VANRY
ASSOCIATES
HIGH PERFORMANCE EXECUTIVE COUNSEL

PO Box 2086, Station Terminal
Vancouver, BC V6B 3T2 Canada

T: 604 732 4010
www.vanry.com

Santee Cooper IRP Stakeholder Process 2024-2026

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #2 – Meeting Summary

Date: June 27, 2024

Time: 1:00 – 5:00 pm EDT

Location: Virtual Meeting via Zoom, Vanry Associates facilitating

Meeting: Santee Cooper Stakeholder Working Group Session #2

The meeting's business focus was to provide working group members with an opportunity to comment and ask questions about the analysis underpinning the upcoming 2024 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) annual update, which will be filed with the Public Service Commission (PSC) in September 2024. Members also discussed feedback from the first meeting, which honors a standing commitment for all sessions.

This summary provides an overview of the meeting logistics, presentations, and discussions. It is organized into the following sections:

- Meeting Information & Materials
- Session Participation
- Topics, Presenters, and Discussion
- Meeting Feedback
- Commitments and Next Steps
- Appendix - List of External Stakeholder Working Group Members & June Meeting Attendees

Meeting Information & Materials

The Santee Cooper Resource Planning team held its second IRP Stakeholder Working Group meeting on Thursday, June 27, 2024. The IRP Stakeholder Working Group (or working group) is integral to Santee Cooper's commitment to engage stakeholders in its ongoing integrated resource planning process. As with the first meeting, a presentation was prepared by Santee Cooper and shared with working group members a week in advance on June 20, 2024. It was also posted to the Stakeholder Working Group section of the Santee Cooper IRP webpage. The Meeting #1 Summary was shared with members on May 6, 2024.

Session Participation

The Stakeholder Working Group includes a set membership of organizations representing diverse interests and perspectives, including government, regulatory agencies, environmental, social, and customer groups. Each organization was invited to join the working group by the Santee Cooper Resource Planning team and asked to assign a primary and secondary member.

Vote Solar is new to the working group, accepting Santee Cooper's invitation to join in June. Based on a recommendation made in Meeting #1 by the Coastal Conservation League, Resource Planning is undertaking conversations to invite another member organization well suited to represent lower-income customers. The invitation process includes ensuring prospective organizations represent stakeholder interests outside the current membership and are deemed to have the capacity and are willing to participate fully, as outlined in the Charter commitments.

Working group members received the invitation to attend Meeting #2 on May 24, 2024, from Vanry Associates. See Appendix A for a list of working group member organizations and June meeting attendees.

Topics, Presenters, and Discussion

The agenda and associated times were included in the presentation posted to the 2024-2026 IRP Stakeholder Process webpage a week before the June 27th session.

Welcome and Agenda

– Stewart Ramsay, Meeting Facilitator, Vanry Associates

Stewart Ramsay opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda, introducing the guest speakers, Greg McCormack from Santee Cooper and Joel Dison from Astrapé Consulting, and outlining the meeting outcomes. These were related to working group matters, specifically to review progress action items and feedback received in the first meeting, and to provide updates and to hear from members about Resource Planning's updates to major assumptions, portfolios, sensitivities, and metrics in the run-up to Santee Cooper's required 2024 Annual IRP filing in September.

Stewart also welcomed Vote Solar as a new organization to join the working group and asked member Jake Duncan to say a few words.

Working Group

– Clay Settle, Manager Resource Planning, Santee Cooper

Clay Settle reviewed Resource Planning's response and progress against action items and feedback captured at the first meeting. This type of review is intended to be a standing agenda item for each session. Three items prompted members to clarify the original requests made:

- Taylor Allred (Coastal Conservation League) shared that he has identified a potential new member organization representing low-income customers and is eager to have them join the June meeting. Clay Settle acknowledged that internal processes have slowed the team from completing the necessary steps to review the fit and commitment capacity of the proposed new member. Conversations are underway, and a low-income member representative is anticipated to join before the next working group meeting.
- Eddy Moore (Southern Alliance for Clean Energy) clarified and reiterated his request from the first meeting to lift confidentiality around a 500 kV transmission study to allow for more open stakeholder discussion, emphasizing that many working group members already have access and that the request intended to add a few more. Clay Settle acknowledged potential legal and infrastructure concerns but offered to discuss options offline.
- Eddy questioned Santee Cooper's response about sharing data pre-filing. He indicated that he agrees with all responses except for the data sharing and would prefer to have data shared throughout the process.

