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

**June 17, 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 (May 20th)**  Meeting minutes reviewed. No feedback received. | **Chair** |
| **4.** | **PGRR 122 – Reliability Performance Criteria for Loss of Load** | **ERCOT/PLWG** |
|  | No new comments had been posted since last PLWG meeting.  Jeff Billo (ERCOT) shared that ERCOT has contemplated comments, but these are not yet finalized. Discussion on voltage ride through requirements for load occurred at the Large Load Workshop held on June 13th. Nothing new to share at PLWG today.  Clayton Greer – Will the comments encompass anything further than changing the maximum load loss limit from 1,000 MW to 2,600 MW?  Jeff – Yes, anticipate comments will be more extensive and will include language changes. ERCOT previously shared concepts for concepts at the April PLWG meeting. Still processing stakeholder feedback from that meeting.  Clayton - Did that include a definition for “electrically close”?  Jeff – No, not explicitly. PGRR122 is not intended to lay out the modeling details or study assumptions, rather it will establish the criteria. Likewise, it will not build out a process or flow chart. The flow chart introduced at the workshop is meant to be an interim process, and ERCOT would eventually follow-up with a new PGRR to address.  ***No action taken. Continued to table PGRR122.*** |  |
| **5.** | **NPRR 1272 – Voltage Support at Private Use Networks**  **Review Oxy comments**  Melissa Trevino and Scott Wardle with Oxy reviewed comments posted on May 20th. Oxy is not seeking to change ERCOT’s interpretation but rather to clarify the protocols on this issue. Main purpose was to respond to some concerns that ERCOT had raised in their previous comments.  The ERCOT personnel who could best speak to this NPRR were not available to provide feedback.  ***Action Taken: Continued to table NPRR1272.*** | **PLWG**  **Melissa Trevino / Oxy** |
| **6.** | **PGRR 124 – ESR Maintenance Exception to Modification**  Eric Goff – Tesla is still working on setting up offline discussion with ERCOT on this item and is not prepared for a policy discussion today. The proposal addresses when a battery site does augmentation without changing capacity. This is done by adding equipment and then limiting output through firmware. This could happen on a regular maintenance cycle with some frequency.  Sun Wook Kang (ERCOT) – Noted that a process is already in place via PGRR109. ERCOT wants to better understand what is involved in the megapack changeout.  Tesla and ERCOT hope to have the meeting before July PLWG.  ***Action: Continued to table PGRR124.*** | **Tesla / Eric Goff** |
| **7.** | **NPRR 1274 – RPG Estimated Capital Cost Thresholds of Proposed Transmission Projects** | **ERCOT** |
|  | **Review TEBA comments** | **Bryn Baker / Eric Goff** |
|  | Robert Golen (ERCOT) – ERCOT has held internal discussions regarding the Oncor and Joint Commenter comments posted. Expect forthcoming requests for additional information. ERCOT would like to table for another month and address at July PLWG.  Eric Goff spoke on behalf of the Texas Energy Buyers Alliance (TEBA) comments posted on June 12th. TEBA willing to accept Oncor’s proposed doubling of the threshold, in exchange for including in ERCOT’s planning processes an ongoing review of grid-enhancing technologies to potentially lower the cost or enhance reliability of transmission projects. TEBA will lay out language in an associated PLWG (to be written and posted). |  |
|  | ***Action Taken: Continued to table NPRR1274.*** |  |
| **8.** | **PGRR 126 – Related to NPRR1284, Guaranteed Reliability Load Process** | **Clayton Greer** |
|  | Clayton Greer (Cholla Petroleum) walked through a presentation on this PGRR and related NPRR1284. The goal of the NPRR/PGRR is to provide a bridging solution for loads that can provide flexibility through curtailment or the use of backup generation.  Melissa Trevino (Oxy) – What happens to a load seeking to interconnect that cannot be curtailed and thus won’t use this process when there is a second curtailable load goes faster through the queue? Concerned that first load may be at risk of no longer connecting as the timing of when you connect to the system matters.  Clayton – Would need ERCOT to weigh-in on how the studies would be affected.  Martha Henson (Oncor) – Some concerns about the complexity from standpoint of both the planning studies and operations. Asked Clayton to elaborate on how the curtailment piece is facilitated.  Clayton - Similar in operation to a RAS. Preprogrammed so that if a contingency occurred, there is an automatic notification to the transmission operator notifying the load that it needs to curtail. Expects participants would also need to sign a Market Participant agreement with ERCOT. Would also need to write a NOGRR on the operational process.  Catherine Kauffman (TMV) – Do you anticipate there being an expanded set of reporting requirements of contingencies that would signal curtailment to the load?  Clayton – Yes, expect so. Would also need reporting requirements on total MW of load curtailed, for inclusion in price adders, reported in a confidential manner – potentially aggregated or identifying details masked. These details will need to be worked out.  Xuan Wu (PEC) – Would we need to perform planning studies every year to update the loads’ curtailment plan, because the topology is always changing?  Clayton – No, these loads shouldn’t be responsive to additional contingencies found after signing a contract.  Mina Turner (AEP) – How will you address compliance issues with NERC standards?  Clayton – This is no different from the current process where the load on the system has changed in ways we did not anticipate and then need projects that are reviewed in RPG. Don’t see how this would violate any other standard that’s out there.  Kevin – Are we assuming that all large loads have a kill switch on them?  Clayton – Yes, legislation made that mandatory and would be in place before this program would be in effect.  Chris Matos – Noted that SB 6 did not make kill switches mandatory but rather permissible. Would this process sufficiently allow a significant number of MW? Is it scalable?  Harshad – It would be site dependent. The complication is looking at multiple conditions / violations in real time.  