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 #5 – Meeting Summary

Date: February 26, 2025

Time: 1:00 – 3:56 pm EDT

Location: Virtual Meeting via Zoom, Vanry Associates facilitating

Meeting: Santee Cooper Stakeholder Working Group Session #5

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 & February Meeting Attendees

Meeting Information & Materials

The Santee Cooper Resource Planning team held its fifth IRP Stakeholder Working Group meeting on Wednesday, February 26, 2025. The IRP Stakeholder Working Group is integral to Santee Cooper's commitment to engage stakeholders in its ongoing integrated resource planning process. The fifth meeting covered several key topics, including a review of the 2024 IRP Update, coal retirement methodology and related transmission cost impacts, the load forecast process and economic development loads, and demand-side management. The group emphasized the importance of stakeholder feedback and discussed potential technical meetings for detailed discussions on emerging technologies and methodologies, as well as energy efficiency and demand response in the coming months.

The presentation that was shared during the meeting is posted to the Stakeholder Working Group section of the Santee Cooper 2024-2026 IRP Stakeholder Process webpage, along with meeting summaries from the first four working group meetings.

Session Participation

The Stakeholder Working Group includes a set membership of 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 and assign a primary and secondary member.

Appendix A lists the working group member organizations and the members who attended the February 26, 2025, meeting. Two new member organizations are included: the South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center and the South Carolina Research Authority.

Topics, Presenters, and Discussion

The presentation, which included the meeting agenda and associated timing, was emailed to members on February 19, 2025.

Welcome and Agenda
– Stewart Ramsay, Meeting Facilitator, Vanry Associates

Stewart Ramsay outlined the meeting agenda, emphasizing that the session design included generous time allocations per topic. He highlighted the importance of ensuring ample time for thoughtful conversation and stakeholder input.

Stewart introduced new members, including Greg Wilcox from the South Carolina Research Authority and David Millar, the new Director of Resource Planning for Santee Cooper, and invited both to share more. Greg detailed his energy and environmental research background, emphasizing his experience in developing innovative solutions for energy challenges. Dave highlighted his diverse experience in energy economics and policy, bringing a broad perspective to his new role.

Working Group Business
– Clay Settle, Manager Resource Planning, Santee Cooper

Building on previous discussions, Clay reviewed the action items from the last meeting. The first task was for Stewart to note Santee Cooper's decision on the Transmission Impact Analysis (TIA) information-sharing request, which was unsatisfactory, according to Eddy Moore (Southern Alliance for Clean Energy). This was annotated in the Meeting #4 Summary report.

Next discussed was making general notice meetings more accessible. Resource Planning is working with Vanry to implement changes by April's meeting. Stewart discussed ongoing work to simplify technical topics for a broader audience. He stressed the importance of framing discussions so all stakeholders, regardless of expertise, could understand.

- Taylor Allred (Carolina Conservation League) voiced strong support for these efforts and offered to engage offline for further discussion.
- Stewart acknowledged the challenge of accommodating a broader audience while maintaining technical depth, noting that alternative meeting times might be needed to increase participation.

Stewart continued the conversation for the next action item regarding the potential opportunity for data centers that come online to offset costs associated with retiring coal plants earlier. He provided context from other engagements and explained that it is a broader issue about managing the connection and load demands from data centers. Utilities often need to expedite construction to meet the large, urgent power needs of data centers and are likely to incur additional, unplanned costs. He shared there are examples where these costs are assumed by the data center developers, ensuring utility customers are not burdened. Stewart has seen acceptance from both sides (utilities and developers) that these extra costs are reasonable. He suggested that Santee Cooper quantify these costs and share them with developers.

- Clay noted that Santee Cooper had a dedicated team evaluating how to balance economic growth with customer protection and risk management.
- Will Brown added that Anna Sommer (Southern Environmental Law Center), who was experiencing technical difficulties getting into the meeting, could contribute insights to the conversation; Stewart committed to following up with her offline.

Next, Clay recapped the action item assigned to John Burns, noting that John had shared testimony from transmission planning experts for the Duke Carbon Plan and other areas, which completed that task. Clay

also mentioned a discussion from the last meeting about the transmission cost methodology for coal retirements and that no additional feedback was received by the end of the year.