Members also discussed the availability of NDAs and strategic scheduling for future proceedings, aiming to be proactive rather than reactive, and reiterated the need for timely access to existing information for effective preparation and solution-oriented discussions.

Clay closed by outlining the 2024 and 2025 IRP working schedules and emphasizing the importance of members providing timely feedback in support of the 2024 Annual Update, ideally on or before August 2nd.

Meeting Summaries for the Working Group
– Stewart Ramsay, Meeting Facilitator, Vanry Associates

Stewart addressed the transition of the accountability of meeting summaries produced by Santee Cooper to Vanry Associates. Rather than being verbatim transcripts, the summaries are intended to outline the discussions and follow-up actions. Stewart expects summaries to be posted publicly by Santee Cooper for transparency and ultimately filed with the Public Service Commission (PSC).

Stewart shared that, thus far, members have not shared much feedback regarding the Meeting #1 summary, apart from a request to add more context to the conversations. He emphasized the importance of members reviewing the summaries and asked members to share how the summaries would be most useful to them.

Taylor shared that he had provided feedback on the first meeting summary and consulted with Eddy before doing so. They suggested that more information should be captured in meeting summaries to reflect better what stakeholders are saying and recommending.

- Taylor expressed that the initial draft of the Meeting #1 summary lacked details on stakeholder contributions. They believe it's important to document stakeholder input to demonstrate their value in informing resource planning decisions.
- Taylor asked if there was openness to revising the summary of the first meeting to include member perspectives that may have been overlooked initially. Stewart offered to amend the summary based on feedback and invited members to review the Meeting #1 summary again and suggest changes.
- Taylor sought clarification on whether members needed to regularly provide written feedback to ensure their comments were included in future summaries or if the documents would naturally evolve to capture all relevant points. Stewart shared that Vanry intended to include a more comprehensive

account of member perspectives and asked that members provide specific input to ensure all relevant points were captured.

Throughout the discussion, Stewart emphasized the ongoing nature of seeking feedback to refine future summaries, aiming to strike a balance between brevity and detail. He assured stakeholders that their input is crucial for shaping the quality and usefulness of the summaries. He emphasized a collaborative approach where members' perspectives would shape the final content, ensuring the summaries represented the discussions held in the meetings. Vanry intends to honor the shared working group commitment to transparency and responsiveness to member input, as documented in the Charter.

Load Forecast
– Greg McCormack, Senior Manager Financial Forecast, Santee Cooper
– Carl Ciullo, Financial Analyst, Santee Cooper

The load forecast update was presented in four sections: an overview, followed by a review of results before large loads, then the potential large load stochastic analysis results, and finally, a summary of the overall load forecast results.

Greg opened the discussion by introducing the topic of load forecasting for Santee Cooper's IRP process. He highlighted that the load forecast from 2022 had been revised twice in 2023 due to new large customer agreements and that the 2024 forecast was completed in May, incorporating feedback from members. Key points discussed included adjustments in methodology to anticipate economic development loads and considerations for uncertainty in future load forecasts.

Greg acknowledged the feedback the load forecast team received from Taylor, Eddy, and Jalen Brooks-Knepfle (Conservation Voters of South Carolina) at the technical meeting held on May 2, 2024. The Load Forecast team reflected on what they heard and chose to respond and continue the discussion with all members at this working group meeting. The May 2nd discussion covered both technical and process-related elements and provided a summary of the conversation.

