

Santee Cooper IRP Stakeholder Process 2024-2026

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #12 – Meeting Summary

Date: August 11, 2026

Time: 10:03 am – 12:04 pm EDT

Location: Virtual Meeting via Zoom, Vanry Associates facilitating

Meeting: Santee Cooper Stakeholder Working Group Session #12

This summary includes meeting logistics, presentations, and discussions.

It is organized into the following sections:

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

Meeting Information & Materials

The Santee Cooper Resource Planning team called a twelfth IRP Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) meeting for August 11, 2026. The IRP Stakeholder Working Group is integral to Santee Cooper's commitment to engaging stakeholders in its ongoing integrated resource planning process. This meeting was not in the original IRP SWG schedule. The additional meeting was called to allow the Resource Planning team to update the SWG on progress and potential new decisions based on the IRP analysis. Topics covered included updates to working group business, load forecast, capacity position, and resource availability assumptions, as well as overall updates on the progress of the IRP and solar procurement process. The meeting presentation is posted in the Stakeholder Working Group section of the [Santee Cooper 2024-2026 IRP Stakeholder Process webpage](#), along with materials from the previous eleven working group meetings and other related sessions.

Session Participation

The Stakeholder Working Group membership comprises organizations representing diverse interests and perspectives, including government, regulatory agencies, and environmental, social, and customer groups. The Santee Cooper Resource Planning team invited each organization to join the working group, represented by a primary and secondary member.

Appendix A lists the working group member organizations and the members who attended the August 11th meeting.

Topics, Presenters, and Discussion

The presentation, including the meeting agenda and timing for the various conversations, was emailed to members a few hours before the session.

Welcome and Agenda

– *Stewart Ramsay, Meeting Facilitator, Vanry Associates*

Stewart Ramsay opened the meeting and outlined the agenda: a review of working group business, followed by an update on the 2026 Triennial IRP, before closing. He invited an open, conversational format, encouraging participants to raise questions by hand or in the chat throughout the session.

Working Group Business

– *Will Brown, Manager Resource Planning, Santee Cooper*

Will Brown welcomed the group and thanked members for joining on short notice. He noted that the team felt the meeting was required to share updated information with the members. Consistent with past practice, the next planned working group meeting will follow the IRP filing. Clay Settle is scheduled to present on the 2026 IRP to the Santee Cooper Board on September 29th, with a working group meeting tentatively planned for October 7th to walk through the same board presentation.

Will then reviewed outstanding action items from Meeting 11. While reviewing planned maintenance costs preceding retirement, Will confirmed that Santee Cooper plans to continue modeling these costs through each unit's retirement date. He said that doing so would not materially affect study results. He added that the units will need to run at a fairly high capacity factor until replacement generation comes online and therefore will require continued maintenance to remain reliable. On the load forecast, Will noted that the high and low cases, not yet available at the prior meeting, were completed and shared with the working group on July 30th and will be used in the IRP sensitivities.

- Taylor Allred (Coastal Conservation League, (CCL)) asked whether Santee Cooper expects non-routine maintenance costs or added regulatory investment to keep Winyah operating, including compliance with zero liquid discharge (ZLD) requirements under the Effluent Limitation Guidelines (ELG). Will Brown confirmed Winyah is compliant with current ELG requirements through its assumed 2034 retirement date, with no further federal investment anticipated beyond continued ash pond closure obligations, and that ZLD would only be needed if the unit ran past that date.
- Taylor noted active litigation over the ELG compliance timeline, disclosing that CCL is a plaintiff, and asked that Santee Cooper evaluate a sensitivity reflecting potential ZLD compliance costs across the Winyah generating fleet. Will agreed to consider the request, noting that ZLD costs are already evaluated as part of the Cross retirement analysis and that, under current requirements, a 2035 Winyah retirement would avoid the investment.

Bob Davis (nFront Consulting) added, speaking hypothetically, that an earlier mandated ZLD compliance deadline would likely lead Santee Cooper to reconsider its assumed retirement date rather than invest in ZLD for a unit nearing end of life.