- Taylor raised a point about the integration of the South Carolina Regional Transmission Planning (SCRTP) group into the Southeastern Regional Transmission Planning (SRTEP) group, which offers the opportunity for more integrated planning in the southeast. He suggested replicating Duke's Carolinas Transmission Planning Collaborative model for Santee Cooper and possibly coordinating with Dominion. Taylor also referenced upcoming regional transmission planning efforts that will follow the implementation of FERC Order 1920.
- Clay welcomed further discussion from any members who wanted to contribute after the call.

Clay confirmed the Resource Planning team had continued conversations regarding performing portfolio resource adequacy analysis. This involves checking the reliability of portfolios developed during the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) process using software like SERVM. Clay confirmed that this analysis would be conducted for the 2026 Triannual IRP.

- Anna expressed er appreciation and inquired if this analysis would be done iteratively or as a final check on the portfolios. Clay responded that they are still deciding but noted that doing it iteratively seems like the simplest option. However, they aim to find the most efficient method, given the workload involved in the IRP process.

The final action item fell to Taylor regarding potential cost reductions through the Department of Energy (DOE) programs. Taylor confirmed via email soon after Meeting #4 that after reviewing the program, there are no additional savings for Santee Cooper, as they already have favorable debt rates. Stewart mentioned that this is an advantage for Santee Cooper.

- Rahul Dembla added that Santee Cooper had issued bonds, which were approved by its Board earlier that day. These bonds included both new funds and refunding savings, with an all-in cost of just over 4% for long-term debt. He shared this as a positive update regarding Santee Cooper's credit situation, noting that it allows the organization to fund resource needs cost-effectively.

Clay confirmed that there were no other outstanding items before moving on to the next conversation topic.

2024 IRP Update Status
– Clay Settle, Manager Resource Planning, Santee Cooper

Clay reviewed the 2025 planning schedule, detailing key meetings and topics. A general notice meeting is planned for early April, followed by potential technical meetings that could be scheduled as needed for more in-depth discussions or to address emerging issues. Members reviewed schedules, addressed concerns about the methodology for IRP studies, and discussed the possibility of technical meetings for specific topics like battery storage, long-duration storage, and wind resource deployment in South Carolina. Additionally, they explored opportunities for stakeholder input and potential expert involvement, particularly around emerging technologies like advanced nuclear and demand-side management.

- Anna raised a question about the timing of the Market Potential Study (MPS) discussion, expressing concern that their technical expert was not present. Clay clarified that the MPS would be addressed at a higher level in the current meeting. Will Brown (Resource Planning) explained that today's meeting was meant as an introduction and that a more detailed technical meeting would be scheduled later, allowing the relevant experts to participate.
- Taylor asked about scheduling additional technical meetings, particularly for the load forecast and coal retirement methodology, and inquired about updates to the battery storage methodology following last year's meeting. Clay indicated the battery storage methodology would be covered in the June Working

Group meeting, with further technical meetings as needed. Taylor emphasized the importance of early updates, allowing for meaningful feedback and research.

- Will suggested bringing in a presenter to discuss emerging technologies, like long-duration storage or advanced nuclear and asked for input. Taylor expressed interest in long-duration storag**e** and raised the idea of exploring wind energy deployment in South Carolina, noting that more study is needed to assess its feasibility since there is currently no wind energy capacity in the state. Clay responded that Santee Cooper's research and development (R&D) team is commissioning a study on the feasibility of onshore wind, which is expected to inform the 2026 IRP. Taylor offered connections to wind deployment experts as valuable resources for continued conversation. Will encouraged members to bring forward topic presenters for future meetings.
- Steve Thomas (Century Aluminum) expressed interest in potential technologies that could extend the life of coal generation resources. He mentioned carbon sequestration as not currently viable but wondered if future technologies might help support cost or price-sensitive customers. Clay acknowledged the point and said they'd address it in the coal retirement section later.
- Shayne Kinloch (South Carolina Energy Justice Coalition) asked about Santee Cooper's energy efficiency programs, how they are deployed, and if there are plans for expansion. Clay confirmed the MPS discussion later in the meeting will cover energy efficiency and DSM programs.
- Denny Boyd (Nucor) advocated for technical meetings on nuclear and battery storage, primarily from the perspective of stakeholder education, to dispel potential fears related to the technologies or to clear up misconceptions. Clay acknowledged the points he had made.

