

**Carolinas Transmission Planning Collaborative
Oversight / Steering Committee (OSC)
Meeting Highlights
December 18, 2024
Webex / Teleconference Meeting
10:00 AM - 12:00 PM ET**

Avni Patel, Chair	Duke Energy Carolinas
Bob Pierce	Duke Energy Carolinas
Orvane Piper	Duke Energy Carolinas
Matthew Knudson	Duke Energy Carolinas
Sammy Roberts	Duke Energy Progress
Bill Quaintance	Duke Energy Progress
Brant Werts	Duke Energy Progress
Sid DeSouza	Duke Energy Progress
John Lemire	NCEMC
Chris Walton	NCEMC
Joe Mason	NCEMC
Marty Berland	ElectriCities
Mark Oliver	ElectriCities
Rich Wodyka	Consultant Administrator

Administrative Items

OSC Agenda

- Avni Patel opened the OSC Meeting with a safety message and highlighted the meeting agenda.

PWG Member Change

- Fayetteville PWC has made some staff changes which has resulted in Tim Stankiewicz leaving the PWG. Fayetteville PWC has proposed replacing Tim with Carey Jacobs, Sr Engineer Electrical Engineering. After review and discussion, the OSC approved the addition of Carey Jacobs to replace Tim Stankiewicz as the Fayetteville PWC member on the PWG. The OSC thanked Tim for his involvement in the PWG and welcomed Carey to the PWG.

PWG Officers Rotation

- The rotation of the PWG officers occurs on January 1st every two years. This January PWG officer rotation results in DEC becoming the PWG Chair and ElectriCities becoming the PWG Vice Chair / Secretary. Orvane Piper was selected by DEC to become the PWG Chair and Marty Berland was selected by ElectriCities

to become the Vice Chair / Secretary. After review and discussion, the OSC approved the PWG officer changes effective on January 1, 2025.

OSC Meeting Minutes and Highlights

- The November 21, 2024 OSC Meeting Minutes and Highlights were reviewed and approved.

CTPC 2024 Base Reliability Study Activities

TAG Reliability Solutions Meeting Follow-up

- Rich Wodyka reported that the deadline for TAG members to submit any comments, questions or to propose alternative solutions on the proposed preliminary reliability solutions that were distributed on November 7th was Friday - December 6th. No TAG feedback or alternative solutions were received by the deadline.

NCEMC Request for Additional Solutions Results Information

- John Lemire led the OSC discussion on the NCEMC request for adding a list of which study supports each solution listed on the summary of 2024 projects in the Transmission Plan. After review and discussion, Bill Quaintance stated that DEC and DEP need to have additional internal discussions on whether this additional information can be provided. Bill will report back at on this item at the next OSC meeting.

NCEMC Issue - Discussion of Alternative Solutions

- John Lemire led the OSC discussion on the question of having the opportunity to review the alternative solutions that DEC and DEP has investigated on the proposed preliminary reliability solutions. Joe Mason reported that the PWG at their last meeting did discuss receiving and reviewing a list of alternative solutions for the projects proposed to be included in the 2024 Transmission Plan. There was agreement at the PWG meeting that the focus will be on projects greater than \$5M and rather than a review on a project by project basis, DEC and DEP will put together a list of typical alternatives that are considered and viable alternatives.
- Another question discussed is what alternative solutions information gets included in the CTPC annual report on the proposed reliability solutions included in the Plan. Rich Wodyka noted that the report does list the alternatives that were considered for each project as part of the information in the Transmission Plan Major Project Descriptions included as one of the report appendices. The OSC will have another opportunity to review and discuss alternative solutions once the draft report of the 2024 Collaborative Transmission Plan is distributed for review.

NCEMC Issue - Reporting of 44kV Facilities under the CTPC

- Sammy Roberts led the OSC review and discussion on the question of do 44kV facilities get included in the CTPC Transmission Plan. Sammy reported that Duke legal has advised that the FERC standard is the Seven Factor Test (Mansfield Test) on whether an electric facility is distribution or transmission. This test would be used to determine when 44kV projects should be included under the CTPC. Network 44kV expansion facilities could pass this test and be included under the CTPC Transmission Plan. Radial 44kV would not pass this test. No 44kV facilities are included in this year's CTPC Transmission Plan report.