- Taylor asked whether Santee Cooper would consider providing periodic, at least quarterly, updates on large load growth, citing Duke Energy's Public Service Commission (PSC) filings and significant recent shifts in that utility's large-load forecasts. Will agreed to share the request with Santee Cooper's load forecast group and clarified that the IRP already includes a PSC-ordered requirement to update the Commission on large load activity. Taylor suggested that a useful update would flag loads that drop out of the stochastic queue, as well as prospective loads that sign service agreements and move to confirmed, contracted status.

- Stewart raised a materiality consideration, noting that with loads adding and dropping simultaneously, frequent reporting could be triggered even where there is no net change to the forecast. Taylor agreed a materiality threshold could work alongside periodic reporting, suggesting both a regular (e.g., quarterly) update, including confirmation when there is no material change, and prompt notice when a material change does occur. Will agreed to note the request, but clarified, at Stewart's prompting, that he had committed only to raising it internally rather than to Santee Cooper agreeing to provide the updates, and noted that Central Electric Cooperatives, as a co-contributor to the load forecast reviewed by Carl Ciullo and Greg McCormack and approved by the Joint Planning Committee, would also need to weigh in on any such commitment.
- Eddy Moore (Southern Alliance for Clean Energy (SACE)) asked whether Santee Cooper updates its Board when a material change in large load occurs, such as a large new customer signing or an existing one dropping off. Citing a three-gigawatt customer in Georgia, he noted that the scale of recently announced large loads represents a financial as well as a planning impact that could be of interest to bondholders. Will described Santee Cooper's normal annual cycle process culminating in the Board review each September, and the intent behind including the probable load in the forecast is to provide the Board, regulators, and stakeholders with a reliable planning estimate of potential new load. Will acknowledged the pace of large load activity is changing, and that a load of the magnitude described would be brought to the Board's attention.

2026 Triennial IRP Update

– Will Brown, Manager Resource Planning, Santee Cooper

Will reviewed the upcoming filing and stakeholder engagement schedule. Non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) will be made available toward the end of August, ahead of the Board presentation on September 29th and the IRP filing on September 30th. For working group members who execute an NDA, the associated input files will be made available one week after filing, with results files available two weeks after filing.

Will noted that Santee Cooper plans to pause stakeholder meetings during the regulatory proceeding, resuming after the May 2027 hearing. The goal is to hold a working group meeting to review assumptions before modeling begins, targeting the period between the hearing and the anticipated June/July 2027 start of modeling. Santee Cooper intends to develop the 2027 update assumptions using the same approach as in prior cycles, though earlier stakeholder input on any significant methodological changes, typically sought in March or April, may be more difficult to arrange on this timeline. Will recognized that issues surfacing during the regulatory proceedings may carry forward into the 2027 IRP Update slated to be filed in September.

- Taylor asked whether Santee Cooper is evaluating the effect of high load-factor large customers on the system's overall load factor, and what implications that has for production cost modeling. Will shared that the system is increasingly energy-constrained in summer months, with high-capacity factor operation needed to meet total energy requirements under the load curve, while winter remains more of a peak-demand event driven by cold-weather residential and commercial usage. Large, high load-factor customers are contributing to that shift. Taylor suggested that a slide showing forecasted energy growth would be helpful for stakeholders to better understand the resulting production cost implications.
- Findlay Salter (South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff (ORS)) and Jake Duncan (Vote Solar) separately asked for clarification on the meaning of the gray bar shown on the load forecast slide. Will confirmed it represents average system demand.
- Jake asked whether data center cooling load in summer affects the forecast differently than winter load, given that data centers tend to be less peaky in colder weather. Will confirmed that Santee Cooper's limited but growing data center load is summer-peaking, driving higher, flatter energy usage

in summer relative to winter, and noted that Joel Dison had pulled these loads out and modeled them separately in the reserve margin study given their relatively low volatility.

Bob added that a standard, publicly available data center load profile for South Carolina is not readily available industry-wide, and that Santee Cooper's load forecasting group is still developing its seasonal assumptions for this load type, though even a reasonable seasonal tilt would not shift the utility's system peak away from summer.