Clay finished the discussion by providing an update on the status and procedural schedule for the 2024 IRP annual update and confirming that all documents were available on the Public Service Commission website.

Coal Retirement Methodology
– Clay Settle, Manager Resource Planning, Santee Cooper
– Bob Davis, Executive Consultant, nFront Consulting

Clay provided an overview of the coal retirement methodology for the 2026 IRP which builds on the work from the 2023 IRP. The study will evaluate when best to retire coal plants, specifically looking at different scenarios for the Cross and Winyah stations. The process will include analyzing transmission costs and resource planning impacts, to retire plants when reliable replacement capacity is available. The study will also develop a cost curve and evaluate different options, including retiring Cross 1, Cross 2, or the full plant.

- Steve inquired about the scrubbing status of the Winyah and Cross units. Will confirmed that both are scrubbed, with Winyah being one of the first plants to install scrubbers.
- Taylor tested whether the recent capacity factor forecasts included any analysis related to the retirement methodology. Clay confirmed that the capacity factors discussed were based on existing modeling from the 2023 IRP available in the data room [on the Santee Cooper IRP webpage].
- Taylor also asked if any changes in the allowed effluent temperature at Winyah had been evaluated for potential impact on capacity factors. Clay indicated that was a question for the Santee Cooper environmental team and committed to following up. Bob and Clay were able to say that assumptions were updated yearly based on the latest data from the generation team. If any re-rating or de-rating of units, it would be reflected in their modeling, including any costs related to environmental compliance efforts.

The discussion then covered the Cross Retirement Study, which aims to determine optimal retirement dates and portfolio strategies, focusing on partial and full plant retirements, assessing transmission costs, and exploring different sensitivities. The study will consider a baseline with no retirements, as well as scenarios like retiring just Cross 1 and 2 (the older units) or the full plant. Sensitivities will include scenarios with unrestricted capacity expansion, restrictions on gas generation after 2035, or allowing peakers or small modular reactors for replacement. The study will plot a cost curve to analyze trends over the study period. The belief is that studying the scheduled retirement dates would provide similar insights to an endogenous analysis, and the team is open to stakeholder input.

- Anna asked how transmission and generation models would be integrated, particularly since transmission costs may vary depending on which resources replace the Cross plant. Clay explained that the process would first develop portfolio strategies based on different scenarios and then pass those strategies to the transmission planning group for a study to assess costs. Those costs will then inform the Cross analysis.
- Anna followed up, suggesting the possibility of iterating between transmission studies and portfolio analysis to avoid relying solely on transmission upgrades and instead consider generator solutions for mitigating transmission issues. Bob responded that the transmission group takes an optimistic approach, citing assets where they cause the least impact, and may also consider operational strategies to resolve constraints. He agreed with Anna's suggestion that if Winyah is retired, new generation may be placed there to minimize transmission issues.
- Taylor inquired about the potential for gas-fired capacity at the Winyah and Cross sites, given the existing pipeline infrastructure. Clay explains that any significant gas capacity would likely require upgrades, and Cross would need a new pipeline. For smaller units like combustion turbines or peakers, less gas would be required, but larger units would need infrastructure improvements. Bob reminded members that the Cross site has no gas infrastructure and requires a new pipeline, while Winyah has a pipeline, but it's at the end of the Carolina Gas Transmission (CGT) system. It's unclear whether interruptible gas will be available in the future. He confirmed that a small, low-demand unit might be possible at Winyah if the existing pipeline could be utilized, though gas availability is uncertain.

Clay went on to outline the study process, which involves using the EnCompass model to develop portfolio strategies and identify potential resource scenarios. These are then given to the transmission planning group, which conducts studies to develop cost assumptions. The transmission costs are fed back into EnCompass for the Cross retirement evaluation, which will happen later this year. It's a stepped process to integrate transmission costs into the retirement analysis.

