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

**May 20, 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 (April 29th)**  Meeting minutes reviewed. No feedback received. | **Chair** |
| **4.** | **PGRR 120 – SSO Prevention for Generator Interconnection** | **PLWG** |
|  | * **Review AEP and Lonestar Comments**   Erin Rasmussen (AEP) spoke to the comments which proposes moving the grandfathering date from September 1, 2025, to April 1, 2026. Rasmussen stated that 6-9 months will provide best information and options to the generators in the queue. Lonestar has a larger queue than AEP and could go past the April 1 date, but together offering this as a good compromise date based on the list of projects in both TSPs’ queues.  Megan Miller (ERCOT) responded that the grandfather date in comments was a starting point and that ERCOT wanted feedback about the reasonableness and thus is open to adjusting to the date. ERCOT can compromise with the April 1, 2026, date.  Aditi (Lonestar) – Stated that Lonestar is good with the April 1 date. Would want ERCOT to allow exemptions should some projects slip past that date.  Megan - ERCOT would need to determine if there are further edits needed to allow for exemptions prior to ROS.  Kristin Cook (Southern Power) – Asked whether NPRR 1280 would help address the other stated concern in AEP / Lonestar joint comments.  Erin Rasmussen – NPRR1280 will help but would also like to see other solutions as mentioned in previous comments.  Kristin – Southern Power supports the desktop edit and where PGRR120 has landed.  Megan – ERCOT appreciates all the engagement on this issue from various stakeholders. | **AEP/Lonestar** |
|  | ***Action Taken: PLWG provided a desktop edit reflecting the change in date and will forward a report to ROS stating that consensus was reached.*** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **5.** | **PGRR 122 – Reliability Performance Criteria for Loss of Load** | **ERCOT/PLWG** |
|  | John Russ Hubbard spoke to Texas Industrial Energy Consumers (TIEC) comments posted on May 19.  Jeff Billo (ERCOT) – The load loss limitation will only impact the loads that cannot meet ride-through capability.  Hubbard (TIEC) – Suggests that ERCOT codify what ERCOT will be testing in the study so that loads would be able to know if you can meet the ride-through capability.  Billo – What TIEC suggests is tantamount to creating a standard for Large Load ride-through for the system. So that everyone knows what the expectation would be, the system would need a standard like the one proposed in NOGRR256 256. NOGRR256 received pushback, but ERCOT is willing to work on that language to make it palatable.  Hubbard – Not asking for a VRT standard. Believes there is a difference between establishing a new requirement for Large Loads and codifying what is entailed in the modeling study – i.e. which capabilities are being tested in the study.  ERCOT – The load loss limitation doesn’t create a moratorium; rather, it’s an operational issue that you can’t ignore.  Hubbard – Disagree as functionally, that is a moratorium on interconnections.  Ken Donohoo – Has ERCOT mapped how wide the voltage disturbance is that would trip off?  Billo – Yes – and ERCOT presented at the May Large Load WG meeting with an example of a simulated trip in West Texas.  Clayton Greer (Cholla) – What’s the status of ERCOT presenting its Load Commissioning Plan?  Agee Springer (ERCOT) – The template is being developed, and ERCOT plans to show that within the next couple of weeks.  Greer – Hopes it will ease people’s concerns. Some projects may be starting lower and then ramp up over several years – this should be accounted for. Suggests testing for max facility load at the end of the load ramp.  Billo – Agrees. The timing is an important consideration. We’re most likely to see issues in West Texas.  Melissa Trevino (Occidental) – An operating limit issue may be caused by an aggregation of numerous loads. How will ERCOT determine which load will be shut off? Ideally we would never shut off loads, but doesn’t believe the procedure is very straightforward.  Jeff Billo (ERCOT) – ERCOT knows which Large Loads are causing issues in the system, but the system is not yet at the point where ERCOT would need to curtail Loads. Doesn’t want to speculate further on a procedure.  