Chris – Reservations that this process would not necessarily mitigate the concerns in a meaningful way, especially where large loads tend to coalesce.  Melissa Trevino (Oxy) – Concerned that this creates preferential treatment for flexible loads over firm loads but will withhold judgment until ERCOT can speak to the study impacts.  Clayton – Believes it’s good policy to have preferential treatment for flexible loads over firm loads. We want to promote as many flexible loads as possible onto the system while we’re generation limited for the foreseeable future.  Mina Turner (AEP) – If ERCOT sees a limitation in the day-ahead market and needs the flexibility, would the load be flexible enough to come down for the whole day?  Clayton – No, the load would only be called upon to curtail if one of the contingencies in which it was registered was invoked. These loads are not signing up to be the “easy button” at all times. You wouldn’t attract anyone to this program if that were the case. Also, if there’s a long list of contingencies it would deter people from signing up; a short list of contingencies is a lower probability of occurring.  Maribel Khayat (AEP) – Not clear how scenarios could be crafted in a way to not put the system at risk of a security violation. Reliability cannot be a voluntary service.  Harsh Naik (Oncor) – Similarities to CLR treatment. Should explore the fallback for if load reduction doesn’t happen when called upon, such as a loss of telemetry. If there is a failure and the overload is bad, then you would be exposing the grid to severe risk.  Additional Q & A discussion.  **Action Taken: Tabled until receive the related NPRR1284 and associated NOGRR (TBD) referrals to take up discussion together.** |  |
| **9.** | **NPRR 1280 – Establish Process for Permanent Bypass of Series Capacitors**  Sun Wook Kang (ERCOT) introduced NPRR1280. The goal of this language is to create a formal process to review the permanent bypassing of existing series capacitors at RPG.  Warren Lasher (Texas Oil & Gas Association) - Some projects provide stability or congestion relief. ERCOT would need to provide independent review for congestion analysis. May come in as a Tier 3 but would need to be bumped up to Tier 2 for the independent review. Consumers have paid for these devices. If there’s a negative ramification then that should be known before. Recommends conducting both steady state and dynamic studies to determine if there are still benefits to having the series capacitors (such as power transfer). Stakeholders should be able to review the full stability and congestion analysis.  Prabhu Gnanam (ERCOT) – There are other reliability benefits for bypassing the series capacitors such as SSR.  Sunil Dhakal (Lonestar Transmission) – The NPRR is limiting projects to Tier 3. If there’s a project the TSP identifies and it will help to bypass a series cap without hampering the stability limit, then this RR doesn’t provide for this. It should be open to any other Tier level.  Sun Wook – Tier level will be determined by existing language. This PGRR is about bypassing series capacitors. If there is a major transmission project and part of it includes bypassing the series cap, then the project would still be classified as the relevant Tier (1 or 2) as needed.  Mina Turner (AEP) – Would the SSR study requirement go away if the series capacitors are permanently bypassed?  Sun Wook – Yes. We need a transparent process through RPG so that ERCOT knows which series capacitors are permanently bypassed.  Harsh Naik (Oncor) – Does ERCOT have criteria for how a transmission project can be justified to bypass the series cap as a standalone project?  Sun Wook – Not aware of a project unless the TSP has an issue with the series cap such as difficulty maintaining or other TSP criteria used to replace it. Not aware of planning criteria.  Harsh – ERCOT is not actively asking the TSPs to proactively look to bypass the series caps? This would only be used if conditions have changed such that it can be retired with no adverse effect?  Sun Wook – Provided example of a reinforced transmission system with approved upgrade projects. The expectation is the TSP would propose a project if there is no benefit to retaining the series capacitor in that region.  Harsh – Why not have it be reversed where there are criteria to approve a transmission project to bypass the series caps? There are multiple RRs ongoing dealing with the issues created by series capacitors.  Prabhu - Like what Warren said, consumers have paid for this transmission element. Therefore, this would likely be an economic project, even though there is a reliability component.  Aditi Upadhyay (Lonestar) – Now that PGRR120 is approved, doesn’t that give us a reason for a project? Since NPRR1283 describes SSFR as a reliability risk, can’t we submit a series cap bypass project as a reliability project?  Sun Wook - Mitigation plan could be on the transmission or generation side. Unaware of any planning criteria for TSPs to use to submit a project to bypass series cap.  Aditi - Can we submit an RPG project as a reliability project? We are being impacted by PGRR120, we have at least 10 generators in queue that will be impacted if we don’t sign the SGIA by April 2026.  Prabu – At this time, we don’t have reliability criteria for the project to be approved. That would be an economic project.  Lonestar plans to submit comments and requested tabling.  ***Action Taken: Tabled NPRR1280 to allow for further comments.*** | **ERCOT** |
| **10.** | **NPRR 1283 – Modification of SSR Mitigation Timeline** | **ERCOT** |
|  | Sun Wook Kang (ERCOT) spoke to this RR.  Katie Rich (Vistra) – ROS sent this over because of the timeline. Some comments at ROS stated that the SSO study timeline may take 12-18 months.  Bob Helton (Engie) – Not a concern about the need to eventually implement this. But want to give developers time to assess how this change will affect the COD with the change in schedule. Only affects those will outstanding SSO studies remaining.  ***Action Taken: Move to ROS for a vote. Anticipate receiving related action item at a future time.*** |  |
| **11.** | **Review Open Action Items**  No other business discussed. | **Chair** |
| **12.** | **Adjourn**  Adjourned until next PLWG meeting scheduled for July 29. | **Chair** |