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

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** | **Antitrust Admonition**  Meeting started at 1:17 pm. Antitrust admonition was given. | **Chair** |
| **2.** | **Agenda Review**  Agenda was reviewed. | **Chair** |
| **3.** | **Review of PLWG Meeting Minutes (June 17th)**  Meeting minutes reviewed. No feedback received. | **Chair** |
| **4.** | **NPRR 1280 - Establish Process for Permanent Bypass of Series Capacitor**  John Russ Hubbard spoke to Texas Industrial Energy Consumer (TIEC) Comments (July 8). TIEC suggests revising categorization of these projects from Tier 3 to Tier 2 as there is key information delivered to stakeholders in advance that could assist in the review.  Sunwook Kang stated that ERCOT is currently discussing internally about Tier 2 vs 3 approach. ERCOT plans to file comments in August to discuss at the next PLWG meeting on 8/26.  Eric Goff (TEBA) – Would the economic analysis be standalone or would it be paired with the reliability analysis?  Sunwook (ERCOT) – Expectation as of now is that they will be conducted together.  Warren Lasher (TXOGA) – Analysis would be similar to when ERCOT conducts a reliability analysis and then look at the congestion impacts at the end – it’s not necessarily passing either of the economic cost tests.  Prabhu Gnanam (ERCOT) – Reliability analysis conducted by the TSP; subsequently ERCOT would perform economic analysis and would provide those results simultaneously. Could subsequently classify as Tier 4 project.  Erin Rasmussen (AEP) spoke to comments filed jointly with LoneStar Transmission on July 28. Since the devices originated for reliability needs, commenters believe an economic test would be inappropriate. Retiring a series cap would be for a reliability reason. Commenters advise that the language should remain Tier 3 and not bump up to Tier 2. These projects do not fit the characteristics of a Tier 2 project, as they are not a large capital investment nor require a CCN. Moreover, the existing economic tests aren’t appropriate for these projects because there are problems with both cost-to-benefit evaluations (the Production Cost Savings and Congestion Cost Savings tests). Which costs do you use? The series capacitors are existing assets and reflect a sunk cost. PCS and CCS use initial and first three years of the revenue, respectively – what would be applicable here?  ***Action Taken: Tabled to August 26 PLWG pending ERCOT comments.*** | **ERCOT** |
| **5.** | **NPRR 1274 – RPG Estimated Capital Cost Thresholds of Proposed Transmission Projects**  Robert Golen (ERCOT) requested tabling for one more month. ERCOT has issued an RFI to the TSPs and is awaiting feedback. ERCOT plans to share findings and comments at the August 26th PLWG meeting.  ***Action Taken: Keep tabled pending ERCOT comments and RFI feedback.*** | **ERCOT** |
| **6.** | **NPRR 1272 – Voltage Support at Private Use Networks**  Bill Blevins (ERCOT) shared that ongoing discussions have not persuaded ERCOT to change position from their last posted comments. There are reliability impacts and cost considerations to compensate for the lack of reactive power that would result from Oxy’s interpretation. Also noted that ERCOT believes there is a path forward to register as a self-limiting generator and thus handled within normal processes.  Melissa Trevino (Oxy) – No one has told us what the reliability issue is. Load was studied independently, generator was studied independently, but the issue was identified only when combined. Solution still shouldn’t be to have a punitive requirement over a merchant generator.  Scott Wardle (Oxy) – Required to maintain 0.95 power factor at all times regardless of load. ERCOT is Asking 160% reactive power in versus a merchant generator.  Oxy and ERCOT went back and forth with several examples. Oxy feels this interpretation is punitive to PUN generators compared to merchant generators. However, ERCOT needs the generator to provide VSS that is short of the requirement at the POI due to the load consumption.  Oxy and ERCOT reached an apparent impasse in the disagreement of language interpretation. Since the issue has been at PLWG for several months without progress, PLWG will report back to ROS that the group was unable to reach consensus. Katie Rich (Vistra, Chair of ROS) asked the parties to work together prior to taking up at ROS.  ***Action Taken: Provide report to ROS that PLWG was unable to reach consensus after multiple months of discussion.*** | **ERCOT / Oxy** |
| **7.** | **PGRR 122 – Reliability Performance Criteria for Loss of Load** | **ERCOT/PLWG** |
|  | 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.  ***No action taken. Continued to table PGRR122.*** |  |
| **8.** | **PGRR 124 – ESR Maintenance Exception to Modification**  Eric Goff – Tesla is working with a battery developer on additional comments and expects to file by the next PLWG meeting.  ***Action: Continued to table PGRR124.*** | **Tesla / Eric Goff** |
| **9.** | **PGRR 126 – Related to NPRR1284, Guaranteed Reliability Load Process**  No discussion. Continuing to table until PLWG receives the associated NOGRR (TBD) referral to take up discussion together with NPRR1284 (referred from ROS on July 10). | **Clayton Greer** |
|  | **Action Taken: Tabled until receive the associated language referrals.** |  |
