



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

Evergy Offices
1200 Main Street
Kansas City, MO 64105

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., April 30, 2024, with a quorum. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of the meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. Commissioner Andrew French was noted as a proxy for John Krajewski, and Commissioner French was also noted as a proxy for Adam McKinnie. Chair Raheem then reviewed the agenda (Attachment A). Derek Brown (Evergy) moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner French (KCC) seconded, and the motion passed with one abstention – Commissioner French on behalf of Adam McKinnie in his absence.

Ms. Russell reviewed the March 18, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B). Alan Myers (ITC) moved to approve the March 18th meeting minutes and Carrie Dixon (NextEra) seconded, with the motion passing with one abstention – Commissioner French on behalf of Adam McKinnie in his absence.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – QUARTERLY MEETING DEBRIEF

Chair Raheem provided an update on the MOPC, SPC, & RSC approvals and follow-up actions from the recent meetings. He reported that the group received approval to move forward into the revision request process from MOPC and SPC and was informed to get the resources to dedicate to the revision request effort. There was a targeted action item noted from SPC to figure out what will occur if the CPP entry fee plan doesn't work as originally anticipated. He stated that there was a high-level approval going to RSC next week on Monday where the seven individual approvals were aggregated into one draft motion for RSC. The next item of focus will be to determine how we can backcast participation in the CPP transition study or entry fee.

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



AGENDA ITEM 3 – TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT IMPACTS

Chair Raheem outlined the review that internal staff has performed for the initial technical impact assessment. The CPPTF was requested to review the information in this meeting and the next meeting to refine the process and determine the right level of assessments to decide if what has been proposed is the right approach. He outlined the current process milestones for the ITP and GI DISIS processes. He stated that the priorities for impacts (build – “how do we do these in the CPP study?” and design – “how do we carry this forward into future studies?”) will have to be refined and determine what will carry forward into CPP. These items will have to be discussed in the next twelve months. SPP I/T has an organizational readiness structure developed but automation will have to be prioritized. The CPP transition study items (types of assessments) have the highest priority; the items that can be done later in the year are ranked as medium (model assessments), and the lower priorities (transmission solutions) will be done in the future. One member shared his perspective on SPP’s need to focus on what we want to study and assess and how we will identify the issues. The transition models will start being built this summer. Another member suggested that SPP make it plain to FERC that we are following NERC standards and maintaining firm service. The previous member stated that SPP must prioritize - SPP can only build so many models and will need to identify areas where there isn’t value in order to free up the resources. A different member stated that this study is what we want to see on grid development over the course of CPP. He stated that we need to look at SPP’s long-term needs and come up with a cost-sharing system that is fair. Chair Raheem stated that we will align the 2026 ITP with the CPP transition study to balance with tariff needs. There was a great deal of group discussion on the various items and the justification behind the priority rankings. Chair Raheem stated that we want to target completing this impact assessment by June because of the work that will be framed up for this group. One member requested a clear timeline for completing the high/medium/low priorities.

There was no direct opposition to the proposed priorities, but the group had suggestions for considering some medium-priority levels as being ranked as high throughout the discussion.

The group took a 22-minute break from 2:58 – 3:22 pm

AGENDA ITEM 4 – REVISION REQUEST APPROACH

Ramunda Russell started the conversation about initiating the revision request process following the MOPC and SPC approval to move forward. One member voiced concern about how to handle tariff revisions on the entry fee itself. Since the study will not be completed in order to get feedback by the time this is presented to MOPC, there would be concern about bringing

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.