- The current schedule: scenario development is targeted for completion by March. The transmission planning group will conduct studies from March to August. Transmission costs will be provided in the fall, and the Cross-retirement evaluation will take place in the fall and winter after the IRP updates are completed. Feedback areas include scenario sensitivity, design, and technologies for the Cross-retirement evaluation, with other feedback welcome.
- Anna checked if the assumptions for the Cross Retirement Study will be identical to those in the 2026 IRP. Clay explained that they will likely use the 2025 annual update assumptions since that will be the most recent data available when conducting the study. The results will then inform the 2026 IRP update. Anna acknowledges this, noting that they have strong opinions about the load forecast and technology cost assumptions, which they plan to provide more detailed feedback on after the meeting.
- Taylor suggested revisiting the scenarios, sensitivities, and technologies for the Cross Retirement Study at the June meeting, allowing for feedback before the evaluation begins in September. He

emphasized the importance of having a clear starting point for discussion. Clay agreed and suggested a more detailed technical discussion later in the year to address concerns.

- Findlay Salter (Office of Regulatory Staff) supported a more technical discussion regarding both the transmission upgrades and the coal retirement evaluation. Clay appreciated the feedback.

2025 Load Forecast
– Greg McCormack, Senior Manager Financial Forecast, Santee Cooper
– Carl Ciullo, Financial Analyst, Santee Cooper

Greg McCormack led a discussion on the 2025 Load Forecast. The presentation served as a **refresh for working group members** rather than a data presentation, as the forecast is still in its early stages. Santee Cooper anticipates completing the forecast by **mid-May**, following a process similar to previous years.

Greg highlighted the significant increase in Santee Cooper's load forecast between the 2023 and 2024 IRPs, attributing it to population growth and industrial development. Originally, the system was expected to reach 6,000 MW by 2041, but the revised forecast projects hitting 6,000 MW by 2027 and 7,000 MW by 2033 due to new economic development loads.

He detailed the load forecasting process, highlighting collaboration with Santee Cooper staff, GDS Associates, Central Electric Power Cooperative, and the Energy Authority. The forecast includes residential, commercial, and industrial customers, with a focus on Santee Cooper's distribution system in the Myrtle Beach area, which has experienced rapid growth. The forecast also accounts for energy efficiency measures, electric vehicles, and rooftop solar.

Greg further explained the inclusion of stochastic analysis to evaluate potential new large loads, emphasizing input from various Santee Cooper teams to ensure accurate predictions. The final load adjustment is based on a 50th-percentile result from a 50,000-run stochastic analysis.

Taylor began the discussion:

- He asked if potential large loads are being asked about the possibility of interruptible service or clean energy requirements. Greg responded that while he isn't directly involved with customers, conversations are happening to assess whether Santee Cooper is a good fit for their needs. Interruptible load projections haven't been factored in, although it is something they might consider how best to fit into the forecasting.
- He suggested including clean energy commitments in load forecasts, particularly for companies like Google, which have firm decarbonization goals. Greg acknowledged this point and agreed that they will consider these factors in discussions, though no customers have yet raised clean energy requirements.
- Taylor then asked whether Santee Cooper is considering aggregate constraints (e.g., water or fiber optic capacity) that could affect multiple data centers or large loads collectively. Greg replied that while water constraints have been discussed, they haven't flagged any significant concerns at an aggregate level. However, they did bring in network services experts to evaluate fiber optics, and there were no concerns about capacity, especially with the installation of new infrastructure like subsea cables.

David Millar added that data center demand response has been on his radar as a potential way to manage peak demand. He also mentioned that they are open to discussions with companies like Google about clean energy portfolios, though current data center developers are more focused on obtaining cheap and fast power rather than pushing for green energy.