Specific to the suggestion of adjusting forecasts to account for future uncertainties, Greg confirmed the team chose to use the 50th percentile stochastic results, noting the current methodology already considers potential future growth and uncertainties without needing further adjustments. Greg emphasized the importance of not double-counting potential changes and maintaining the integrity of the forecast separate from resource planning. He welcomed ongoing discussions for future forecasts and appreciated the valuable input from the three members.

The remainder of his presentation and conversation focused on managing uncertainty, the appropriateness of forecasting methodologies, and requests for transparency regarding customer information. Discussions also touched on updates to incorporate new energy efficiency standards and integrate members' feedback into refining the load forecast methodology.

- Taylor asked for clarification on the differences in load forecast reductions in earlier years but not in the 2030s compared to the preliminary result. Carl Ciullo responded that the substantial load originally in the forecast for the earlier years materialized as the customer signed a contract with Central. It appears the load was decreased in the earlier years, however, since it is no longer a potential load, it is realized and therefore moved to a contracted forecast. Additional new projects in later years maintained the higher forecasts into 2030.

- Taylor also questioned using the 50th percentile in forecasts given the right-skewed distribution of potential load scenarios. Carl explained that this choice represents the median outcome and is the most likely scenario according to the analysis undertaken.
- Eddy asked whether the team had considered the timeline for including new energy efficiency standards in the forecasts, particularly given the impact of new hot water standards. Greg explained that Santee Cooper's consultant, GDS, incorporates such regulatory changes based on the Energy Information Administration's Annual Energy Outlook (AEO). If GDS thinks the outlook used in the next forecast doesn't make appropriate adjustments for the new rules, they will adjust based on their view of the changes that should be anticipated in the EIA's AEO.
- Taylor emphasized the need for more frequent updates on forecast changes and data inputs to improve stakeholder understanding and allow for feedback. Greg recognized the need and committed to providing timely updates to the best of their ability without committing to a specific number per year.
- Taylor also asked whether there were elements from the technical discussion meeting or written feedback that resulted in changes to the load forecast. Greg shared that the feedback had them adjust the methodology and create the rubric they are now using. They decided to use the 50th percentile instead of the 75th in response, in part, to Taylor's helpful comments.
- Taylor raised concerns about the limited granularity of information on large loads due to confidentiality regarding customer-specific information. Greg acknowledged the sensitivity of such data and offered to discuss with his team how to provide members with relevant information without compromising confidentiality.

Carl Ciullo continued with a detailed overview of load forecasts and methodologies jointly explored by Santee Cooper and Central, segmented into residential, commercial, and industrial sectors, with stochastic analysis of potential large loads. Clarification questions were asked by Jake Duncan (Vote Solar), Jonathan Ly (J. Pollock), Eddy, and Taylor. The discussion focused on exploring specific aspects of the forecasts and seeking additional information. The conversation continued to touch on the methodology behind stochastic analysis and its implications for load factors, particularly in distinguishing between firm and non-firm loads and how these factors affect resource planning. It also touched on the rationale behind the observed trends in seasonal load peaks, particularly the faster rise in winter peaks compared to summer peaks, and the implications for infrastructure planning.

- Jake queried the inclusion of behind-the-meter storage in load forecasts, particularly regarding the integration of rooftop solar in projections. Carl replied that battery storage for shaving the peak is not explicitly included in the system load forecast but is considered in aggressive PV growth scenarios. Jake offered to follow up offline with more information regarding the increased inclusion of batteries with rooftop solar in base forecasts.
- Eddy asked about the reduced energy usage in the industrial sector despite adding new customers, exploring whether it stemmed from efficiency gains or changes in customer operations. Carl answered that this resulted from slightly lower energy usage by existing customers and not due to the loss of customers.
- Taylor asked for clarification on the specific impact of newly identified large loads on forecasts, including their timing, size, and integration into existing load profiles. Answer: One new customer moved from stochastic to base, while others added directly to the forecast.