- Jake asked whether Santee Cooper had coordinated with other South Carolina utilities, such as Duke Energy and Dominion, who may be facing similar data center load questions. Will indicated Santee Cooper had not yet done so but was open to reaching out to counterparts. Bob noted that data-sharing on this topic is often complicated by confidentiality concerns when load profiles are drawn from a single customer or a small subset of customers.
- Eddy asked whether the recent Century Aluminum expansion is reflected in the near-term industrial load increase, and whether part of the 2027 increase reflects that facility's first winter online. Will confirmed Century Aluminum's added load is part of the increase, contributing to the near-term rise in both firm and non-firm industrial load, particularly in the 2026-to-2027 timeframe. Eddy noted that, since the forecast includes industrial non-firm load, a firm-only version of the load line would sit a couple hundred megawatts lower. Will confirmed this reflects how non-firm demand is treated in reserve margin accounting: the energy is planned for, but not the capacity, with non-firm load served through a non-firm resource in the modeling.
- Eddy then asked whether any data centers have signed up under Santee Cooper's new large load tariff, which requires substantial payment commitments, given the increase in the short-term load forecast. Will said the question was too outside his area to answer confidently in the moment.

Taylor shared that, per a rate study data request response, Santee Cooper does not expect any customers to take service under either the existing or proposed large load tariffs through the 2028 study period. Will thanked Taylor and confirmed that rate study information is posted on the Santee Cooper website.

Will walked through the system's capacity position, presented as a resource stack showing a surplus in 2033 and 2034 and a deficiency in all other years. The stack includes nuclear and coal (Cross and Winyah, with Winyah retiring in 2034) at the base, followed by combined cycle resources, including the Rainey conversion project coming online in 2027-2028, a Central Non-Shared Resource (NSR) addition in 2029, and Canadys entering as a peaking resource in 2033. A modest step-down appears in 2028 as Rainey units 2A and 2B convert to combined cycle (CC), and again at the end of 2033 with the retirement of the Myrtle Beach and Hilton Head combustion turbines (CT). Hydro and renewable resources remain relatively flat, with a slight near-term decline attributed to qualifying facility (QF) solar contracts assumed to run five years before rolling off. New solar is captured within the "purchase other" category, though its winter capacity value is limited under Effective Load Carrying Capability (ELCC) accounting. Purchased capacity declines further after 2032-2033, and battery capacity, largely under the 20-year Jeffries agreement, drops off as that contract term ends, with the model selecting the replacement resource.

Measured against the system's new 20 percent reserve margin target, the stack shows Santee Cooper falling short of peak demand plus reserves starting next year, a deficiency that persists until Canadys comes online. Will reinforced that this capacity shortfall, driven by increases in the load forecast relative to currently planned resources, was a key reason for convening this meeting.

- Findlay asked whether the peak demand and peak-plus-reserves lines shown include industrial non-firm load. Will confirmed they do. Findlay inquired further, clarifying he was asking specifically about the demand side of the chart, not the resource side, and confirmed with Will that Santee Cooper is in fact planning for non-firm loads, not just building a matching resource against them.

Will explained that both non-firm load and an offsetting non-firm resource are included in the accounting, a methodology change adopted in the 2023 IRP to align with peer utility practice; Santee Cooper carries more non-firm load on a total basis than its neighbors, making both figures appear larger relative to total system load. He noted the reserve margin calculation already accounts for non-firm load and its offsetting resource, so reserves are not separately planned for it, though Santee Cooper does plan to serve the associated energy. He described two non-firm product types, interruptible service and economy power (a buy-through arrangement), and explained that EnCompass models an offsetting "perfect capacity" resource, sized to the non-firm load expected at coincident peak and capped at a small usage limit, sitting at the top of the dispatch stack. Findlay confirmed, with Will and Bob Davis concurring, that this offsetting resource is captured within the "purchase other" category shown on the capacity position slide.

Bob added that, on a net basis, Santee Cooper is still planning for the capacity needed to serve total demand, but because non-firm and interruptible customers are represented in the chart as an offsetting resource, the utility is not planning new firm capacity to serve that non-firm load despite it appearing within peak demand.

