**Planning Working Group (PLWG) Meeting Minutes**

**April 29, 2025 (In Person + WebEx)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** | **Antitrust Admonition**Antitrust admonition was given. | **Chair** |
| **2.** | **Agenda Review**Agenda was reviewed. | **Chair** |
| **3.** | **Review of PLWG Meeting Minutes (March 18)**Meeting minutes reviewed. No feedback received. | **Chair** |
| **4.** | **PGRR 120 – SSO Prevention for Generator Interconnection** | **PLWG** |
|  | * **Review ERCOT Comments**

Megan Miller (ERCOT) spoke to comments filed on April 16.Aditi Upadhyay (Lone Star) – Concerned that the proposed cutoff date of September 1, 2025, would impact projects that have incurred significant investment. Doesn’t believe that banning interconnection is a prudent approach in light of system growth forecast.Megan – ERCOT would push back on calling this a “ban” since there are pathways in existing language for a generator to pursue transmission enhancements (e.g. Protocol Section 3.11.4.11). | **ERCOT** |
|  | * **Review Smart Wires Comments**

Ted Bloch-Rubin, Juan Botero, and Alex Al-Homsi with Smart Wires provided presentation “SmartValve for Series Compensation without SSR.” This is a technology of Modular Static Synchronous Series Compensators (M-SSSC) to mitigate risk of SSO/SSR. Aditi (Lone Star) – Does this technology completely eliminate the risk for SSR?Juan (Smart Wires) – Depends on the topology. It’s best to make the analysis specific to the applicable case. | **Ted Bloch-Rubin** |
|  | ***Action Taken: Continue to table PGRR120 until May PLWG meeting to allow for discussion at DWG meeting on May 15.*** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **5.** | **PGRR 122 – Reliability Performance Criteria for Loss of Load** | **ERCOT/PLWG** |
|  | **ERCOT Draft Comments**Jeff Billo (ERCOT) introduced a set of draft comments that builds on top of LCRA’s February 21 comments. This now limits the load loss requirement applicability to Large Load Interconnection Studies (LLIS). ERCOT noted that the 1,000 MW number still in pencil pending the completion of the Frequency Overshoot Study. Plans to present results of this Study to the DWG in May.John Russ Hubbard (TIEC) – Concerned this will impose retrofit costs on Large Loads and thus negatively impact development in Texas.Melissa Trevino (Occidental) – Is ERCOT contemplating a model that would be similar to voltage ride-through for existing loads? If get too close to the end of a project and have made a lot of design decisions and then asked to change settings to meet this requirement, it would be tantamount to being retroactive.Jeff Billo (ERCOT) – Vision of PGRR122 does not contemplate asking existing loads to do something. If there is an issue identified, ERCOT would work with transmission solutions and potentially new Large Loads.Martha Henson (Oncor) – Before being comfortable with supporting set of comments, would want that number to be in ink rather than pencil. Looking forward to DWG conversation.Evan Neel (Lancium) – Agree with comments / concerns of Oxy. Having the criteria helps a developer know how to plan for and meet that criteria. Raised several hypothetical scenarios for ERCOT to consider.Sun Wook Kang (ERCOT) – ERCOT will look for system instability or dynamic reliability issues. The goal is to determine whether there is unacceptable risk during the study.Discussion touched on similarities with the withdrawn NOGRR256 to establish a ride-through standard for Large Loads. TIEC noted its views on NOGRR256 have not changed.ERCOT asked PLWG to be prepared to move forward on this item at May meeting.***Action Taken: Continue to table PGRR122 until May PLWG meeting to allow discussion of the Frequency Overshoot Study results at May DWG.*** | **ERCOT** |
| **6.** | **NPRR 1272 – Voltage Support at Private Use Networks**ERCOT spoke to comments posted earlier today which elaborate on the interpretation of existing Protocol language. Noted that 15 GW of co-located load is currently in the queue. 0.95 power factor requirement results in thousands of Mvars that would be supplied by the generator but not available to ERCOT. Thus would need to call upon the generator to supply that voltage support to the system. Reactive Power requirement would be zero if the load matches exactly with co-located generation – this is not a good scenario. There is also a question of fairness. ERCOT has changed position from neutral to opposed. No alternative solutions at this point.Melissa Trevino (Occidental) – Oxy plans to have comments filed ahead of the next PLWG meeting. A self-limiting option would not work for Oxy. Bill Blevins (ERCOT) - Appropriate for discussion to stay at PLWG. However, if cost shifting will be discussed, then may also need to go to the WMS for review.Martha Henson (Oncor) – Last month during ERCOT’s presentation, ERCOT had asked where are the TSPs on this issue. Speaking for itself, Oncor believes this is a challenging issue to think through. Most likely would support the self-limiting concept that ERCOT proposed. However, also interested in hearing why that would not be a good solution from Oxy’s perspective in their written comments.***Action Taken: Continue to table NPRR1272.*** | **PLWG** |