- Jonathan inquired about the decision to use the 50th percentile for potential large loads. Carl replied that the 50th percentile was chosen to reflect an equal likelihood of over or underestimating loads, aiming for accuracy.
- Taylor asked for a breakdown of types of customers (e.g., data centers) in the forecast. Carl answered that he does not have those exact numbers but indicated that the relative percentage is closer to a 50/50 ratio of data centers to other customers. He reinforced that this is a very rough estimate.
- Eddy asked about the assumptions for the probable new load related to interruptible programs. Carl responded that we assume all probable load is firm and not interruptible.

Effective Load Carry Capability Update
– Joel Dison, Technical Manager, Astrapé Consulting

Joel Dison presented an update on the Effective Load Carrying Capability (ELCC), applying the Strategic Energy Risk Valuation Model (SERVM), and provided a comprehensive overview of several critical aspects. SERVM, a multi-area reliability and economic simulation tool initially developed by Southern Company and now owned by Astrapé Consulting, has been continually refined for over 15 years. This tool is essential for resource adequacy and planning studies, offering valuable insights into the reliability contributions of different resources. The presentation highlighted the significance of ELCC, which measures the reliability contribution of various resources, such as renewables and batteries, compared to perfect capacity. For Santee Cooper, the primary focus was on winter ELCCs due to the higher resource adequacy risk during this period.

The calculation of ELCC involves a process where, when a new resource is added to the system, the load is iteratively added until the Loss of Load Expectation (LOLE) returns to its initial state before the test resource is introduced. This is visualized as a three-step process: establishing the baseline system at 0.1 days/year LOLE, adding a resource that decreases LOLE, and then increasing the load until the original LOLE returns to 0.1. Dison also distinguished between marginal ELCC, which refers to the value of the next added resource, and average ELCC, which measures the reliability value of an entire resource class. Monte Carlo simulations are used to calculate both types of ELCCs. The presentation further explored the synergy in resource interactions, noting that the combined value of multiple resources can exceed the sum of individual values. This synergy is particularly important when evaluating combinations of solar, wind, and battery storage.

Additionally, Joel's presentation detailed an expanded analysis aimed at capturing synergies by evaluating various points in a matrix of solar and battery penetrations. Future updates will include the evaluation of eight-hour batteries and wind resources, as well as the need to consider ELCC for thermal resources. Overall, the presentation underscored the complexity and necessity of accurately modeling the reliability contributions of various energy resources to ensure effective resource planning and adequacy.

The following comments and questions were discussed in this section:

- Jake asked why the ELCC assessment was only being done for renewable technologies when capacity accreditation for thermal resources is also crucial. He mentioned that assumptions around thermal resource availability might not always be appropriate, given recent winter storms. Joel explained that the SERVM model used for the reserve margin study does account for the reliability contribution of thermal resources. He clarified that the reserve margin generated includes the ELCC of these resources. Clay added that the topic was discussed in the previous IRP and will be revisited in the 2026 IRP update. He noted that current methodologies are consistent with those used by other utilities in South Carolina and throughout the region.

- Jake's follow-up question on historical data emphasized that historical performance might not always indicate future performance, especially with increasing winter storms. He asked how this was being addressed in the SERVM model. Stewart acknowledged the importance of the topic and indicated that it would be discussed in future meetings. He suggested reviewing the reserve margin study from the last IRP, available on the Santee Cooper website.
- Eddy asked if the solar and storage resources were assumed to be operationally linked or independent in the ELCC analysis. Joel explained that in the analysis, solar and battery resources were evaluated as independent. If they were hybrid resources, they were assumed to be unlimited, meaning the battery was not required to be charged by the solar, and both could operate simultaneously.
- Taylor asked about the methodology for selecting cells to model in the ELCC matrix and whether the smooth curves seen in different utility systems would still hold if every combination were modeled. Joel explained that the cells marked with Xs in the matrix were actual runs made in the SERVM model, while the rest were filled in using a radial function basis smoothing technique. He emphasized that while not every combination was modeled, capturing the corners and single technology (single tech) points was crucial for accurate interpolation.
- Dave Rogers (Sierra Club) [in the chat] noted that many areas are moving to ELCC for thermal resources and asked if the methodology biases the capacity expansion model toward selecting thermal resources. Joel reiterated that the SERVM model accounts for the ELCC of thermal resources. He explained the difference between accounting based on installed capacity (ICAP) and ELCC, stressing that the model simulations remain consistent regardless of the accounting method.
- Taylor asked if raising the reserve margin rather than using ELCC for thermal resources would impact the selection of non-thermal resources like solar. Joel responded that the higher reserve margin compensates for the ELCC of existing thermal resources and does not affect the marginal decisions for non-thermal resources, as the outages for solar and wind are not incorporated in the analysis.
- Stewart noted that future conversations would address the intricacies of ICAP, UCAP, and ELCC in reserve margin studies, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of these methodologies.