- Eddy asked in follow-up, that if interruptible load is included in the peak demand line, should the offsetting capacity resource be visibly represented in the stacked bar, rather than folded into another category, since doing so could otherwise make the capacity gap look smaller than it is. Will and Bob confirmed the resource is, in fact, represented within the existing stack, with Will suggesting the team might consider breaking it out as a separate, distinctly colored resource in future presentations to improve clarity. Bob added that the non-firm/interruptible resource grows to roughly 450-500 MW by 2055, sized appropriately to serve the corresponding peak demand.
- Taylor asked whether Santee Cooper has engaged with new large load customers on demand response pricing and their willingness to accept non-firm service, or whether uncertainty remains as to which of those loads will ultimately be firm versus non-firm. Will stated he is not directly involved in those rate discussions but raised a broader consideration: given that Santee Cooper already carries a higher proportion of non-firm load than its neighboring utilities, there is a question of how much additional non-firm or interruptible load the system can absorb without increasing curtailment impacts on customers already taking non-firm service.

Taylor added that Duke Energy had reportedly announced plans to require new data centers on its system to take non-firm service, suggesting this may become a broader regional expectation.

Stewart provided context from his due diligence experience with data center developments, that "non-firm" varies widely in practice, citing for example, some MISO-territory arrangements only curtail under high-level system emergencies rather than routine peak shaving, and that NERC and PJM are actively examining the issue. He observed that most developers and tenants initially insist on firm capacity in their contracts, only exploring non-firm options later as they better understand their own operational flexibility, with speed to market the dominant data center industry priority currently.

- Taylor raised the U.S. Department of Energy's recent practice of issuing emergency orders during winter peaks requiring data centers to switch to backup generation, with an exemption from emissions limits under their minor source air permits, as a factor relevant to how much data center load Santee Cooper should plan capacity for at winter peak. Stewart noted that data center backup generators are typically permitted for only about 100 hours of operation per year, so repeated activation during a difficult year could bump against permit limits, and that the industry will likely need to collaborate with data center operators as they better understand their own load-shifting flexibility. Will thanked Taylor and Stewart for the context and indicated the topic would continue to be discussed as it evolves.

Will continued presenting on resource availability assumptions and shared that the identified shortfall in 2027 through 2030 complicates the IRP modeling, since Santee Cooper's existing assumptions hold that no new resource could reasonably come online before 2031. The EnCompass inputs will retain that assumption, with 2031 remaining the first year the model can select a new resource. Will indicated that Santee Cooper will still need to address the near-term shortfall separately, with the approach to be finalized as the preferred portfolio is developed; again, citing this near-term gap as one of the key reasons for convening the working group.

- Taylor asked whether, given that the earliest online date among the Competitive Procurement of Renewable Energy (CPRE) responses is 2029, there might be enough attractive bids to bring some of that capacity online sooner than the IRP's modeled 2031 first year-available assumption. Will distinguished the separate CPRE procurement process from the IRP's resource modeling assumptions: decisions on which, if any, CPRE solar projects to pursue will be made later this year, after the IRP filing, and the 2031 assumption is a modeling simplification rather than a decision to forgo earlier projects. He noted that 2029 and 2030 are advantageous start years under current tax credit timing, and that if attractive CPRE projects are available within that schedule, Santee Cooper would pursue them and reflect them in subsequent IRPs.
- Jake asked whether Santee Cooper had considered demand-side resources — specifically a residential behind-the-meter battery program modeled on Duke Energy's North Carolina Power Pair Program — as a near-term tool to address the capacity shortfall before Canadys comes online. He noted Duke's program is bringing on an estimated 72 MW of dispatchable, solar-paired battery storage within about two years, and that a similar program could be stood up in months. Will responded that Santee Cooper's DSM programs are limited to a small residential/commercial segment (industrial customers largely self-manage) and described an existing demand buyback rider that lets customers install behind-the-meter generation, with a capped buyback tied to system planning.

Jake clarified his suggestion was distinct from that rider: he meant a residential/small commercial "virtual power plant" model, where Santee Cooper offers an upfront incentive for battery adoption in exchange for dispatch rights during defined events. He noted such programs deploy quickly, without the interconnection or land requirements of utility-scale resources, making them a potential near-term bridge.

Will said he wasn't familiar with current residential program offerings, and that details would come with the upcoming IRP filing, with new programs also being evaluated through the rate case and market potential study (MPS). He added that Central Electric Cooperatives — a large share of system load — lets individual member co-ops design their own DSM programs, which vary widely (e.g., agricultural vs. residential territories). Jake encouraged Santee Cooper to keep considering the concept, offered to share supporting resources, and noted Duke had recently added a similar program to its NC IRP modeling.

