December 17, 2019 RPG Meeting Notes

**Miscellaneous Updates**

Stephen (RCEC) gave an update on the RCEC integration indicating that everything is on track for integration to start on January 6 with all of the load moved over to ERCOT by January 7.

Paul Bell (Oncor) gave an update on the status of the CCNs for the integration of LP&L. Paul provided a map that shows the configuration and the updated station names. Based on a stakeholder question, Paul clarified that Oncor is building two 115 kV lines and the 345/115 kV transformers for LP&L and will submit the updates for those projects to the PUCT monthly construction progress report, but LP&L will ultimately own the facilities.

Cole Diedert (EPE) provided an update on behalf of LP&L on the integration into ERCOT. Cole indicated that the LP&L integration is on track for June 2021. The Planning models have been updated. The Operations modeling will begin in March 2020.

Doug Evans asked if the ERCOT map would be updated, but no one representing ERCOT was sure.

**2020 RTP Scope**

Ping Yan (ERCOT) gave an overview of the scope for the 2020 Regional Transmission Plan, highlighting the main difference from the 2019 RTP. Several stakeholders warned to be careful with the terminology used for distributed resources.

**Corpus North Shore Project**

Ben Richardson (ERCOT) provided an update on ERCOT’s independent review of the Corpus North Shore Project. The study models have been updated based on an additional 144 MW of newly committed industrial load. The analysis showed overloads under several contingencies and bus voltage violations. The next step is to study project alternatives. The current timeline is to finish the analysis by end of Q1 2020.

Walter Reid (Advanced Power Alliance) commented that ERCOT should conduct economic analysis to analyze the congestion relief benefits of the various options.

Brad Meyers (AEP) asked about the treatment of the Gregory Power Partners plant which has seasonally mothballed. Ben responded by indicating ERCOT treated it as a G-1 in the summer analysis but would perform a maintenance outage scenario for an off-peak case with the plant out of service.

**Valley Import Project**

Sun Wook Kang (ERCOT) gave an update on ERCOT’s independent review of the AEP and STEC Valley Import Projects. Sun Wook indicated that this would be the final update to RPG until the LNG loads that are driving the need for the project are confirmed with financial commitment and notice to proceed to construction. Sun Wook went through the key findings which showed the need for upgrades within the Valley and outside of the Valley if new LNG load materializes and ERCOT’s preferred options at this point. If the LNG load does not materialize some upgrades will be needed by 2027.

AEP had questions about if the recommendation would change if a different (larger) LNG facility committed before the one assumed in the study. ERCOT indicated that they would need to study that condition further, but the upgrades would be a subset of the preferred projects for the scenario that includes all of the LNG load.

There were several stakeholder questions around the cost estimates. ERCOT explained the cost estimate assumptions including why Options 2 and 3 have a lower per mile cost estimate when compared to Option 1 (which is due to Coastal wind loading and soil assumptions).

There were also several stakeholder questions about generation assumptions. Regarding sensitivities, ERCOT did not perform a sensitivity analysis that included the San Miguel plant not being available.

Clayton Greer (Morgan Stanley) asked if an LNG load was confirmed if the project would go straight to TAC and not need to go back to RPG. Sun Wook answered that ERCOT would examine the changes in assumptions once that happens and then decide the appropriate next step.

**Delaware Basin Study**

Ying Li (ERCOT) went over the final results from the Delaware Basin Study. Ying presented a roadmap showing five stages of upgrades with trigger levels in terms of total Delaware Basin load. Ying also described the study assumptions that could change the trigger levels.

There were several stakeholder comments about battery energy storage modeling. ERCOT stated that there are not many BES meeting the requirements (Planning Guide 6.9) for inclusion in the models, and that a larger discussion with stakeholders on planning model assumptions will be needed.