something this new to FERC without having the right level of detail spelled out on the GI side. Chair Raheem stated that it adds complications to the filing, but we know the broad boundaries for the entry fee (minimum and maximum costs) so we will have to be diligent in sharing the numbers within the boundary conditions. The member responded that we need to evaluate the risk level before going to FERC and figure out if there is other work that needs to be done and the documentation to be developed so that this can be accepted. Chair Raheem stated that it will be difficult to wait to file the first iteration of the filing, but we can use outreach to educate FERC and get buy-in on an iterative basis. Another member agreed that the uncertainty of the entry fee and generation vs. load split could drive people to intervene and challenge this proposal. He felt that the lack of finalization on the studies wouldn't be the showstopper, but the vague nature of the cost allocation could be an issue. A third member stated that we should focus on the mechanics of the process and file this at FERC, as a minimum, by this year. Then, work to develop a portfolio of projects based on the comparison of what we would do today vs. the project selection from what we have built the study around and present that to FERC. A different member asked how new technologies would reduce cost and the risk of load not showing up the way we anticipated. Chair Raheem stated that this is a commit-over-time concept. He also stated that we will need to have some level of comfortability with being vague. If we put numbers out there, then we will veer away from the CPP process. The question was posed of the right level of support for the filing. A member stated that the CPP study will be a forecast; if SPP can get enough out of the study before it's done and we can provide adequate evidence, then we will have a stronger position. An SPP team member confirmed that we need to define the legal position. If SPP can develop a process with our legal team, then we can document the process and bring it back to the CPPTF. The member agreed that we need to find a way to do this in the background and do a ramp-up approach to get information to FERC in a timely fashion. One member expressed a desire to get to some rough estimations and a different level of approximations to provide with the FERC filing. Another member voiced his concern about the amount of work for SPP in the next 45 days, especially if a new attachment has to be created for CRIS. A third member asked if the 20-Year assessment can be done on an as-needed basis because of the level of work involved vs. the amount of impact it would have on the numbers. Chair Raheem stated that we can see if there would be waivers; the FERC filing that is coming out may help to define how often assessments are required. A different member stated that we need to develop a plan to get to the finish line. He suggested that we get waivers approved by MOPC and the working groups and then document our approvals after the tariff revisions before going to FERC. Chair Raheem believed that we could get to a middle ground to ensure the filing is effective. Chair Raheem recapped that our next steps are to keep developing and working towards the revision request timeline, develop supporting evidence for the filing in Q1 or Q2, bring back to the group on how much supporting evidence is needed to make the first filing, and finalize the presentation date.

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 5 – ENTRY FEE FRAMEWORK

Chair Raheem recapped the entry fee framework. He described the four options for defining intra-queue priority and stated that we need to eliminate the less favorable options so we can provide more details on the selected option(s). One member asked for clarification on why we need an intra-queue priority. Chair Raheem stated that it will help to determine who pays for the transmission demand. Another member questioned the additional readiness criteria (intra-queue priority options 2A & 2B). He also questioned the impact of the harm that a larger generator would cause by backing out of the commitment. Chair Raheem responded that there is work to do on the readiness criteria. Based on group conversations, he stated that 2A & 2B did not seem to be favorable options so we will focus on options 1A & 1B. A different member asked if we have considered contingencies, and Chair Raheem's response was that we don't want to include a contingency cost in the entry fee calculation for fear of double dipping. The same member then asked about the consideration of using a locational RFP that gets into generation planning. Chair Raheem stated that we are limiting our governance on determining the generator cost. The previous member stated that if we over build it is a concern, but under building is a larger issue. An SPP team member stated that we will need a guardrail to ensure that we don't have a response that will cost millions of dollars. Chair Raheem stated that we may need to explore other areas for this safeguard. Another SPP team member suggested to layout the flow for the all the possible impacts. Agenda item 5 was not concluded on day 1, so the remaining content carried over to day 2.

WRAP UP FOR THE DAY

Chair Raheem outlined plans for the next day and adjourned for the day at 5:04 pm.

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)
May 1, 2024, 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Energy Offices
1200 Main Street
Kansas City, MO 64105

MINUTES

DAY 2

RETURN TO ORDER

Chair Raheem resumed the meeting at 8:31 am with a quorum. Ms. Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. Commissioner Andrew French was noted as a proxy for John Krajewski, and Commissioner French was also noted as a proxy for Adam McKinnie. Chair Raheem recapped the items that were discussed the previous day (agenda item 7) and stated that we would start the day with the entry fee maintenance discussion.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – ENTRY FEE FRAMEWORK