- Building on Jake's point, Eddy noted that South Carolina's high rate of residential battery adoption alongside solar, driven in part by hurricane preparedness, means a substantial base of existing batteries could potentially be brought into a dispatchable capacity program relatively quickly, and would not be considered non-firm if dispatched under utility-controlled agreements. He separately raised a rate design concern previously flagged in the rate case: Santee Cooper's residential time-of-use energy rate, intended to reflect the avoided cost of shifting load off-peak, currently excludes solar and battery customers, which he argued limits the ability to draw on those resources for short-term capacity needs and represents an important link between the rate case and the IRP.
- Eddy also asked why, given that solar bids were received in July with projects potentially online by 2029, solar or battery resources could not be modeled coming online by 2030 rather than the assumed 2031. Will reiterated that 2031 is a simplifying modeling assumption while Santee Cooper evaluates

the economics and interconnection timelines of the CPRE bids, and noted that the newly issued all-source capacity RFP is a separate, parallel process that could surface projects further along in interconnection or procurement and able to come online sooner. He indicated the IRP filing would acknowledge both processes as potential sources of resources.

- Eddy asked why the capacity RFP does not allow solar-plus-storage bids. Will explained his understanding that South Carolina law requires renewable energy, including solar, to be acquired only through the CPRE process, though battery storage has occasionally been bundled with solar bids submitted through that process. Eddy pressed on the distinction, noting CPRE procures solar primarily as an energy resource while the capacity RFP is meant to address a short-term capacity need, and questioned the basis for excluding solar from the capacity RFP.
- Will added a closing clarification that CPRE is a defined, Commission-approved competitive process with established procedural steps to ensure fair bidding, distinct from the all-source capacity RFP that Santee Cooper is administering on its own.
- Taylor asked whether it may be aggressive to assume a new, non-brownfield combined cycle resource could reach commercial operation on a timeline aligned with Canadys, given that Canadys benefited from an established site and Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) process already underway. Will clarified that the model assumes development of an additional combined cycle would begin roughly two years after Canadys' 2033 online date, based on an assumed development timeline covering all regulatory, permitting, and procurement requirements.
- Taylor followed up to confirm whether the resulting online date aligns with Winyah's retirement at the end of 2034 or start of 2035. Will confirmed this reflects the combined cycle assumption, noting that this timeline has lengthened since the 2023 IRP. Taylor encouraged Santee Cooper to consider extending the assumed timeline further still, citing constrained turbine supply chains, rising equipment costs, and lengthening wait lists.
- Taylor asked whether Santee Cooper is tracking any specific projects, such as the merchant gas plant recently approved for a FILO permit in Kershaw County, as potential candidates for the demand buyback program or the capacity RFP. Will said he was not aware of any specific projects under consideration through those channels, noting that behind-the-meter installations would typically arise from individual customer negotiations, or through the member cooperatives' own discussions with their customers, and that Santee Cooper's load forecast would capture any such impacts on the demand or energy side rather than as a resource, unless it were a resource the utility directly controlled.
- Returning to Jake's earlier point on demand-side resources, Findlay asked how a dispatchable battery program, similar to the "Power Pair" concept, could actually be effectuated given that most residential and commercial load in Santee Cooper's territory is served indirectly through Central and its member cooperatives rather than through direct retail service; specifically, whether Santee Cooper would have direct dispatch control over such resources or would need to coordinate dispatch through Central. Stewart noted this raises contractual complexities better suited to a separate conversation, characterizing direct Santee Cooper dispatch of a co-op-sited battery as a meaningful, unresolved question rather than a straightforward capability.
- Findlay noted that, as the balancing authority, Santee Cooper would presumably have some degree of control and asked for a general sense of how this would work in practice. Will said he was not aware of any current program of this kind beyond limited non-firm participation by some Central and Santee Cooper rate customers, describing his understanding as preliminary. Findlay observed that as the capacity need grows, resolving how to effectuate this kind of demand-side dispatch is likely to become increasingly important.

- Findlay also offered that other utilities' pro forma electric service agreements with large customers often include provisions such as a defined ramp period, for example five years, during which a set number of hours of non-firm service are required each year. He suggested this structure exists to bridge the resource-availability gap shown, giving the utility time to bring new resources online to serve large hyperscale customers, and encouraged Santee Cooper to continue exploring large-load flexibility as a near- to mid-term tool alongside its contractual and procurement efforts. Will agreed, reiterating that 2031 remains a reasonable generic resource assumption, given constrained supply chains, while the CPRE and capacity RFP processes are separately being evaluated for resources that could become available sooner.