Major Assumptions for the 2024 Annual IRP Update
– Bob Davis, Executive Consultant, nFront Consulting

Bob Davis provided an extensive update regarding major assumptions in the ongoing and future resource planning efforts. The economic and financial assumptions for the 2023 IRP remain largely unchanged, with a slight decrease in Santee Cooper's discount rate and weighted average cost of capital. The short-term commercial paper rate used for construction interest is currently higher due to elevated rates. The planning team is using the same energy efficiency and demand response assumptions for the upcoming IRP update, considering them aggressive yet reasonable.

In terms of reserves, both spinning and Quickstart reserves are modeled, with a total allocation of 235 MW. The reserve margins have increased to 18% for the winter period, targeting 15% by 2026. The fuel price forecast incorporates both fundamental forecasts and forward prices to reflect current conditions accurately. Environmental considerations include modeling the EPA's greenhouse gas rules as sensitivity for CO2 emission regulations and using historical pricing data from the 2023 IRP for reference.

Santee Cooper's existing resources include various thermal and hydro assets, with recent additions such as the Cherokee combined cycle unit. The company has several contracts with biomass generators, SEPA hydropower, and solar agreements, alongside capacity purchase contracts to meet short-term needs until 2028. Near-term options being evaluated include upgrades to the Rainey Generating Facility, extension of Power Purchase Agreements, and no Cherokee retirement. The exploration of battery additions, new peaking assets, and incremental PPA additions are also under consideration.

Capital and operational cost assumptions for conventional and nuclear resources are based on industry standards and closely aligned with Dominion's assumptions for consistency. The update includes considerations for air-cooled technologies and estimated transmission upgrade costs. Renewable energy assumptions for solar, onshore wind, and battery storage have been updated based on the latest Annual Technology Baseline (ATB) data, showing gradual cost declines for solar and wind, with a notable increase in battery costs. Tax credits and domestic content assumptions have been factored into the levelized cost calculations, providing a comprehensive overview of Santee Cooper's resource planning efforts.

- Taylor Allred asked a series of questions:
    - Is the importance of updating potential DSM along with load forecasts due to significant jumps from previous forecasts and capturing dynamic factors such as industrial class changes and potential rate increases? Bob replied that the assumptions are considered aggressive but reasonable. There is an iterative process in DSM, with updates to be provided in the next triennial hallmark of potential study.
    - How does the current fuel transportation cost rate account for potential rate increases on pipelines? Bob replied that Santee Cooper is incorporating an elevated rate, specifically a $2 per MMBtu reservation fee.
    - What are the assumptions regarding the difference in fixed O&M costs for combined cycles compared to Lazard's data? Bob replied that the assumptions are based on the EPRI TagWeb and engineering estimates from Sargent and Lundy, which are considered reputable sources.
    - What accounts for high fixed O&M costs for aero-derivative turbines compared to other sources? Bob replied that higher fixed costs per kW are due to labor and staffing needs often being the same for larger and smaller units but being spread over a small number of kW for smaller units.
    - What is the explanation for assuming a 2040 availability date and cost data for SMRs despite no commercially operable units in the U.S.? Bob replied that the assumptions are based on engineering estimates and the need for market history before widespread adoption.
- Eddy had several questions:
    - Why do the achievable savings from demand response programs appear flat in the long term? Bob shared that programs show continuing implementation, but obsolescence and replacement over time lead to flat savings curves.
    - What is the impact of potential supply disruptions on fuel price risk modeling? Bob replied that specific disruptions are not modeled due to their short-term nature; econometric methods may capture some historical disruptions.
    - What are the cost and risk assumptions for fuel transportation and supply? Bob replied that costs include fixed reservation fees for firm gas and premium rates for interruptible gas during peak periods.