Agenda item 5 was resumed from Day 1. Chair Raheem started with discussion around regional and sub-regional buckets and determining the frequency of updates for the entry fee. One member stated that we may need to have some version of the three adjustment options since we don't have hard costs. He suggested that we need some version of a cost estimation to determine if the projects are possible. He also stated that we need to do more on feasibility and costs because we won't know final costs for years. Another member questioned how we will accept variability in the adjustments. He suggested that one approach is to aim for option 3 and adjust the cost accordingly. A different member asked about payment of a risk premium to cover the contingency and provide cost certainty in initial cost payments. Many members agreed, and one also stated that most of what is identified in an initial entry fee evaluation won't be built to support the growth - this is just forward estimation of what we could build. Chair Raheem responded that the main problem statement is to prevent large swings over time if there is no maintenance. This is just collecting funds from customers over time and showing that we are keeping a cost split between generation load reasonable. There was group discussion on cost sharing, credits to customers, and construction decisions. Chair Raheem summarized that the team decision is whether we need to adjust the entry fee after customers

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.



have committed. He stated that we also need to understand how competitive projects will come into play. There was discussion about the entry fee and the metrics of how to get there. One member suggested that we should avoid using the word true-up. Chair Raheem proposed that we table the discussion of the remaining three topics until the next CPPTF meeting, and the team agreed.

The group took a 12-min break until 10:00 am

AGENDA ITEM 6 – CPP SCOPE AND FUTURES RECOMMENDATIONS

Joshua Norton highlighted the current ITP overview outlining stakeholder responsibilities and study scope. He discussed the current process for high level scope development and shared the resource siting plan schedule. He described the strawman proposal for the futures and siting plan. One member had a question on the models and methodology that Brattle is using in the FERNs study and how this overlaps. Joshua responded by explaining how this will work in the transition study. He then moved into the CPP transition study approach strawman proposal. There was group discussion about the FERNs scenarios and economics regarding the carbon drivers. One member stated that this strawman proposal could work as the framework. Another member added that our assumptions may not align. A third member stated that we won't be able to just add FERNs scenarios directly into the study. An SPP team member confirmed that we will leverage the FERNs study to select the sites in the various zones. Joshua concluded with the next step of incorporating feedback into the strawman proposal to bring to the next CPPTF meeting. Chair Raheem stated that we need to understand what we will use from the FERNs study and continue to develop the strawman proposal for further discussion in the next CPPTF meeting. He stated that we need to define the final scope of this recommendation and determine what we need to close it out.

AGENDA ITEM 8 – GENERATOR INTERCONNECTION ASSESSMENT

Chris Jamieson discussed how we bring the reliability and economics together as well as how to prepare for resource plans. He stated that the GI developers are not in our staff/stakeholder accountability program, but we need to tie them into it because they agreed to the entry fee. Two members have discussion on key items to address, stating that we need to focus on what we need to fix and determine which transmission investments make the most sense. Another member stated that we won't be able to do everything that we are doing today for GI in order to get studies completed in the future. We need to comply with NERC standards but may not be able to get a full analysis done until on the back end. Chair Raheem added that we need to be mindful of additional analysis. A different member asked about generator needs for the system. Chair Raheem responded that specific needs would go to the direct-assigned cost, but other isolated stability needs will be included in the initial reliability before the entry fee is set.

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.



One member outlined that there will be studies done with specific generators and design that is directly assigned. He stated that we need to have the right requirements so customers can comply. Chris conveyed that we need to do analysis by performing all three assessment types. Based on feedback from this area of the transition study, the next steps are that we need to know the baselines for these assessments and if we need to build a 20-year Powerflow model.

AGENDA ITEM 9 - WRAP-UP, ACTION ITEMS, AND FUTURE MEETINGS

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

- Update slide 12 in technical assessment impacts .ppt (change last bullet item language)
- Update slide 21 in technical assessment impacts .ppt (change priority of last 2 items)
- SPP to provide a clear timeline for completing the high/medium/low priorities for assessment impacts in item 3
- SPP to work with our legal team to develop/define a process, then document the process and bring back to the CPPTF for review (item 4)
- SPP to keep developing & working towards the RR timeline
- SPP to develop the supporting evidence for the FERC filing
- SPP to bring supporting evidence back to CPPTF on what is required to make the first filing
- SPP staff to continue developing the strawman proposal & define the final scope of the CPP futures recommendation for further discussion in next CPPTF meeting (item 6)

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 12:04 p.m.

Attachments: Agenda, 03/18/2024 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.



