look for some way to split this, maybe based on which area.

The group recommended that there be more language around the actual approvals to be made for each section in the overall document. A member reminded the group that changes would need to be made to the language in the report to align with the motions.

Chair Raheem asked the group to review the draft motion placed on the screen regarding direction for the revised entry fee framework document as edited.

**Derek Brown (Energys) moved to approve the draft motion as shown on the screen:**

The task force approves the overall Entry Fee framework document. CPPTF considers the Entry Fee framework recommendations as a foundation for ongoing work on the governing language and CPP transition study items to further develop the Entry Fee.

- Intra-queue priority based on option 1 (first ready) and meeting all readiness criteria
- Entry fee maintenance needs to be evaluated and adjusted, if necessary, at least every 3 years (long-term assessment). Continue developing a defined annual adjustment and performance metrics recommendation.
- The method on determining how the cross sub-regional area HV upgrade costs will be addressed in the CPP transition study

*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.*

**Jim Jacoby (AEP) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Raheem outlined the next steps: SPP staff will go to CAWG for support, take the technical assessment portion to TWG/ESWG for alignment next week, and all approvals for the primary document will go to MOPC in April. CRIS allocation will be provided to MOPC for information only initially while more details are being developed. The staff will plan to take the proposal to MOPC regardless (for updates at a minimum), but the working group feedback will drive the direction of whether staff moves forward with modifying the motions for approval.

### **AGENDA ITEM 3 – Wrap Up, Action Items, and Future Meetings**

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

- The CPPTF group will need to determine if there are milestones needed past financial commitment
- SPP staff needs to add timeline revisions in the entry fee framework
- SPP staff to develop base funding eligibility requirements if this is a partial designation of MW load
- Secretary will revise the entry fee framework document and send out to the group for review - requesting comment back by Monday 3/25 (complete)

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

**Attachments:** Agenda, 03/06-07/24 Minutes, Attendance List

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

**March 18, 2024: 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. CT  
 WebEx: 2490 937 6637 | Password: Z2ZvKBMx4b3**

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

## AGENDA

- 1) **Call to Order and Administrative Items** (15 mins.)
  - a) Administrative Items ..... Ramunda Russell & Sunny Raheem
  - b) Agenda (**Approval**) ..... Sunny Raheem
  - c) Meeting Minutes (**Approval**)..... Ramunda Russell
  
- 2) **CPP Phase 1 Entry Fee Framework** (280 mins.)..... Kelsey Allen & Sunny Raheem  
*Review the approach for the April MOPC and discuss key policy areas to develop and approve before MOPC.*
  - a) Review of current approvals
  - b) Technical Alignment (**Approval**).....Kelsey Allen & Sunny Raheem
  - c) CRIS Cost Allocation (**Approval**).....Kelsey Allen & Sunny Raheem
  - d) GI Customer Readiness (**Approval**).....Kelsey Allen & Sunny Raheem
  - e) Full Document Approval (**Approval**).....Kelsey Allen & Sunny Raheem
    - a. Intra-Queue Priority ..... Sunny Raheem
    - b. Entry Fee Maintenance ..... Sunny Raheem
    - c. Cross Subregional Area HV Upgrades ..... Sunny Raheem
    - d. Remain sections..... Sunny Raheem
  
- 3) **Wrap-Up, Action Items, and Future Meetings** (5 minutes) ..... Ramunda Russell  
*Review of documented takeaways, action items, and discussion of potential additional meetings.*

<b>Future Meetings</b>	
<b>Tue - Wed, Apr. 30-May 1, 2024</b> (12p-5p / 8a-12p)	Kansas City
<b>Mon, May 20, 2024</b> (9a-3p) WebEx	
<b>Mon, June 17, 2024</b> (9a-3p) WebEx	
<b>Mon, July 22, 2024</b> (9a-3p) WebEx	



SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)  
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)  
March 6, 2024, 12:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

EDPR NA Corporate Headquarters, Houston, Texas  
1501 McKinney Street  
Houston, Texas 77010