  - Will the shared resource be air-cooled, and how will this impact costs? Clay replied that current assumptions include air-cooled technologies; heat rates reflect air-cooled conditions.
  - Will Santee Cooper consider extending PPAs beyond short-term contracts? Bob replied that long-term PPAs and asset builds converge in cost; market alternatives will always be evaluated.

- Jake asked whether Santee Cooper would account for risk differences between high, medium, and low gas price forecasts. Bob replied that fuel price uncertainty is used to stress test the robustness of portfolios.

- Jake then inquired how fuel transportation costs were forecasted and whether this affected the rates. Bob confirmed that Santee Cooper includes fixed reservation fees in its calculations, with recent updates reflecting potential increases in reservation fees.

- Diane Bell (individual customer member) commented that regarding demand side management (DSM), with a distribution load of only about 1000 MW, achieving a 250 MW reduction is significant. Achieving additional savings with the current customer base is optimistic. Bob responded that these curves represent the total of Santee Cooper's and Central's programs.

Portfolios, Sensitivities, and Metrics for the 2024 Annual IRP Update
– Clay Settle, Manager Resource Planning, Santee Cooper

Clay's presentation focused on the updated modeling strategy for the 2024 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) update. The primary objective is to revise market conditions and modeling assumptions to evaluate their impact on the preferred portfolio. The strategy involves assessing three distinct portfolios: the 2023 IRP preferred portfolio with new assumptions, an optimized portfolio based on the new assumptions, and a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) portfolio. The reference case assumes the current EPA GHG rule is stayed. The EPA GHG Rules assume specific retirement plans and CF limits on new combustion turbines.

The presentation highlighted the key modeling assumptions and constraints, including annual renewable constraints of 300 MW for solar starting in 2026 and 100 MW for wind beginning in 2029. Sensitivity analyses will be conducted for different load forecasts and fuel price scenarios. Clay stated that the evaluation of various metrics, such as minimax regret and reliability uncertainty, will be reconsidered based on their relevance to the current focus on updating assumptions rather than comparing multiple portfolios. He emphasized that we will be utilizing the Load Forecast with the probable Even Distribution load as the base case Load Forecast.

A significant portion of the discussion centered around the interpretation of the EPA GHG rule and its implications for Santee Cooper's IRP. Three compliance options were outlined: retiring coal plants by 2031 or 2032, continuing operation with a 40% coal-fired natural gas mix until 2038 or implementing carbon capture and sequestration. The latter was deemed impractical for South Carolina. For new combined cycles and CTs, capacity factor limits are set based on emissions rates, with H-class CTs capped at 40% and others at 20%.

The presentation concluded with a call for stakeholder feedback by August 2nd, stressing the importance of incorporating this input into the final modeling strategy. The need to consider current state laws in the modeling process was underscored to ensure the feasibility and legal compliance of the selected portfolios.

The discussion highlighted the practical challenges of carbon capture and sequestration and the necessity of developing portfolios that are both economically viable and legally permissible. The key questions and comments about this part of the discussion were:

- Eddy asked about the potential regret associated with the new greenhouse gas rule and if it would be considered in the minimax regret metric. Bob explained that minimax regret evaluates differences across multiple inputs. Highlighted concerns about the credibility of high load sensitivity under the GHG case and confirmed that the metric would be considered but acknowledged limitations due to current uncertainties.
- Eddy questioned whether there needs to be a portfolio based on current state law to account for the possibility that the law won't change to allow joint resource builds. Clay acknowledged the point and agreed that the optimal portfolio should consider legal constraints, confirming they would evaluate a portfolio that adheres to current state laws.
- Jake [shared in a chat comment read by Stewart] suggested performing sensitivity analysis on both proposed portfolios despite uncertainties about the future of the EPA rule. Clay agreed that sensitivity analysis on both portfolios is worthwhile and promised to consider this feedback in the evaluation process.
- Eddy raised a concern about the practicalities of assuming legislative changes, emphasizing that the core portfolio should remain within current state law. Clay agreed that the IRP should not assume legislative changes and should ensure that the core portfolio is legally permissible under current state law.

The discussion focused on the implications of the EPA GHG rule, particularly around compliance options and their feasibility, such as the impracticality of carbon capture and sequestration in South Carolina. Clay and Bob provided detailed responses on the practical challenges of each compliance option, reaffirming the importance of realistic and legally compliant assumptions in their modeling strategy.

Closing

– Clay Settle, Manager Resource Planning, Santee Cooper
– Stewart Ramsay, Meeting Facilitator, Vanry Associates

Stewart led the closing segment of the meeting, beginning by addressing a clarifying question to Clay regarding his preference to receive feedback in smaller, more frequent submissions rather than waiting for consolidated comments. Clay affirmed that earlier feedback is preferred and emphasized the importance of clear, direct recommendations to avoid misunderstandings.

Stewart then outlined the next steps and action items. He mentioned that the summary of the meeting would be developed and distributed to the working group members by July 10th, with a request for feedback by July 16th. He highlighted the next full working group meeting scheduled for October or November and an upcoming meeting on battery electric storage systems (BESS) on July 17th. Stewart encouraged working group member participation in a general notice meeting on July 18th.

Peter Claghorn from Vanry Associates displayed the list of action items, and Stewart asked the attendees to review it for any omissions. He indicated that the list of action items would be included in the meeting summary, acknowledging that the displayed list was a work in progress.

After reviewing the meeting outcomes, Stewart checked with members to see if these were met. Specifically, he asked whether members understood the progress on action items, were able to provide feedback about the meeting schedule and priority topics and were able to provide feedback on the 2024 annual IRP update. He asked for comments on whether these objectives were achieved.

During the review of action items, Taylor asked to capture continuing a conversation around developing a group where marginalized community members could participate. Stewart acknowledged this point and agreed to add it to the action items list.

Stewart solicited further feedback on the meeting's productivity. Jonathan Ly responded positively, noting that he found the meeting productive and that the objectives were met.

In his closing remarks, Stewart expressed appreciation for everyone's participation and stressed the importance of their feedback on both the meeting summary and the post-meeting survey. He thanked the attendees and acknowledged the good conversations and contributions throughout the meeting.

Meeting Feedback

Members were invited to provide additional feedback upon leaving the Zoom session through a short survey that included the same five questions related to the working group commitments, as documented in the Charter, and to gauge whether their time spent in the meeting was of value. Vanry Associates received no responses.

Commitments and Next Steps

The following is a summary of commitments made and the next steps agreed upon at the close of the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS – noted during the meeting discussion	**By WHOM**	**By WHEN**
1. Santee Cooper is committed to adding an additional member to the working group to represent marginalized communities, beginning at the next working group meeting. Details are under discussion.	Clay Settle	By the next meeting
2. Will Brown will follow up with Eddy and discuss internally how to have a meaningful conversation about the 500 kV plan	Will Brown	
3. Will Brown will follow up with Eddy to clarify his request to add additional people to NDAs so that more people can see and contribute to it	Will Brown	
4. Stewart commits to making sure that we capture and reflect germane stakeholder comments in the meeting summaries and continue to refine and evolve these	Stewart Ramsay	By the next meeting
5. We are committed to incorporating additional comments to the Stakeholder Meeting #1 summary based on specific comments and suggested edits received from stakeholders	Stewart Ramsay	July 16th