ATTACHMENT A – 202404300501 AGENDA

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

Energy Offices
1200 Main Street
Kansas City, MO

April 30, 2024: 12:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. CT
May 1, 2024: 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. CT

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 (20 mins.)
a) Administrative Items Ramunda Russell & Sunny Raheem
b) Agenda (Approval) Sunny Raheem
c) Meeting Minutes Ramunda Russell
i) March 18, 2024 (Approval)
2) Quarterly Meeting Debrief (10 mins.) Sunny Raheem/All
Verbal review of MOPC, SPC, and RSC actions and upcoming decisions
3) Technical Assessment Impacts (60 mins.) Sunny Raheem & Kelsey Allen
Identification of impacts to the ITP and GI DISIS process per activity. Discuss impact levels and priorities for the CPPTF effort.
4) Revision Request Approach (30 mins) Ramunda Russell
Introduction to Staff's concept proposal for CPP transition study funding and discussion of next steps for future funding needs
5) Entry Fee Framework (60 mins) Sunny Raheem
Remaining cost allocation approaches for specific situations under the Entry Fee Framework discussion
a) Intra-Queue Priority
b) Entry Fee Maintenance



ATTACHMENT A – 202404300501 AGENDA

- c) Cross Subregional Area HV Upgrades
- d) Direct Assigned Allocation
- e) Withdrawal Impacts to Generation Expansion

Break (15 mins)

- 6) **CPP Scope & Futures Recommendations** (90 mins.)
A strawman proposal for Futures and Siting in the CPP & application in transition study
 - a) Organization Groups’ Roles and ResponsibilitiesJoshua Norton
 - b) Demand Assumption GuidanceJoshua Norton
 - c) On-going CPP CyclesJoshua Norton
 - d) Transition Study.....Joshua Norton

DAY 2

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

- 7) **Day 1 Wrap-Up** (30 mins.) Sunny Raheem
- 8) **Generator Interconnection Assessment** (190 mins.)Chris Jamieson & Kelsey Allen
The new DISIS approach
 - a) ERIS: Invest, Connect, and Manage
 - b) CRIS: Invest, Connect, and Deliver
 - c) Transmission Reinforcement Criteria
- 9) **Wrap-Up, Action Items, and Future Meetings** (5 minutes) Ramunda Russell
Review of documented takeaways, action items, and discussion of potential additional meetings.

Future Meetings
Mon, May 20, 2024 (9a-3p) WebEx
Mon, June 17, 2024 (9a-3p) WebEx
Mon, July 22, 2024 (9a-3p) WebEx

~~SOUTHWEST POWER POOL, INC.~~
~~CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)~~
~~January 22, 2024: 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. CT~~
~~-WebEx: 2495-906-1145 | Password: PbCptmQJ348~~
~~This meeting will be recorded. By attending the meeting, you are consenting to be recorded.~~

AGENDA

10) Call to Order and Administrative Items (15 mins.)

- a) Administrative Items Matt Jackson & Sunny Raheem
- b) Agenda (Approval) Sunny Raheem
- c) Meeting Minutes Matt Jackson
 - i) *December 13, 2023 (Approval)*
- d) Action Items Matt Jackson

11) Organization Effectiveness Survey (30 mins.) Matt Jackson

Review the organization effectiveness survey and identify the best approaches to addressing areas of focus

12) January MOPC Debrief (15 mins.) All

Verbal discussion around key discussion items from January MOPC approval items. Identify the next steps for addressing key challenges.

- a) *HITT T1 CRIS Deliverability Areas*
- b) *CPP Phase 1 Inclusion and Transition*

13) HITT C1 Decouple Schedule 9 & 11 Pricing Zones Update (30 mins.) Charles Locke

Review scope, status, and potential areas of cost allocation and in flight policy dependencies

Break (15 mins.)

14) HITT T1 CRIS Plan A Review and Strategy Plan (60 mins.) Steve Purdy

Review CRIS "Plan A" objective, timelines, key areas of policy development. Determine stakeholder feedback on approach through discussion and WebEx straw proposal responses.

15) FERNS – CPP Transition Study Coordination (30 mins.)