## MINUTES

### DAY 1

*Lunch 12:00 – 12:30 pm and started meeting immediately following*

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

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m., March 6, 2024 with a quorum. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of the meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. There were no proxies identified for the in-person meeting. Chair Raheem provided membership and staff support updates. Ramunda Russell will be replacing Matt Jackson as Staff Secretary, and Carrie Dixon has been appointed to replace Matt Pawlowski. He then reviewed the agenda (Attachment A). Steve Gaw (APA) moved to approve the agenda as displayed with redlines. Jim Jacoby (AEP) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Russell reviewed the February 7, 2024 and February 16, 2024 draft meeting minutes (Attachments B & C). Alan Myers moved to approve the February 7th meeting minutes and John Krajewski seconded, with the motion passing unanimously. Carrie Dixon moved to approve the February 16th meeting minutes and Derek Brown seconded, with the motion passing unanimously.

#### AGENDA ITEM 2 – COORDINATION WITH FERNS STUDY UPDATE

Afshin Salehian provided an update on the FERNS study. The initial milestone was completed at the end of last year. Brattle Group presented the approach on demand electrification study. FGSAG approved the scenarios, & SAWG also approved. He stated that EER will be presenting today on the progress of milestones from the study. Chair Raheem explained that this update is for information and education today to determine the demand and load amount in futures for the CPP study. Ryan Jones (EER) reviewed the analytical tools used in-house; the modeling tool that they are using is EnergyPATHWAYS. He summarized the study scope and purpose for which EER was contracted. He shared the motivation for the study and the key strategies as well as highlighted the modeling methodology. He reviewed the final energy demand for the SPP footprint in addition to load shapes. He outlined the future work needed from his team. One

member had a question about slide (pg. 32) on 2050 hourly loads, and Ryan provided clarification. Chair Raheem mentioned that we will have to provide a recommendation for which to use the CPP study. A member stated that this needs to be a conversation to get some guidance from SAWG. Another member suggested that we may need a smaller team to work on the siting. Chair Raheem stated that once we get some sense of what the data looks like, we should frame up a scope of work for the joint meeting with ESWG. Sherri Maxey reviewed the two studies in progress - FERNS 40-year study & CPP transition study. She shared the timeline for the modeling needs. Chair Raheem stated that we plan to have results from the FERNS study in April - June 2024 and plan to take futures to MOPC for approval in Oct. 2024. Then the scope approval will go to Jan. MOPC for the 2025 ITP and assessment. A member recommended that we figure out how to layer in capacity requirements. NTC's will be issued in the 2026 ITP study. An SPP member suggested that we write out the functions and understand the timing of each. It was determined that we must have discussion of whether the study is the right size for the deliverable. Sherri correlates the milestones from the different initiatives in slide 7. Chair Raheem recapped the action items identified in this section.

*The group recessed from 2:40 pm to 3:00 pm*

#### AGENDA ITEM 4 – GENERATOR INTERCONNECTION PROPOSAL

This agenda item was swapped with item 3 due to National Grid Renewable's time constraints. National Grid Staff (Matt Morais) explained the issues causing problems in the queue. Their team is proposing a platform to have the gen projects to compete for the capped queue to reconnect functions with the grid (reliability & economic criteria). They wanted to reconnect the planning process with the interconnection process. The projects would be judged and prioritized based on this criteria. A capped queue would be formed, and the cost would be the up-to-bid, which provides cost certainty. Matt stated that this could compliment the CPP study by facilitating a more efficient queue and ability to select projects getting on the grid. Vince Duane explained that there are three assumptions forming the future of interconnection - this is a numbers game (have a large number of projects in the queue now so will likely cap), policy makers require an ISO/ITO environment resulting in better coordination of generation within transmission network, and trending towards an environment with distinct queues for distinct resource types. Chair Raheem highlighted key areas of intrigue - how to develop intra-queue priority and how much forecasting we should put into resource plans. A member had an issue with cost allocation (should show how loads throughout the footprint will not be the backstop for the cost - should be project owners). A member had a question/concern about ensuring that FERC will accept the cap. Another member believed that the proposal of the queue cap is an alternative vs. enhancement to the CPP entry fee. He also stated that this won't work with how we do cost allocations in SPP; he feels that this is taking a step back to planning infrastructure. It doesn't seem to be limiting the transmission rates that customers will be allocated. Another member stated that there must be a non-discriminatory method of determining the project costs. Chair Raheem stated that we are balancing the cost methodology that we already have established for load (300kV+ is covered cost). Another member questioned how you set a cap and states that there has to be more discussion from this