- Anna asked about large load scenarios and sensitivities for the next IRP. Greg explained that a stochastic analysis would be used, which provides high, low, and 50/50 projections based on probabilities applied to customer ramp schedules. This allows for a smoother forecast, though individual customer load increases may be more "blocky." Carl Ciullo added that the overall growth of the system is driven by both the stochastic model and smoother statistical methods for other customers.
- Anna also raised concerns about the impact of large loads on resource planning, noting that these customers can significantly influence resource selection. She suggested that assumptions about customer rates and network costs could introduce risk and advocated for a "no additional large load" sensitivity in the next IRP. This would help assess the true cost of serving large customers and provide important information for resource planning. Greg acknowledged her points and appreciated the feedback.
- John Brooker (Conservation Voters of South Carolina) asked whether Santee Cooper is considering the recent report, *Rethinking Load Growth: Assessing the Potential for Integration of Large Flexible Loads in US Power Systems*. He suggested it would be useful in considering large loads on the Santee Cooper system.
- Findlay Salter (South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff) asked about how non-firm industrial load is handled in the forecast and whether it drives peak demand. Greg explained that non-firm load is included in winter peak calculations. At the same time, Clay added that it's treated as a dispatchable resource, similar to a demand response program, and doesn't drive the need for additional capacity.
- Findlay then inquired about the development of a large load tariff to manage risks associated with potential large loads that may not materialize. Rahul Dembla confirmed that Santee Cooper and Central are working on this issue, including risk management and cost impacts.
- Findlay highlighted the importance of considering interruptible loads in the interconnection queue and ensuring the system isn't overbuilt. Greg responded that they avoid making assumptions about customers unless there's clear information but could consider interruptible loads in future planning.

Greg concluded the load forecast discussion, noting that Myrtle Beach's residential and commercial growth is about 100 MW, with the industrial load (firm and non-firm) remaining flat. Central's forecast shows strong growth of 650 MW, while potential large loads increase over time. He mentioned further analysis on interruptible loads and water usage and promised to provide updates in the future.

2026 Demand Side Management Market Potential Studies
– Steven Roys, Manager Program Development, Santee Cooper

Steven Roys presented the 2026 Demand Side Management (DSM) and Market Potential Studies (MPS), which will feed into the 2026 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). These studies focus on reducing energy consumption and demand during peak times through energy efficiency (e.g., upgrading to efficient HVAC systems) and demand response programs (e.g., reducing energy use during cold winter mornings or hot summer afternoons).

Two separate studies, one for energy efficiency and one for demand response, are planned. They will follow a timeline starting with an overview in February 2025, an April public meeting, and technical meetings to discuss assumptions and feedback. The results will be reviewed in late 2025, with final studies expected in early 2026. The goal is to ensure accurate assumptions and effective programs for reducing energy use.

- Anna inquired whether Santee Cooper would use the same vendor and whether conversations about the MPS assumptions include the different levels of potential that are likely to emerge and how these might be bundled together for analysis in the IRP. Steven explained that during the April meeting, they plan to discuss several key items: cost-test methodology (including the utility cost test), the number of scenarios (low, medium, high), cost-effectiveness thresholds, and how measures could be considered at various levels (measure, program, or portfolio). A list of potential measures for both residential and commercial sectors will be provided, and Steven emphasized that specific programs are not slated for design at this stage.
- Anna flagged several points for future discussion, including grossing up savings to the generator level, using marginal land losses, bundling measures for maximizing cost-effectiveness, and incorporating emerging technologies in the MPs. She offered to submit these comments before the April meeting to ensure they could be considered early. Steven assured that feedback could be sent before the meeting, and while it might not influence the initial recommendations, it would be considered for the final MPS. While the meeting plan is not yet finalized, Steven confirmed the meeting will address data sources (e.g., EIA Data) and external factors, such as federal funding and IRA funds, and how these might impact the potential studies.
- Findlay asked about how incentives are calculated and whether they are looking at industry trends or other utilities for guidance. Steven explained that they haven't finalized their approach yet but are considering setting a threshold, likely around 75% of the cost of items, based on their 2023 high scenario. The incentive level will depend on the scenario, combining industry standards and internal decisions.

Meeting Close

– Stewart Ramsay, Meeting Facilitator, Vanry Associates

The meeting concluded with a review of action items, including following up with Anna on the data center cost, providing a summary of methodology changes, and developing a plan for upcoming technical meetings on market potential, coal retirement, and transmission scenarios.

Participants were asked to email Will Brown by March 5 regarding their interest in attending technical meetings. Santee Cooper will also consider a low load forecast for the IRP.

The next working group meeting is planned for late April, with the next general notice meeting scheduled for April 3, 2025. Participants were encouraged to offer feedback on the session.