Will introduced the 2026 all-source capacity RFP, issued August 3rd with bids due back by September 1st. He confirmed that shortlist selections cannot be made until after the IRP filing, but that Santee Cooper expects to have a general sense of responses soon. He described a preference for resources connected within Santee Cooper's balancing area or directly to its system, noting that transmission capability to bring in off-system resources is becoming increasingly constrained. Will indicated that details, including the target years and preferred resource types, are posted on the RFP webpage, and that clarifying the purpose behind issuing the RFP was another key point the team wanted to share for this meeting.

Will highlighted that Santee Cooper had incorporated two pieces of stakeholder feedback into the IRP modeling. In response to input on long-duration storage costs, the team lowered the assumed capital cost by 25 percent from the original assumption, which he expects will allow long-duration storage to be selected in some cases in the later years of the study. Separately, in response to questions raised at the general notice meeting about rising diesel fuel costs and their potential impact on coal generation, the coal fuel price forecast was adjusted.

Will then discussed the Fairfield Nuclear Project, noting that since the prior meeting, when Fairfield was not expected to be part of the IRP, the project has passed several milestones and moved beyond its initial phase, including setting a Final Investment Decision (FID) date of March 2028. As a result, Santee Cooper will model Fairfield across all IRP portfolios, based on what has been received for the project's interconnection request: 1,250 MW coming online in 2031 and an additional 1,250 MW in 2032. Because Santee Cooper's ownership share of the jointly developed project is 25 percent, the IRP will model only that 25 percent of Fairfield's output as available to serve the Santee Cooper system, representing a significant resource addition across the portfolios.

In addition to including Fairfield in the base portfolios, Will confirmed Santee Cooper will run several side cases: an economically optimized portfolio excluding Fairfield, a thermal capital cost sensitivity run both with and without Fairfield, and the statutorily required side case retiring Winyah by 2028 under a net-zero scenario.

- Eddy asked for clarification on the mechanics of the capital cost sensitivity case relative to the economically optimized base case and the no-Fairfield case. Will explained that the sensitivity raises capital costs across all thermal resources by 50 percent, noting this would have limited effect on the renewable and storage portfolio, which selects little to no thermal capacity. Bob added that the purpose of the case is to test whether a 50 percent increase in thermal capital costs would change the optimal resource selections when the portfolio is re-optimized.
- Eddy asked for clarification on Fairfield's online date, noting an apparent discrepancy between an earlier reference to 2031 and a slide showing 2040. Will clarified that Santee Cooper is modeling the dates submitted in the project's interconnection request posted to OASIS: Unit 1 online in 2032 and Unit 2 in 2033, representing Santee Cooper's modeled share of the project. The 2040 date references a broader assumption of generic new nuclear coming online.

Eddy questioned the feasibility of the assumed timeline, citing that the project's FID is not expected until 2028, that four to five years is a fast construction timeline for nuclear, and that he recalled legislative testimony suggesting interconnection upgrades alone could take up to 12 years; his own assessment was that operation by 2032 seemed unlikely even under favorable conditions. Will responded that this concern is precisely why Santee Cooper intends to run the no-Fairfield side case, to understand what resource decisions would look like in the early-to-mid 2030s if Fairfield were delayed or did not materialize.

- Eddy asked about the cost assumption behind the proposed financial arrangement, under which Santee Cooper would reportedly receive \$2.5 billion and a 25 percent share of Fairfield's output¹. Bob confirmed only Santee Cooper's 25 percent offtake would be modeled for the IRP, based on generic AP1000 characteristics, with Santee Cooper assumed to incur a pass-through of the asset's fixed and variable operating and maintenance costs. When Eddy suggested this might translate to roughly \$30 per megawatt-hour, Bob said that sounded reasonable but noted he had not specifically reviewed the fixed-versus-variable cost breakdown. Will closed by noting that Fairfield's inclusion is a significant pivot for the IRP and welcomed the working group's feedback on the reasonableness of modeling the interconnection-request timeline, noting this was another central point for this meeting.
- Findlay asked whether Santee Cooper is running scenarios that assume current federal greenhouse gas (GHG) rules for new generation are repealed. Will said all portfolios are assumed to comply with GHG requirements currently in effect for new resources, including an emissions rate standard for new combined cycles and a 40 percent capacity factor limit for new combustion turbines. He indicated he did not see a need to model a separate scenario because the new H-class combined cycle units are efficient enough to run at high capacity factors regardless, and new combustion turbines would not be expected to exceed the 40 percent threshold.