Review approach to improving coordination between FERNS and CPP transition study. Collect CPPTF's feedback on transmission zones for resource expansion milestone for FERNS.

a) – Collaboration Approach Afshin Salehian & Sunny Raheem

b) – FERNS Transmission Zones Brattle

Lunch (30-60 mins)

16) Entry Fee Framework Recommendations (120 mins.) Staff

Review Entry Fee Rate Task Force (EFRT) recommendations and initial release of CPP Entry Fee Framework Recommendation document

17) 2024 Work Plan Sunny Raheem

Determining 2024 Work Plan for remaining CPP and CRIS policy, and CPP transition study

18) Wrap Up and Action Items (5 minutes) Matt Jackson & Sunny Raheem

Review of documented takeaways and action items

Future Meetings

Mon, Feb. 19, 2024 (9a-3p) WebEx

Wed-Thur, Mar. 6-7, 2024 (12p-5p / 8a-12p) Houston

Tue-Wed, Apr. 30-May 1, 2024 (12p-5p / 8a-12p) Kansas City

Mon, May 20, 2024 (9a-3p) WebEx

Mon, June 17, 2024 (9a-3p) WebEx

Mon, July 22, 2024 (9a-3p) WebEx



ATTACHMENT B – 20240318 MINUTES

SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP) CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)

Mar ~~Jan 22~~ 18, 2024, 9:05~~59~~ a.m. to 3:12:10~~50~~ p.m.

WebEx 2490 937 6637 ~~2495 906 1145~~

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

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 (Every) 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 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.

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

Derek Brown_(Evergy) 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 the 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 a 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 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 the generator connects 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 the 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 (Everygy) 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 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 a member discussion on this topic. Chair Rheem 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 the door open for further discussion later. A member suggested that the motion be broken down even further by adding more language for consideration on financial security. There was member discussion on this recommendation. One member asked if staff was ok with editorial comments being added into 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 removing the language 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.

- 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_(Energy) 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 of determining how the cross sub-regional area HV upgrade costs will be addressed in the CPP transition study.

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)

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

~~Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m., Feb/January 22, 2024, with a quorum present and reviewed the agenda (Attachment A – Agenda). Matt Jackson provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. No changes were requested for the agenda. John Krajewski Steve Gaw moved to approve the agenda. Heather Starnes Alan Myers seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Mr. Jackson provided a review of previous meeting minutes (2024012231213_Minutes). These were reviewed as draft to approve with 02/07/2024 Minutes in Feb. 16 meeting. Heather Starnes moved to approve the 12/13/23 Minutes. Jim Jacoby seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.~~

~~AGENDA ITEM 2 – ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY UPCOMING FEB. 16 MEETING~~

~~Mr. Jackson provided an update on brief summary of the change in meeting dates for the scheduled Feb. meeting due to the President's Day holiday. A reminder was provided that there will be a recording available for those unable to attend. The date the annual assessment results and highlighted the area that had the single greatest variance from last year (drop from 4.5 → 3.9). Two members provided feedback on suggestions for addressing the item related to departing with a feeling that we have accomplished something. *Al: Suggestion made to review visual reminders of where we are & where we are going next has been updated on the spp.org website.~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Font color: Auto

AGENDA ITEM 3 – HITT T1 CRIS Plan A Review and Strategy Plan JANUARY MOPC-DEBRIEF

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Chair Raheem Steve Purdy reviewed the open issues for the 5 primary deliverables to implement the plan. There was a great deal of member discussion and several questions asked for clarity regarding the issues around each deliverable. [@ 9:27-9:49a highlight discussions between Steve Gaw & Purdy and Derek brown & Purdy and Jim Jacoby & Purdy on D1 – CRIS interconnection service for new requests – use existing NRIS study process] (A member mentioned that we should determine if there is a gap in this NRIS study process to tell us whether we need to make an adjustment in the approach for CRIS. Another member states that this should be taken a step further during the transition period, but should change methodology to align with CRIS transition study. Suggests establishing a policy for RR's – target a date & DISIS cluster to mitigate the backlog. Chair Raheem requested to share thoughts on impact assessment. Will be similar to option 2 on fuel-based dispatch model. The deliverables from NRIS analysis doesn't move the needle as much.) [@ 9:58 – 10:13a highlight discussions between Jim Jacoby & Purdy on option 1 of D2a related to pro-rates and Rafik Halim & Purdy and Shilpi Kumar & Purdy on expedited designation process for CRIS resources – Rafik asked which models will be used & Purdy stated that we need to figure that out] Purdy requesting input from the members on options for D2b [@ 10:17 – a highlight discussions between Steve Gaw and Carrie Dixon – suggest & agrees that it would be good to bring Micah into discussion and analysis for his insight; should also consider if there are candidate paths (up to 3) to be evaluated the MOPC decision and generated discussion regarding next steps for April MOPC items. Main topics were to review the HITT T1 CRIS deliverability areas & CPP Phase 1 Inclusion & Transition.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – HITT C1 Decouple schedule 9 & 11 pricing zones update