6. Given the constraints of the overall IRP schedule and timeline, we plan to keep stakeholders informed of material changes to the load forecast to the best of our ability	Greg McCormack	Ongoing
7. Will Brown will work with the Load Forecast team to figure out a frequency for updates and present that proposal at the next meeting.	Will Brown	By next meeting
8. We will provide Taylor with any updated versions of data representations that have been shared in the technical discussion, for example TVA view of the simulation results that is based on updated information.	Greg McCormack	
9. We are committed to discussing the details of how ELCC is developed for renewable and conventional resources in future meetings	Stewart Ramsay	Future Meetings
10. Stewart will work with Clay and Will to look for opportunities to add additional conversations about ELCC and how to incorporate these into working group meetings and only schedule, if necessary, a technical meeting to support all members' time and resources	Stewart Ramsay	Future Meetings
11. We will consider the suggestions for portfolios and sensitivities raised by stakeholders	Clay Settle	
12. We request feedback in the form of a clear recommendation	Clay Settle	
13. Vanry will have follow up conversation with Santee Cooper regarding the applicability of a sub-group for marginalized community members	Stewart Ramsay	

Next Steps:

- The next working group meeting is tentatively scheduled for October 2024
- The first public IRP General Notice Meeting will be held on July 18th, 1:00 pm EDT.
- Santee Cooper will file its IRP Annual Update with the PSC in September 2024.
- Members wishing to present a topic at a future meeting may contact Will Brown or Clay Settle.
- Updated IRP materials will be posted on the Santee Cooper IRP webpage.

APPENDIX A

List of Stakeholder Working Group Members and Attendees

ORGANIZATION	MEMBER / ALTERNATE	JUNE 27TH ATTENDEE
Office of Regulatory Staff	Findlay Salter Shane Hyatt	Findlay Salter Shane Hyatt
SC Dept of Consumer Affairs	Jake Edwards Roger Hall	
SC Dept of Natural Resources	Elizabeth Miller Lorianne Riggin	Elizabeth Miller
SC Dept of Environment	Rhonda Thompson Robbie Brown	Robbie Brown
Central	Caleb Bryant Marcus Harris	Caleb Bryant
J. Pollock	Jeffry C. Pollock Jonathan Ly	Jonathan Ly
Century Aluminum	Michael Early Steve Thomas	Steve Thomas
Nucor	Bradley Powell Denny Boyd Karl Winkler	Bradley Powell Denny Boyd
Messer	Steven Castracane	Steve Castracane
Google	Katie Ottenweller Will Cleveland	Will Cleveland
SC Association of Municipal Power Systems	Eric Budds Gary Baysinger	
Individual	Charles Hucks	Charles Hucks
Individual	Richard Berry	
Individual	Diane Bell	Diane Bell
Carolinas Clean Energy Business Association	Hamilton Davis John Burns	Hamilton Davis John Burns
Conservation Voters of South Carolina	Erin Siebert Jalen Brooks-Knepfle John Brooker	Jalen Brooks-Knepfle
Coastal Conservation League	Emily Cedzo Taylor Allred	Taylor Allred
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy	Eddy Moore Maggie Shober	Eddy Moore
Southern Environmental Law Center	Anna Sommer Chelsea Hotalling Kate Mixson	Chelsea Hotalling Emma Clancy
Sierra Club	David Rogers Dori Jaffe	Dave Rogers Dori Jaffe
Vote Solar	Jake Duncan	Jake Duncan
Santee Cooper Resource Planning	Clay Settle Jane Campbell Rahul Dembla Will Brown	Clay Settle Jane Campbell Will Brown
Santee Cooper Corporate Communications		Mollie Gore
Santee Cooper Financial Forecast		Carl Ciullo Greg McCormack
Astrapé Consulting		Joel Dison Nick Simmons
nFront Consulting	Bob Davis Jonathan Nunes	Bob Davis Jonathan Nunes
Vanry Associates	Peter Claghorn Stewart Ramsay Yvette Smith	Peter Claghorn Stewart Ramsay Yvette Smith

**Members listed in alpha order by first name*