team. Another member asked about different scoring criteria and identifying costs/coming up with a cost solution. A member stated that there is a lot of risk and uncertainty, but she commended SPP. Chair Raheem stated that the opportunity for success is slim but there is great reward.

### AGENDA ITEM 3 – CRIS APPROACH

Steve Purdy explained how he made revisions to the last presentation provided to the group. He provided an update of the bridge plan being approved. He highlighted the key bridge plan process changes and the future CPP. He reviewed the various clusters - those that have been completed, those currently in active study queue, and the DISIS clusters that are planned for the future. NRIS tends to trend down as studies progress. There is a need to get the tariff reviews completed in July. A member asked if we could implement bridge plan, talk about cost allocation up to some drop dead date, and then make a final proposal. Another member stated that you have to make it simple and straightforward with a time limit - if direct assigned, then track the same way. Another member had a question about designating load and AQ - if you don't have firm generation to serve load, then it's going nowhere so how does this process tie into CRIS? Steve stated that we do need some decision points made but not today.

### AGENDA ITEM 5 – CPP PHASE 1 ENTRY FEE FRAMEWORK

Chair Raheem outlined the key areas that we still have remaining to discuss on this topic. He stated that we need to establish initial guidance on how the study will be performed. He mentioned that it will help to shape what we want to get approved at the April quarterly meetings and targeted education for CAWG. He stated that we must start thinking about critical path policy approvals as we move forward. Agenda item 5 was not concluded on day 1, so the remaining content carried over to day 2.

### WRAP UP FOR THE DAY

Ms. Russell reviewed action items noted, and Chair Raheem adjourned for the day at 5:00 pm.

SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)  
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)  
March 7, 2024, 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

EDPR NA Corporate Headquarters, Houston, Texas  
1501 McKinney Street  
Houston, Texas 77010

## MINUTES

### DAY 2

#### RETURN TO ORDER

Chair Raheem resumed the meeting at 8:32 am. with a quorum. Ms. Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. There were no proxies identified for the in-person meeting. Chair Raheem recapped the items that were discussed the previous day and stated that we would focus on approval items and those ready to move forward for MOPC approval.

#### AGENDA ITEM 5 – CPP PHASE 1 ENTRY FEE FRAMEWORK

Agenda item 5 was resumed from Day 1. Chair Raheem outlined the policy recommendation approach. He stated that we are at the level 1 or level 2 stage. The entry fee is helping to achieve CS1 & CS2 (on slide 5). The entry fee framework document targets on standing up the entry fee components and how cost allocation will occur within the entry fee for study results/input. The group took action on entry fee components in the last meeting and this was provided to CAWG for their consideration. Approval was received for regional & sub-regional components (11 for, 0 against, & 1 abstain). The group needs to align on how we can use the CRIS deliverability areas. SPP staff believes that we should start the CPP transition study with draft deliverability areas. A member asked about how we will identify the entry fee assessed. The response was that it is more about the distribution of the fee. A member commented on the simplicity of the cost signals to be sent on the various CRIS zones. A member suggested that creating examples with smaller zones will be helpful in conveying; this was agreed upon by another member. From a ratepayer perspective, the zone will determine the payment allocation. An SPP member stated that having a larger zone will help to mitigate the concern. A member brought up whether FERC ratemaking has to be treated differently under FERC rules. Chair Raheem shared that there are two remaining entry fee components to be approved. A member stated that it is hard to approve the motion separately instead of as a package deal. Chair Raheem clarified that if there is a vote on the individual motions, then there will be a final approval as a package for the entry fee framework. Members agreed that this motion should be changed to conditionally approve the entry fee components structure. Chair Raheem got