Bob added that, under EPA's proposed rules, the requirement for carbon capture and sequestration as best available control technology has effectively been eliminated, and confirmed that Santee Cooper applies internal capacity factor limits of 40 percent for new H-class combustion turbines and 20 percent for other peaking assets such as reciprocating engines and LM6000 units, which satisfy the current GHG obligations; and the 20 and 40 percent limits currently have no practical effect on how those assets are operated, should the federal rules be repealed

- Findlay clarified that his concern was more specifically about coal plant retirement requirements under the GHG rules. Bob confirmed that Santee Cooper is not modeling coal plant retirement requirements, having eliminated that assumption along with the carbon capture and sequestration requirement for natural gas units. Will added his understanding that, while not yet formally published, these regulatory changes have cleared Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review and are proceeding toward finalization.
- Findlay asked how Fairfield's inclusion would affect the extensive Cross coal retirement analysis the working group had examined over several technical sessions, specifically whether Fairfield coming online would make retiring more of Cross's units more economically favorable. Bob confirmed that the coal retirement cases being run do include Fairfield as an asset, and that, as Findlay's question anticipated, this would likely improve the economic case for retiring Cross.

¹ Post meeting addendum: the non-binding terms of the MOU contemplate \$2.7 billion in cash to Santee Cooper should the parties reach a final investment decision and commit to constructing the units plus a targeted 25% ownership share for Santee Cooper, with proportional capacity, once the units begin commercial operation. The ownership benefits could be adjusted depending on the final cost of completing the units.

- Taylor asked whether the Engineer Procure Construct (EPC) bids Santee Cooper received for Canadys, referenced at the June board meeting, had prompted any changes to the IRP's cost assumptions for future resources. Will said no, indicating confidence in the current assumptions. Taylor followed up to ask whether the bids received fell within the range expected under the \$5 billion capital cost assumption; Will said that was his understanding, noting that while he was not directly involved in reviewing the bids, he had heard no indication of budget changes or cost increases and understood the bids to be coming in as expected.
- Jake asked whether, given that Fairfield's FID is still two years away and the IRP is updated annually, Santee Cooper would consider inverting its approach, treating no-Fairfield as the base case and Fairfield as a side case, consistent with a continuous planning process built around high-confidence resources. Will said the resource planning team had specifically debated this approach, but that Santee Cooper's management's confidence in the Fairfield project informed the strategic decision to model it in the base case, while committing to plan for readiness in case the project is delayed or does not materialize. Will encouraged the group to suggest any additional side cases they felt were missing.
- Taking up that invitation, Jake suggested that an illustrative modeling scenario for a dispatchable, behind-the-meter residential battery program, building on the earlier demand-side resource discussion and a related comment from Eddy, could help demonstrate the potential need and value of such a resource without requiring a fully developed program, and could support more productive conversations with Central on the topic.
- Responding to Eddy's question on contract term flexibility in the capacity RFP, Will confirmed Santee Cooper would entertain contracts of up to 20 years for newly built resources. Eddy asked whether existing resources willing to sign shorter-term contracts, for example, seven years, would also be considered, reasoning that locking in available existing capacity could provide a hedge given uncertainty around Fairfield's timeline. Will confirmed that a five-year term is not a cutoff for existing resources, and that all bids, due in September with shortlisting in October, would be evaluated on their merits, adding that more detail is available within the RFP itself.
- Eddy asked when the RFP's 750 MW capacity target was established and whether it had been planned as part of the prior IRP filing. Will indicated it had not been planned in the last IRP, and that the target was in fact lower than the amount sought in Santee Cooper's previous capacity RFP. Will was not certain of the specific reason for the reduction but believed it was related to bidder expectations and typical project sizing.