Melissa – Need to have that codified so that can report back the operational risk to respective Entities.  Jeff – ERCOT would highlight that the risk is there regardless of PGRR122.  Warren Nasher (TXOGA) – A Large Load that rides through would be immune from this PGRR. In the situation where a small load could ride through but adding to the system would cause other loads to not ride through. What would happen to that load? Prevented or delayed? Other?  Jeff – If ERCOT runs the LLIS and the new load exceeds the limit, there are likely transmission upgrades that would need to be put into place before you could interconnect.  Warren - Is there a pathway for those transmission upgrades to proceed?  Jeff - No, no current pathway. The loss of load issue has three components to address: 1 – LLIS (PGRR122); 2 – operational component – if reach system operating limit in real time or during the operational planning horizon then requires action; 3 – longer term planning perspective (e.g. transmission upgrades, ERCOT system changes). Still months away from figuring out #3. Weeks to months away from figuring out #2. Agree, this is a piece of the bigger picture. Pitch for moving forward today without other pieces figured out is that it will be less painful to a large load project if identify the issues during LLIS rather than months/years down the road  ***Action Taken: Continued to table PGRR122.*** ERCOT noted it has draft comments that it hopes to finalize soon. It will target making the September Board of Directors meeting with the motivation to move forward with language is to set expectations for Large Loads going forward. |  |
| **6.** | **NPRR 1272 – Voltage Support at Private Use Networks**  Melissa Trevino (Oxy) – Occidental has submitted comments that are being reviewed by ERCOT before posting. For the next PLWG meeting, would suggest a good topic to discuss is how this language would apply to technologies going forward – e.g. to an SMR or a gas fired generator.  ***Action Taken: Continued to table NPRR1272.*** | **PLWG** |
| **7.** | **PGRR 124 – ESR Maintenance Exception to Modification**  Eric Goff – Still working on setting up offline discussion with ERCOT on this item. No discussion for today.  ***Action: Continued to table PGRR124.*** | **Tesla / Eric Goff** |
| **8.** | **NPRR 1274 – RPG Estimated Capital Cost Thresholds of Proposed Transmission Projects** | **Robert Golen** |
|  | **Review Oncor Comments**  Martha Henson reviewed the Oncor comments, recommending a higher threshold than in the ERCOT language based on observed cost trends in the past 7-8 years. | **Martha Henson** |
|  | Jim Lee (CenterPoint) reviewed the Joint TSP comments, providing additional analysis supporting Oncor’s point that an adjustment based on the CPI inflation number does not reflect true cost increases for transmission projects.  Robert Golen (ERCOT) – More than likely will reach out to commenters directly for more information about project costs.  Brian Hithersay (BEPC) – Similarly, BEPC costs have approximately doubled in the time frame since the thresholds were last increased. |  |
|  | ***Action Taken: Continued to table NPRR1274.*** |  |
| **9.** | **Update – FAC-002 Qualified Change Definition for End-Use Facilities**  Ping Yan (ERCOT) previewed a Qualified Change definition for End-Use Facilities as part of the NERC FAC-002 standard. This is in anticipation of the implementation of PGRR115.  Agee Springer (ERCOT) – ERCOT will soon send out a Market Notice with a partial implementation of PGRR115 –likely unboxed June 1. ERCOT targets unboxing Section 9 requirements on July 1 that tie into the Qualified Change definition. Other components, including the QSA provision, will be unboxed at a later date.  Monica (Vistra) – Would like ERCOT to work on creating a list of what constitutes a qualified change trigger.  Agee – ERCOT is open to working with stakeholders to develop a list. However, the concern remains that it will not be exhaustive.  **No action taken.** | **Ping Yan** |
| **10.** | **Review Open Action Items**  Not other business discussed. | **Chair** |
| **11.** | **Adjourn**  Adjourned until next PLWG meeting scheduled for June 17. | **Chair** |