clarification on where the concerns are with the motion. Two members had issue with the forfeiture of the entry fee if an upgrade is delayed or a project is terminated. Multiple members stated that there should be language added about having the flexibility to transfer the entry fee within the same region. It was stated that we need to list out the rules that will be allowed for the transfer because otherwise you impact the portfolio justification, which could result in increasing sub-regional rates to make up the difference. Chair Raheem stated that guardrails could be defining the CPP cycle, which would limit to a one-time transfer within the deliverability zone. A member suggested that we should pause and better define the guardrails of the transfer right. New language was added.

**Alan Myers (ITC) moved to approve the revised draft motion regarding the remaining entry fee components as displayed on the screen:**

**Move to conditionally approve the entry fee for CPP Phase 1 Generator Interconnection Customers, encompassing ERIS and CRIS, and shall be enforced according to the Entry Fee Components structure:**

- **Entry fee commitment occurs at the Entry Fee milestone**
- **In case of suspension post-commitment to the Entry Fee milestone:**
  - **Pause in Payments: Entry Fee payments may pause during suspension, with the final due date extended no longer than the suspension period.**
  - **Accrual of Interest: Interest accrues on delayed payments to cover associated costs. Additional security may be required.**
- **In case of termination, the Entry Fee cancellation would result in forfeiture of entry fee obligation up to the available security amount. Limited transferability options will be built out as part of the final termination recommendation.**

**Michael Wise (GSEC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Raheem then moved to discussing the three options regarding the initial estimation of the entry fee. He posed a question to the group on whether this was the approach that the group wanted to take. A member asked if SPP knows how we will determine the system needs for load to figure out the gen load split. An SPP member responded that we will be running a DISIS type assessment and look at overall transmission buildout. The plan is to develop a methodology that is more consistent. A member declared that we should revise the language to state that this is a general contribution based on the load forecast need from a capacity standpoint. An SPP member stated that we may be able to address this comment by rewording that "system needs split" may be more accurate in restating as "capacity needs". A member stated that we should find a way to calculate the entry fee without having a split so we won't cap APC. A member stated that we will have to change how we do economic planning – include

the SPP bucket in APC calcs for how we develop our portfolios and then timing of issuance of NTC's.

*The group recessed from 10:17 am to 10:30 am*

Chair Raheem resumed with discussing historical costs and what has been successful through our current DISIS process in determining costs going forward. He stated that the intent of the next motion is to determine how to calculate the portfolio split to set up the initial entry fee. Chair Raheem stated that we need to ensure the price is set appropriate to cost contribution. A member mentioned that we need to account for cost escalation that has occurred over the years in the analysis. Chair Raheem suggested a wording change to allow for flexibility. A member proposed that we should revise language to state "... system split approach will be the primary component used to set up the first entry fee." Chair Raheem commented that we could use this as the vision for the CPP transition study even if we don't approve the motion.

Chair Raheem stated that the current revised motion language will put more pressure from the tariff standpoint. The group in the room added flexibility to look at data points to give more analytical support to filing with the commission.

**Steve Gaw (APA) moved to approve the revised draft motion as displayed on the screen:**

- **As a starting point for calculation of the initial entry fee, the CPP Transition Study will calculate the following information:**
  - **The system split**
  - **The generator-only cost**
  - **APC benefit**
- **The initial entry fee will be reviewed with historical GI success numbers to make a final policy recommendation**
- **The estimation of the entry fee will utilize the long-term portfolio costs and apply the future approved methodology**

**John Krajewski (NPRB) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Raheem moved to the next item of the entry fee payment structure. He reviewed the collection and distribution flow process and allowed for discussion on the interest treatment language that was revised in the last meeting. There was member discussion about the interest treatment and time value of the entry fee payment providing a benefit to customers who pay in advance. In response to a member's question, Chair Raheem stated that there will need to be discussion on a discount to the credit that will be applied back to the GI customer. A member requested a clarification on the interest; that it will be used in the time value of money to

determine what a customer's entry fee will be in nominal dollars. In response, an SPP member stated that the GI payment of the entry fee will be equivalent to the planned service amount.