Commitments and Next Steps

ACTION ITEMS – noted during the meeting discussion	**By WHOM**
1. Follow up with Anna Sommer offline regarding Mtg4 Action Item 3 – Data Center Costs (given she missed some of the discussion due to connection issues).	Vanry
2. Resource Planning is open to following up offline regarding action items with members who were unable to make the meeting upon their request.	Santee Cooper

3. Provide members with a summary of changes made in the portfolio analysis methodology in a timely manner to allow for meaningful participation at upcoming sessions. — Santee Cooper

4. Develop a plan to host potential technical meetings as follows: — Santee Cooper / All
   - Market potential study session in late April
   - Coal retirement meeting in the spring, related to transmission study scenarios
   - Coal retirement meeting in the summer related to methodology and technologies to consider

   Please email Will Brown (will.brown@santeecooper.com) by Wednesday, March 5th, about which technical meetings you'd be interested in attending.

5. Resource Planning will consider a low load forecast without a probable load for the 2026 IRP — Santee Cooper

Next Steps:

- The next Working Group meeting is targeted for late April 2025
- A General Notice meeting is tentatively scheduled for April 3, 2025
- A series of technical meetings are being considered these to be held in the spring and summer months
- Members wishing to present a topic at a future meeting may contact Will Brown or Clay Settle

APPENDIX A

List of Stakeholder Working Group Members and Attendees

ORGANIZATION	MEMBER / ALTERNATE	FEBRUARY 26TH ATTENDEE
Office of Regulatory Staff	Findlay Salter **Shane Hyatt**	Findlay Salter Jeffrey 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**	
SC Dept of Environmental Services	**Rhonda Thompson** Robbie Brown	Robbie Brown
Central	**Caleb Bryant** Leslie Maley	Heather Zrust William Potter
J. Pollock	Jeffry C. Pollock **Jonathan Ly**	Jonathan Ly
Century Aluminum	**Michael Early** **Stephen Thomas**	Stephen Thomas
Nucor	Bradley Powell **Denny Boyd** Karl Winkler	Bradley Powell Denny Boyd
Messer	**Michael Peters** Steven Castracane	Mike Peters Steven Castracane
Google	**Katie Ottenweller** Will Cleveland	
SC Association of Municipal Power Systems	**Adam Hedden** Eric Budds	Adam Hedden
Individual	**Charles Hucks**	Charles Hucks
Individual	**Richard Berry**	Richard Berry
Individual	**Diane Bell**	Dianne Bell
Carolinas Clean Energy Business Association	Hamilton Davis **John Burns**	John Burns
Conservation Voters of South Carolina	Erin Siebert **Jalen Brooks-Knepfle** John Brooker	Jalen Brooks-Knepfle John Brooker
Coastal Conservation League	Emily Cedzo **Taylor Allred**	Taylor Allred
Energy Justice Coalition	Shayne Kinloch **Zakiya Esper**	Shayne Kinloch
South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center	**Sue Berkowitz**	
South Carolina Research Authority	**Greg Wilcox**	Greg Wilcox
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy	**Eddy Moore** **Maggie Shober**	

Southern Environmental Law Center	Anna Sommer Chelsea Hotaling **Kate Mixson**	Anna Sommer Chelsea Hotaling Thomas Gooding
Sierra Club	**David Rogers** Dori Jaffe Sari Amiel	Dave Rogers Dori Jaffe Sari Amiel
Vote Solar	**Jake Duncan**	Jake Duncan
Santee Cooper Resource Planning	**Clay Settle** David Millar Rahul Dembla **Will Brown**	Clay Settle David Millar Rahul Dembla Will Brown
Santee Cooper Financial Forecast		Greg McCormack Carl Ciullo
Santee Cooper Transmission Planning		Chris Wagner Weijian Cong
nFront Consulting	**Bob Davis** Jonathan Nunes	Bob Davis Jonathan Nunes
Vanry Associates	Peter Claghorn **Stewart Ramsay** Yvette Smith	Peter Claghorn Stewart Ramsay Yvette Smith
Haley & Aldrich		Dawn Santoianni

**Members listed in alpha order by first name*