| **7.** | **PGRR 124 – ESR Maintenance Exception to Modification**Tesla not available to present on this item.Sun Wook Kang (ERCOT) – Noted that Tesla had made a presentation at DWG meeting in April. The concern is about ESR megapack replacement and understanding what is involved in that changeout. ERCOT believes this is already covered in the PGRR109 process. Kang’s understanding from the DWG meeting was that Tesla would have internal discussions and then would reach out to ERCOT SMEs.***Action: Tabled PGRR124 until May PLWG meeting.*** | **Tesla** |
| **8.** | **NPRR 1274- RPG Estimated Capital Cost Thresholds of Proposed Transmission Projects** | **Robert Golen** |
|  | Robert Golen (ERCOT) presented NPRR1274. Cost estimates were last updated in 2018. Since then, a simple inflation calculator shows overall 26% inflation increase since June 2018. ERCOT feels it’s an appropriate time to look at cost estimates in the categorization and make adjustments. ERCOT has made a 35% adjustment to reflect historic inflation change and future inflation. This revision request only changes the prices for the project Tiers, no language changes.Martha Henson (Oncor) – Oncor believes the increase is a step in the right direction but will likely propose a different amount than in the current. Noted for comparison that the thresholds were doubled in the last NPRR that adjusted tier prices, and it took it took one year to get approved in 2018. Oncor believes a similar adjustment might be appropriate in this case as well. The general inflation index may not capture specific items unique to transmission costs (land costs, right of way, energized methodologies, cost of temporary bypass facilities, specialty equipment such as STATCOMs, etc.) that have far exceeded the overall inflation number. Also noted that many more projects are getting EIRs today compared to even a couple of years ago. For example, several Oncor projects submitted recently were only filed because they exceeded the Tier 1 threshold amount. These projects had no material increase in the scope or system impact, simply the costs are higher. Oncor plans to file comments for the May PLWG meeting. ***Action Taken: Tabled NPRR1274 until May PLWG.*** |  |
| **9.** | **Future NPRR – Establish Multi-Value Criteria for Resiliency-Related Transmission Project Evaluation**Ping Yan (ERCOT) previewed concepts for future language potentially to be submitted next month. This language would establish a path or process to allow the TSPs to take results of the Grid Reliability and Resiliency Assessment (GRRA) and proceed to approval.Harsh Naik (Oncor) – Would there be a link between the GRRA and RTP processes? If there’s a project in one, will ERCOT recommend that it be moved forward in the other?Ping - No, current thought is not to link the two processes. Would have the TSP recommend in the RTP process. GRRA identified project would go to TSP and then the TSP could evaluate and potentially propose via RTP. Want to give the TSP an opportunity to find better alternatives or otherwise adjust the scope as needed.Harsh – Comment on the criteria – like seeing 90% threshold for thermal. Oncor has specific voltage criteria that looks at 95%. Most TSPs are between 0.9 to 0.95; suggests changing criteria in paragraph (b) from 0.01 per unit to 0.05 pu. In reality operators don’t want to see voltages less than 0.95 in grid operations. Suggest thinking of increasing the 1% to something higher - perhaps 5%.Ping – Noted that in the cases ERCOT doesn’t apply the default but instead uses the TSP provided specific limits in the analysis. Some buses may have 0.9-0.95; some have 0.95; some have something in between. Feels that the language addresses the TSP variances. Harsh – These variances are equipment specific but don’t reflect how you actually operate the grid (the whole system). Even though the equipment can handle, must consider the actual system limitations.ERCOT concluded by encouraging the group to think of this language as a starting point. ERCOT is open to adjustments and seeks more stakeholder feedback. | **Ping Yan** |
| **10.** | **Review Open Action Items**Not discussed. | **Chair** |
| **11.**  | **Adjourn**Adjourned until next PLWG meeting scheduled for May 20th. | **Chair** |