CTPC Reliability Study Report

- Rich Wodyka led the OSC discussion on the preparation of the 2024 CTPC Reliability Study Report. He noted the proposed outline of the study report and the report preparation assignments. He stated the goal is to have an initial draft of the Transmission Plan Report ready of review at the January PWG meeting and a final draft of the report available for review and discussion at the January OSC meeting.

Multi Value Strategic Transmission (MVST) Planning Process Activities

Response to CCEBA on the MVST ERIS Scenario

- Sammy Roberts led the OSC review and discussion on the proposed response to CCEBA. Sammy reported that Duke legal has been decided that the response should be from Duke rather than the CTPC. He noted that the OSC has already had the opportunity to review the proposed response and provide any comments or questions on the response. The proposed response will be sent to CCEBA if no other additional OSC comments or questions are received by the end of the week.

Approval of the MVST Study Scope

- Brant Werts led the OSC review and discussion of the latest version of the MVST Study Scope. John Lemire raised a question regarding the inclusion of "cost allocation" as a basis of selecting a solution for the inclusion in the Local Transmission plan. Brant noted that cost allocation is outside the scope for the MVST study process. Duke plans to calculate benefits at the project level per NCEMC's ask for items that are likely candidates to go to the solutions. However, final benefits will be at the portfolio level due to the amount of calculations that would be needed with the sensitives that have been proposed. Brant made mention that some benefits might be at the project basis but others would be on the portfolio level.
- In response to this OSC review and discussion, John Lemire made a statement on behalf of NCEMC regarding the MVST Scope and related issues. John's statement follows:

- NCEMC appreciates the effort by the OSC to reach a consensus. The revisions to the MVST Study Scope represent a compromise to address our concerns on transparency. While not all of our concerns are addressed, we feel it is important to build a process where a CTPC Participant or stakeholder is enabled by the presentation of estimated costs and estimated benefits. To explain its Order 1920, FERC wrote, “Filing the cost allocation method in advance is critical because it provides certainty about how costs will be distributed before the transmission facilities are built. This filing helps all relevant stakeholders understand the financial implications from the outset and improves the odds that needed transmission will actually be built.” NCEMC understands that Duke Energy, as the TO, has indicated its default cost allocation methodology is the load ratio share methodology. However, NCEMC disputes that this is a just and reasonable methodology for application to each and every project and has particular concerns about the justness and reasonableness of the LRS methodology as applied to each and every project driven in whole or in part by policy, such as House Bill 951, which establishes a compliance obligation for Duke Energy, but not for NCEMC or other Participants. NCEMC’s belief that the LRS methodology can be unjust and unreasonable for cooperatives requires that we lodge our objections repeatedly in this venue to ensure every Participant and stakeholder is on notice that we intend to challenge allocation of costs to us in future annual updates to Duke Energy’s transmission rates. With that background as context, NCEMC appreciates the effort by the OSC to reach a consensus on the revisions to the MVST Study Scope. NCEMC is prepared to support adoption of the revised MVST Study Scope with the understanding that this MVST Study scope is a one-time study scope and will not create a precedent for future study scopes that would bar NCEMC from again raising its concerns. Given Duke’s commitment to use the tools/processes they have to calculate project level benefits for each project based on the benefit categories for projects that will advance to the Solutions Development phase and the understanding that this MVST Study scope is a one-time study scope thereby not creating a precedent for future study scopes, we are ready to move forward with a vote.
- After discussion of John Lemire’s statement, Sammy Roberts provided a statement on behalf of Duke in response to John’s statement. Sammy’s statement follows:
 - Recently in Docket EL24-74-000, FERC issued an Order rejecting a complaint filed by several Colorado municipalities (“Colorado Cities”) against Public Service Company of Colorado (“PSCO”). The Colorado Cities challenged the cost allocation of PSCO’s Colorado Power Pathway project. The Power Pathway project is a \$2 billion, 560-mile, 345kV project that PSCO planned through its local transmission planning process and supports PSCO’s compliance with Colorado’s clean energy goals. PSCO plans to allocate the costs to wholesale and retail customers via its FERC transmission rate and state retail rates, respectively, based on load ratio share. The Colorado Cities argued they do not benefit from the Power Pathway project and also argued that PSCO

had not followed the appropriate Order 890 and 1000 planning procedures. FERC rejected that argument, finding that local projects are networked transmission that benefit all customers and rolling the costs of such projects into wholesale customers network service rate is consistent with FERC policy and the cost causation standard.