Will closed the resource planning update by noting that Santee Cooper will continue filing quarterly CPRE reports with the Commission, with the September filing expected to provide added detail on the types of bids received and potentially some pricing information. He said that, based on the pricing received to date, Santee Cooper believes its IRP cost assumptions remain reasonable. Will thanked the group for its engagement and expressed hope that the meeting had met the working group's expectations for Santee Cooper's commitment to keep stakeholders informed of material changes through the stakeholder process.

Meeting Closeout

– Stewart Ramsay, Meeting Facilitator, Vanry Associates

Stewart closed the meeting by reviewing the action items and thanked participants for their engagement. Will thanked everyone for their input and for finding time to attend on short notice.

Commitments and Next Steps

ACTION ITEM – noted during the meeting discussion	By WHOM
1. Santee Cooper will monitor the status of the ELG rule and consider the impacts from changes in requirements on the Winyah retirement date	Resource Planning
2. Resource Planning will share the request with the Santee Cooper Load Forecast team to consider providing stakeholders quarterly and/or material change updates to the probable load forecast	Resource Planning
3. Santee Cooper will consider reaching out to Duke to understand their modeling of data center loads, specifically load shapes	Resource Planning
4. Update the Capacity Position chart to break out a separate category for demand response, including non-firm load	Resource Planning

Next Steps:

- The 2026 IRP will be filed on September 30, 2026
- The next working group meeting will be on October 7, 2026

APPENDIX A

List of Stakeholder Working Group Members and Attendees

ORGANIZATION	MEMBER / ALTERNATE	August 11 th ATTENDEES
Office of Regulatory Staff	Findlay Salter Jeffery Gordon Julian McElhaney Shane Hyatt	Findlay Salter Jeffery Gordon Julian McElhaney Shane Hyatt
SC Dept of Consumer Affairs	Jake Edwards Roger Hall	Jake Edwards
SC Dept of Natural Resources	Elizabeth Miller Lorianne Riggin	Elizabeth Miller
SC Dept of Environmental Services	Rhonda Thompson Marie Brown	Marie Brown
Central	Caleb Bryant Leslie Maley	Caleb Bryant
J. Pollock	Jeffery C. Pollock Jonathan Ly	Jonathan Ly
Century Aluminum	Michael Early	
Nucor	Bradley Powell Karl Winkler	
Messer	Michael Peters Steven Castracane	
Google	Katie Ottenweller Will Cleveland	
SC Association of Municipal Power Systems	Adam Hedden Eric Budds	
Individual	Charles Hucks	
Individual	Richard Berry	
Individual	Diane Bell	
Individual	Dennis Boyd	
Carolinas Clean Energy Business Association	Hamilton Davis John Burns	Hamilton Davis
Conservation Voters of South Carolina	Erin Siebert Jalen Brooks-Knepfle John Brooker	Jalen Brooks-Knepfle
Coastal Conservation League	Kennedy Bennett Taylor Allred	Taylor Allred
Energy Justice Coalition	Shayne Kinloch Zakiya Esper	
South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center	Sue Berkowitz	
South Carolina Research Authority	Greg Wilcox	

Southern Alliance for Clean Energy	Eddy Moore Maggie Shober	Eddy Moore
Southern Environmental Law Center	Anna Sommer Chelsea Hotaling Kate Mixson Nina Peluso Thomas Gooding	Chelsea Hotaling Thomas Gooding
Sierra Club	David Rogers Dori Jaffe Mikaela Curry Sari Amiel	Sari Amiel
Vote Solar	Jake Duncan	Jake Duncan
Southeastern Wind Coalition	Jocelyn Juliano	Jocelyn Juliano
Santee Cooper Resource Planning	Clay Settle Ellie Gallagher Will Brown	Ellie Gallagher Will Brown
nFront Consulting	Bob Davis Jonathan Nunes	Bob Davis
Vanry Associates	Peter Claghorn Stewart Ramsay Yvette Smith	Peter Claghorn Stewart Ramsay Yvette Smith

**Members listed in alpha order by first name*

Also in Attendance

Carolinas Conservation League (CCL)	Dylan McGuire
Century Aluminum	Annie Saum
Dominion Energy	Gerald Skipper
Energy Futures Group (SELC, CCL)	Drew Siebenaler
Sierra Club	Érida Tosini-Corea