| **10.** | **NPRR 1286 - Establish Multi-Value Criteria for Resiliency-Related Transmission Project Evaluation**  Ping Yan (ERCOT) provided a short introduction.  Alex Miller (EDF power solutions) spoke to comments jointly filed by EDF power solutions, Invenergy, and Pattern Energy (July 1). Alex and Kevin Hanson (Invenergy) went through a presentation (posted on meeting page).  Ping (ERCOT) – Feels as though the comments are relatively different from the focus on NPRR1070. 1286 is mainly to address the PUCT rules using resiliency as a pathway to endorse a project—looking at, for example, extreme weather conditions and reducing cascading outages.  Kevin Hanson (Invenergy) – Our concepts in the presentation still tie back to improving resiliency in the system.  Alex – We do feel it’s directly related even if it’s an expansion from what ERCOT originally proposed. It makes sense to resolve this while opening the language changes to this section. NPRR1070 has been on hold for four years at ERCOT’s request, and it’s an overlapping topic.  Prabhu Gnanam (ERCOT) – As Ping laid out, the reason for setting this up is there are a set of projects coming out of the resiliency criteria. GTC exit is a separate discussion. ERCOT has concerns about expanding scope of the intent of this language.  Suzi McClellan – Is there any downside to including this language for consideration that the JC’s have introduced?  Ping – The NPRR specifically targets what the PUCT has put forward to establish a resiliency path for projects. But these comments create a much larger umbrella. It’s appropriate to revisit 1070 at this point.  Alex – No action needed as 1070 is tabled at ROS and can refer back to PLWG. The Joint Commenters will discuss a path forward.  ***Action Taken: Tabled 1286.*** | **ERCOT** |
| **11.** | **PGRR 127-Addition of Proposed Generation to the Planning Models**  Ping Yan (ERCOT) introduced this language. This is consistent with what Jamison presented on the 2025 RTP assumptions. Over the past year, ERCOT has discussed this issue at both PLWG and RPG groups. Note that the new paragraph (5) incorporates the order of generation precedent in case of a deficit.  John Russ Hubbard – When ERCOT provides reasonable notice, will it also provide analysis of how it reached its determination and why?  Ping – Yes, similar to RPG presentations wherein ERCOT describes how it added this generation to the cases.  JRH – It may be helpful to add language detailing that into the PGRR.  Dylan Preas (LCRA) – How do you select everything in a single category – what is the methodology?  Ping – If only need part of a single group – like in (5)(a) large generators with a signed SGIA—then ERCOT did not qualify the procedure in the language, but would provide that methodology.  Alex Miller (EDF power solutions) – Suggests picking all and then scaling down to avoid hotspots. Also recommends having some language describing the methodology of selecting generators within a category if not using the entire category.  Dylan - Dynamic models needed for (a) and (b). If the generator doesn’t have models available, will it be dropped from inclusion? Is it helpful to call out which models are needed?  Kristin Cook (SPC) - Reasoning for the 60-day model requirement?  Ping – The language limits the 60-day turnaround on the dynamic model requirement to only type (a) and (b) – either the generators have completed the FIS or signed SGIA. ERCOT only found a handful of generators that have not yet completed the FIS study. There is a dynamic study portion that is required, so you should already have those models completed if you’re at that point.  ***Action Taken: Tabled pending comments from LCRA and others.*** | **ERCOT** |
| **12.** | **PGRR 128 - Regional Transmission Plan Review of Grid Enhancing Technologies**  Eric Goff (representing Texas Energy Buyers Alliance, TEBA) introduced this language.  Prabhu Gnanam (ERCOT) – ERCOT plans to file comments in response.  Liz Jones (Oncor) - Oncor has requested a meeting to better understand. Believes it’s good to raise GETS in comments to an RPG submission, but this approach requires TSPs to have a universal understanding of all GETS – an obligation that is unreasonable to impose on the process. Would feel much better about being asked about a specific technology on a specific project.  Eric – Looking forward to conversation with you and other TSPs. Happy to consider that approach, but this revision request is intentionally trying to create a universal process and open to feedback to that. Having to comment project-by-project puts the burden on other stakeholders – and it’s a significant effort.  Liz – In a RPG submittal, the utility is not obligated to discuss a range of possible tower structures, overhead vs. underground – there are myriad possibilities that go into a particular RPG project. It’s helpful to have the technology consideration called out in a specific project rather than an unlimited range of possibilities that the utility has to negate.  ***Action: Tabled PGRR128 pending further comments and discussion.*** | **TEBA** |
| **13.** | **Review Open Action Items**  No other business discussed. | **Chair** |
| **14.** | **Adjourn**  Meeting adjourned at 3:54 pm. The PLWG meeting scheduled for August 1 is cancelled (not needed). The next PLWG meeting will be August 26. | **Chair** |