- After OSC review and discussion of these proposed statements, Brant reviewed the latest version of the MVST Study Scope - version 4. He noted that Duke has detected a minor issue on how the addition of generation facility additions is documented on page 4. He suggested that the OSC vote on approving the MVST Study Scope - version 4 and he will send out a MVST Study Scope - version 5 after the meeting for a final email vote with the minor corrections. The OSC agreed with Brant's suggestion. The OSC voted and approved the MVST Study Scope - version 4. Brant will update the study scope with the minor corrections and the OSC will review and vote by email on the MVST Study Scope - version 5.

Report on CCEBA Input on Solar Siting

- Brant Werts reported that there was a meeting with CCEBA representatives back on November 6th to review and discuss the development of solar siting information to assist in the development the MVST Study models. In this meeting CCEBA indicated that they would provide additional information to assist us in the development of solar siting for the MVST Study models. After a discussion with Brant, Rich Wodyka contacted CCEBA on December 3rd and indicated that we were running out of time waiting for any additional input and needed any additional CCEBA solar siting input by the end of the day on Friday - December 6th. CCEBA was not able to provide us any solar siting input so on December 11th Rich informed CCEBA that we could no longer wait for input so we are proceeding with the development of the MVST Study model development without their additional input.

Attachment N-1 Update

CTPC Seventh Revised Participation Agreement

- Avni Patel reported that the Carolinas Transmission Planning Collaborative Seventh Revised Participation Agreement has been fully executed.

OSC Scope

- Sammy Roberts reported that the updated OSC Scope document has been approved and will be posted on the CTPC website.

OSC Review of CEPCI Request to join the CTPC

- Avni Patel led the OSC review and discussion of the CEPCI request to join the CTPC. After discussion, the OSC approved CEPCI request to join the CTPC. The OSC instructed Rich Wodyka to inform Chris Ware of the OSC approval for CEPCI to join the CTPC. The OSC also directed Rich to inform them that the OSC will be preparing an Eighth Revised Participation Agreement for them to execute.
- As part of this discussion, Sammy Roberts indicated that he would take the lead in the development of the Eighth Revised Participation Agreement. He will send out an updated Agreement for OSC review and approval prior to sending it to CEPCI. Once approved by the OSC, Rich will send CEPCI the Eighth Revised Participation Agreement to initiate the signing process of the Agreement.

RZEP 2.0 Project Status

- Sammy Roberts led the OSC review and discussion of the proposed CTPC response to the letter received from Dustin Metz of the NC Public Staff on Duke’s proposed RZEP 2.0 Projects. After discussion, Sammy Roberts agreed to update the CTPC response to the NC Public Staff and send it out for OSC final review prior to responding back to Dustin Metz.

CTPC Website Update

- Brant Werts and Sammy Roberts reported on the CarolinanTPC.org website. They reported that progress is being made on the website and many of the final items have been implemented in the development website and will be transitioned to the operational website around the end of the year. The goal is to have the CTPC website fully operational by January 1st.

Regional Studies Update

SERTP Update

- No report.

SERC LTWG Update

- No report.

EIPC Update

- No report.

NERC Activities Update

- Bob Pierce reported on the ongoing Interregional Transfer Capability Study. Bob noted that while NERC has done a good effort in this Study the overall study definition and data problems involving accurate resource information resulted in poor quality Study results. The Study Report is out for industry review and comment.

Other Items

Project Updates

- No update.

2024 OSC and TAG Meeting Schedule

- The OSC reviewed and confirmed the upcoming meeting date and time for the January OSC / TAG meetings. The OSC also reviewed the tentative date and times for February OSC and TAG meetings next year.

January 28, 2025	OSC 10:00 am - 12:00 pm TAG 1:30 pm - 3:00 pm	OSC Meeting Webex TAG Meeting Webex
February 20, 2025	OSC 10:00 am - 12:00 pm	OSC Meeting Webex