Charles Locke presented a summary of HITT C1 & how it fits in with the direction of the CPP entry fee framework. He covered key factors related to the Schedule 9 & 11 decoupling. He outlined the HITT T1 deliverability areas and shared the benefits of decoupling as it relates to the entry fee payments. A question was asked about using CRIS zones to determine how much variance is on schedules to where if you move pricing zones into CRIS zones what the rate impact may be. The response was that a significant amount of analysis was done by taking the existing facility costs and reallocating them based on the sub-regional configurations. The shifts were large enough to where a HITT recommendation was made to have a 5–10 year phased approach. Another question was posed on timing of working on new zones with CAWG. If CAWG wants new analysis run, then new studies can be performed and CAWG will determine the timeline for finalizing a recommendation with the completion of the deliverability study. Another question was regarding CAWG selecting a configuration that doesn't align with CRIS deliverability zones. It will put more burden on the FERC filing. so possibly look at this for the CRIS product [@ 10:29-10:40a highlight discussions between Jim Jacoby & Purdy who was not fond of option 1, Derek Brown & Purdy – and Steve Gaw & Purdy on D3 – ??] Need to define what preservation looks like

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.5", Space After: 6 pt, Tab stops: 6.5", Right, Leader: ...

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Space After: 6 pt, Tab stops: 6.5", Right, Leader: ... + Not at 1.69"

~~on a high level – reflective of consideration with capacity [@ 10:29-10:40a highlight discussions between Jim Jacoby & Purdy who was not fond of option 1, Derek Brown & Purdy – and Steve Gaw & Purdy on D3 = ??]~~

~~NEXT STEPS: walk down options to build out details~~

~~The group recessed for 120 minutes following this agenda item – returned at 11:10:25a~~

Formatted: Font color: Blue

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

~~**AGENDA ITEM 4 – Entry Fee Framework Recommendations**~~

~~Chair Raheem led the discussion to review the current draft of the entry fee framework recommendation and the two items being requested for approval. He reviewed the approvals received during the Jan MOPC meeting and shared approvals needed in quarterly meetings throughout the year.~~

~~**AGENDA ITEM 5 – Evolve Energy Research Demand Forecasts for FERNS CRIS PLAN A REVIEW & STRATEGY PLAN**~~

~~EER Staff Steve Purdy presented on the objectives and 5 deliverables of the plan. Chair Raheem requested feedback from the group on priority and the direction that the staff is headed with the plan and start talking about deliverable timelines. Deliverable 1 – CRIS interconnection service availability. A member had a question regarding timeline, and GI team manager was looking at using CRIS in 2024 DISIS study but new internal processes and automation have to be established. Handoffs from deliverability study are being reviewed with staff this week. Making sure that we don't impact the GI backlog. More info to come in our next meeting. Another question was posed regarding clusters being aligned with CRIS deliverability studies, which may necessitate changes in the study groups. Another member's question was around getting clarification on when the studies need to be performed, which is prior to the CPP process. Chair Raheem clarified what strategies are. A member shared about not missing key areas from previous studies.~~

~~a) Will resume with deliverable 2 after lunch~~

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

~~**AGENDA ITEM 6 – FERNS & CPP TRANSITION STUDY COORDINATION**~~

~~Afshin Salehian & Chair Raheem kicked off the conversation. Johannes Pfeifenberger presented on the FERNS Proposed Expansion Modeling – Transmission Zones. He summarized the 5 FERNS scenarios that will be evaluated through simulations for those not familiar with the study. Proposing 5 zones – north, central east, central west, SE, & SW. Central & South are split to ease congestion & capture transmission needs. Need~~

to reflect resources available in each zone for buildout. A member commented on best use of this study as input into transition study. He thinks there are benefits to site on generation going into model. FERNs study is for resource adequacy but trying to figure out how to incorporate into transition study. ****AI:** One member asked to develop a high level milestone schedule to better align both FERNs & CPP study efforts. The group suggested that a side-by-side of FERNs and the CPP Transition study milestones. The thought is to align Futures, RA/PRM assumptions, and siting analysis assumptions between the two studies. ****AI:** Afshin requested that he & Chair Raheem be contacted with agreeance or suggested changes of proposed zonal structure by end of week. ****AI:** Updated presentation to be posted by SS