**Alan Myers (ITC) moved to approve the draft motion regarding the entry fee payment structure as displayed on the screen:**

**In addition to the Feb CPPTF approval of the remaining payment structure and distribution flow, CPPTF recommends the initial Entry Fee collection as an initial step, with the intent to present it to the CAWG and RSC for approval consideration in initiating the RR process.**

**Jim Jacoby (AEP) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Raheem elected to table the remaining approval items to discuss in the March 18th meeting that needs to be scheduled on the calendar.

## AGENDA ITEM 6 – WRAP-UP, ACTION ITEMS, AND FUTURE MEETINGS

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

- SPP staff to plan a joint meeting with ESWG
- SPP staff to write out the functions & understand the timing of each
- SPP staff to review governing language for CPP transition study
- SPP staff will determine objective of CPP transition study from the technical approach & project selection standpoint
- Members requested that staff should create examples for smaller zones which will be helpful in communicating how entry fee is determined
- SPP staff to better define the guardrails of the transfer right as outlined in the conditional motion
- SPP staff to clean up EHV/HV references to be consistent with zonal language in the paper
- Secretary will make redline updates and send out to the group
- Secretary will schedule the March 18, 2024 meeting (complete)

## ADJOURNMENT

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

**CPPTF ATTENDANCE LIST, MARCH 18, 2024**

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

	Name	Organization
1	Alan Myers*	ITC
2	Carrie Dixon*	NEXTERA
3	David Mindham*	EDP
4	Derek Brown*	Evergy
5	Heather Starnes*	MJMEUC
6	Jim Jacoby*	AEP
7	John Krajewski*	NPRB
8	Michael Wise*	GSEC
9	Steve Gaw*	APA
10	Sunny Raheem (Chair)*	SPP
11	Ramunda Russell (Secretary)*	SPP
12	Loren Ditsch+	OPPD
13	Shari Albrecht+	KCC
14	Adam Schieffer	OPPD
15	Adam Snapp	OGE
16	Afshin Salehian	SPP
17	Angie Anderson	Sunflower
18	Ben Stearney	Aces
19	Bernie Liu	Xcel
20	Brad Cochran	OGE
21	Calvin Daniels	WFEC
22	Casey Cathey	SPP
23	Chris Lyons	CES
24	Clifford Franklin	Sunflower
25	D Diaz	StonePigman
26	David Brauch	PES
27	Denise Martin	SPP
28	Don Frerking	SPP
29	Eddie Watson	SPP
30	Gayle Nansel	WAPA
31	Jennifer Swierczek	SPP
32	Jeremy Severson	BEPC
33	Jerry Bradshaw	City Utilities
34	Jodi Walters	EDP



35	John Stephens	City Utilities
36	Jon Langford	Orsted
37	Jonathan Goldsworthy	ITC
38	Joshua Ross	SPP
39	Kelsey Allen	SPP
40	Lee Elliott	Invenergy
41	Margaret Kristian	NGR
42	Marisa Choate	SPP
43	Maya Nevels	APA
44	Meredith Powell	SPP
45	Michael Wegner	ITC
46	Natasha Henderson	SPP
47	Olivia Hough	City Utilities
48	Paul Antony	GABEL
49	Regan Fink	PGR
50	Robert Pick	NPPD
51	Ryan Benton	OGE
52	Sherri Maxey	SPP
53	Shilpi Sunil Kumar	AESL
54	Simon Cherucheril	PGR
55	Tyler Berton	AES
56	Vaibhav Bilagi	RWE