The group broke for a 35 minute lunch following this agenda item—returned at 1:00p CST

AGENDA ITEM 5 – CRIS PLAN A REVIEW & STRATEGY PLAN – CONT...

Steve Purdy continued presenting on CRIS availability deliverables 1–5. Deliverable 2 = CRIS designated resource availability. Deliverable 3 = CRIS for pre-CRIS resources (CRIS for pre-CRIS resources is tariff language that must be established. Limit amount of CRIS deliverability to a resource in their control area because that is where they were accounted for in the study.). Deliverable 4 = CRIS deliverability rights. A member had a question about the level of scrutiny that resources undergo during CRIS process vs. the aggregate study process. The response is that leveraging NRIS process for CRIS should incorporate the same type of study and analysis that would be used to evaluate a network resource. Deliverable 5 = automation needs for deliverables 1–4. Chair Raheem proposes taking time to digest deliverables 3 & 4 and regroup in next meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 7 – ENTRY FEE RECOMMENDATION PAPER

Chair Raheem informed the group on the entry fee assessment framework which will provide guidance as part of the 20-year assessment and transition work. He summarized current approach to study processes and cost allocation decisions. He recommended focusing on entry fee section and making time in a future meeting for additional discussion. Two key items of focus are standing up the entry fee and where to include upgrades. One member asked about what is the impact/threshold for generators to determine the resource responsibility? Chair Raheem asked if there are thoughts on using average historical cost as a target. Two members stated that it does make sense to consider options to make paths comparable from network upgrade perspective. Chair Raheem proposes another meeting to walk through all language of entry fee recommendation. He touched on the timing of payments with no questions. He mentioned that interest inclusion will be included in payment section to account for the time value of money. Chair Raheem proposed an additional meeting on 2/7 @ 9a–12p before the next scheduled CPPTF in Feb.

AGENDA ITEM 8 – 2024 WORK PLAN

Chair Raheem initiated discussion on the 2024 work plan.

AGENDA ITEM 96 – Wrap Up and Action Items

Chair Raheem and Mr. Jackson reviewed the upcoming meeting dates and action items from the meeting:

~~Impact assessment was suggested for CRIS Plan A (item 3)~~

~~Staff to list out interim steps on topics noted related to CRIS Plan A (item 3)~~

~~CPPTF members would like more options for CRIS interconnection service deliverable (item 3)~~

- Staff will create visual reminders of where we are & where we are going next to review at future meetings.
- Staff will develop a high-level milestone schedule to better align both FERNs & CPP study efforts
- CPPTF members will contact Afshin or Chair Raheem with agreeance or suggested changes of proposed zonal strmbers would like ucture by end of week (1/26)
- Updated presentation to be posted by Staff Secretary (Complete)
- Scheduling additional meeting on 2/7 to discuss CRIS (Complete)
- Will take vote to consider moving 2/19 meeting to 2/16 (Complete)

Formatted: Font color: Blue

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font color: Red

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 23:105 p.m.

Formatted: Font color: Auto

CPPTF ATTENDANCE LIST, APRIL 30 – MAY 1, ~~JANUA~~22, 2024

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

#	Name	Organization	Day 1	Day 2
1	Adam McKinnie*	MPSC	Y	Y
2	Alan Myers*	ITC	Y	Y
3	Andrew French*	KCC	Y	Y
4	David Mindham*	EDP	Y	Y
5	Derek Brown*	Evergy	Y	Y
6	Carrie Dixon*	NEXTERA	Y	Y
7	Heather Starnes*	MJMEUC	Y	Y
8	Jarred Cooley*	SPS	Y	Y
9	Jim Jacoby*	AEP	Y	Y
10	John Krajewski*	NPRB	Y	Y
11	Ramunda Russell (Secretary)*	SPP	Y	Y
12	Steve Gaw*	APA	Y	Y
13	Steve Hohman*	OPPD	Y	Y
14	Sunny Raheem (Chair)*	SPP	Y	Y
15	Adam Mummert	1898	Y	Y
16	Adam Schieffer	OPPD	Y	Y
17	Afshin Salehian	SPP	Y	Y
18	Angie Anderson	Sunflower	Y	Y
19	Austin Baccus	SPP	Y	Y
20	Ben Stearney	ACES	Y	
21	Bernie Liu	Xcel	Y	Y
22	Betty Fung	Spearmint	Y	Y
23	Brad Cochran	OGE	Y	
24	Brian Johnson	AEP	Y	
25	Britney Lloyd	SPP		Y
26	Call-in User_2	#N/A		Y
27	Call-in User_3		Y	
28	Call-in User_4	#N/A		Y
29	Call-in User_5	#N/A	Y	Y
30	Call-in User_6	#N/A	Y	Y
31	Call-in User_7	#N/A	Y	
32	Calvin Daniels	WFEC	Y	



ATTACHMENT C – 202404300501 CPPTF ATTENDANCE

33	Clifford Franklin	Sunflower	Y	Y
34	Charles Locke	SPP	Y	Y
35	Chris Jamieson	SPP	Y	Y
36	Chris Stolz	PGR	Y	Y
37	Daria Diaz	STONEPIGMAN	Y	Y
38	David Duhart	SPP	Y	Y
39	Denise Martin	SPP		Y
40	Devon Pehrson	NGR	Y	
41	Dylan Haas	MWE	Y	
42	Eddie Watson	SPP	Y	Y
43	J.P. Maddock	BEPC		Y
44	James Peters	SPP	Y	Y
45	Jamie Spickes	SPP	Y	Y
46	Jason Mazigian	BEPC	Y	Y
47	Jeff McDiarmid	SPP	Y	Y
48	Jeremy Severson	BEPC	Y	
49	Jodi Walters	EDPR	Y	Y
50	John Stephens	CUS	Y	Y
51	Joshua Norton	SPP	Y	Y
52	Joshua Ross	SPP	Y	Y
53	Kelsey Allen	SPP	Y	Y
54	Kirk Hall	SPP	Y	
55	Lee Elliott Invenergy	INVENERGY	Y	Y
56	Loren Ditsch	OPPD	Y	
57	Lottie Jones	SPP	Y	Y
58	Margaret Kristian	NGR	Y	Y
59	Marie Thompson	SOUTHERNCO		Y
60	Marisa Choate	SPP	Y	
61	MaryGrace Giangarra	SPP	Y	Y
62	Matt Alvarado IUB	IUB	Y	Y
63	Maya Nevels	Power Alliance	Y	Y
64	Meredith Powell	SPP	Y	Y
65	Natalie McIntire	NRDC	Y	
66	Natasha Henderson	SPP	Y	Y
67	Naved Khan	SPP	Y	Y
68	Nicole Wagner	SPP		Y
69	Nitin Kushwaha	NGR	Y	Y
70	Paul Antony	Gabel Assoc.	Y	Y
71	Regan Fink	PGR	Y	Y
72	Richard Ross	AEP	Y	Y



ATTACHMENT C – 202404300501 CPPTF ATTENDANCE

73	Robert Safuto CES	CES	Y	Y
74	Room 1KC-02 North Auditorium - Teams		Y	Y
75	Ryan Benton	OG&E	Y	Y
76	Ryan Yokley	Sunflower	Y	Y
77	Shari Albrecht	KCC	Y	Y
78	Shawnee Claiborn-Pinto PUCT	PUCT	Y	Y
79	Sherri Maxey	SPP	Y	Y
80	Shilpi Sunil Kumar AES CE	ASE CE	Y	Y
81	Simon Cherucheril	PGR	Y	
82	Steve Purdy	SPP	Y	Y
83	Tessie Kentner	SPP	Y	Y
84	Neeya Toleman	NEXTERA	Y	
85	Tyler Berton	AES	Y	Y
86	Vaibhav Bilagi	RWE	Y	Y
87	Zach Sabey	SPP	Y	

|