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

**August 26, 2025 (In Person + WebEx)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** | **Antitrust Admonition**  Meeting started at 11:30 am. Antitrust admonition was given. | **Chair** |
| **2.** | **Agenda Review**  Agenda was reviewed. | **Chair** |
| **3.** | **Review of PLWG Meeting Minutes (July 29th)**  Meeting minutes reviewed. No feedback received. | **Chair** |
| **4.** | **NPRR 1280 - Establish Process for Permanent Bypass of Series Capacitor**  Sun Wook Kang (ERCOT) reviewed ERCOT comments (8/19). Comments reflect the official response to TIEC and LST/AEP joint comments. To address TIEC’s feedback, ERCOT revised language to include a requirement that ERCOT conduct an economic analysis for this project type.  Aditi Upadhyay (Lonestar) suggested modifying language in subparagraph (ii) to add “for informational purposes only”. Erin Rasmussen (AEP) – supported Aditi’s suggestion.  Prabhu (ERCOT) – Should already be language that states ERCOT doesn’t make its decision based on the that analysis and implies that it is informational purpose for the stakeholders to comment from.  Chair asked for feedback.  ***Action Taken: Will report back to ROS that PLWG reached consensus on the language.*** | **ERCOT** |
| **5.** | **NPRR 1274 – RPG Estimated Capital Cost Thresholds of Proposed Transmission Projects**  ERCOT still awaiting info needed to complete their comments and respond to Oncor and the Joint Commenters’ comments. As far as timeline, ERCOT intends to bring this revision request to the Board of Directors in December.  ***Action Taken: Continued to table pending ERCOT comments and RFI feedback.*** | **ERCOT** |
| **6.** | **PGRR 122 – Reliability Performance Criteria for Loss of Load** | **ERCOT/PLWG** |
|  | Chair shared an update on behalf of Jeff Billo (ERCOT). ERCOT is still performing additional studies (discussion at LLWG). Studies will be forthcoming later this year – plan to keep tabled for next few months.  ***Action Taken: Continued to table (expected 2-3 months).*** |  |
| **7.** | **PGRR 124 – ESR Maintenance Exception to Modification**  Eric Goff (on behalf of Tesla) shared that Tesla has conducted several conversations with ERCOT. Has primarily focused on the Advanced Grid Requirements PGRR and NOGRR; Tesla has elected to let those RRs move forward due to overlapping language. Willing to keep this Tabled.  ***Action Taken: Continued to table.*** | **Tesla / Eric Goff** |
| **8.** | **PGRR 126 – Related to NPRR1284, Guaranteed Reliability Load Process**  Discussed jointly with Item #9, below.  Clayton Greer (Cholla Petroleum) – Has had conversations with ERCOT. The PGRR and NPRR may not be needed since we can put Large Loads into SCED as a CLR already. Received comments from Google (7/11) and like the suggestion to use the terminology “provisional load interconnection”. Google process would have limitation to 100 operational hours per year.  Harsh Naik (Oncor) – CLR concept makes sense.  Chris Matos (Google) – Explained the 100-hour operation limit concept.  Clayton – Feels that 100 hours is a decently high amount and provides a reasonable ground to meet security in between unlimited 24/7 hours.  Eric Goff – In general interest of advancing topic, thinks it’s interesting that might not be necessary due to the CLR approach. But it also has a client that has received feedback that the CLR approach is insufficient. There still may need to be a tie-in to the operations component.  Clayton – Thinks it still goes back to SB 6 kill switch option. If you try to exit the program, then they still have the right to cut you off.  Bob Wittmeyer – Seems the best path forward is to incorporate into the rulemaking for SB 6.  Chris Matos – Not fully read up on 1188, an exchange for capacity. Sees it as a different issue from SB 6 implementation (which provides emergency criteria for switch opening). Preference to formally codify the program in an NPRR or other language, to make sure that there isn’t vagueness in the operational implementation (and would look for TDSP / ERCOT guidance).  Clayton posed question to ERCOT and TDSPs - Is there an acceptable limit?  Harsh Naik (Oncor) – The 100 hours sounds like probability of being curtailed. If you’re a CLR and need to curtail to certain amount (varies depending on system limitations). Seems like it’s two different things.  Mina Turner (AEP)– How would you plan for this sort of contingency? How do you plan for the Load to be off for 100 hours?  Ping Yan (ERCOT) – Feels it will be beneficial to keep tabled. Want to contemplate how it would be incorporated into Planning Studies.  Clayton – Good with remaining tabled. Again, may not need the NOGRR due to CLR. | **Clayton Greer** |
|  | ***Action Taken: Tabled to allow Sponsor to work with ERCOT on incorporating into Planning Studies.*** |  |
| **9.** | **NPRR 1284 – Guaranteed Reliability Load Process**  Discussed jointly with Item #8.  ***Action Taken: Tabled to allow Sponsor to coordinate with ERCOT.*** | **Clayton Greer** |
| **10.** | **NPRR 1286 - Establish Multi-Value Criteria for Resiliency-Related Transmission Project Evaluation**  Ping Yan (ERCOT) – spoke to comments that address the Joint Commenters 7/1 comments. Adopted recommendations from Oncor about relaxing the voltage limit threshold.  Matt Arth (ERCOT) – Opportunities for efficiencies, but after internal review and reviewing the Commission’s rule, ERCOT would not be able to endorse a resiliency project identified in GRRA. Would still need to be submitted as an economic or reliability project.  Chair asked if stakeholders were comfortable moving language to ROS.  ***Action Taken: Discussion concluded. NPRR1286 will be moving to ROS for a vote.*** | **ERCOT** |
| **11.** | **PGRR 127-Addition of Proposed Generation to the Planning Models**  LCRA Comments – Trevor Safko (LCRA) spoke to the comments. Desire to reduce arbitrariness or inadvertent addition of unclear modeling considerations. Andrew Hamann (LCRA TSC) spoke specifically to the table included in comments. Concern around partial inclusion of a single class of generators in the cases.  Ping Yan (ERCOT) – ERCOT has two key areas of concern – whether adding the generators will mask any reliability issues; or if adding the generators introduces false reliability concerns. Acknowledges that the proposed process creates the potential for creating those risks, especially generation added last year that wasn’t in the interconnection queue. With framework of those two concerns and addressing the LCRA comments, added a portion of category C to the 2025 RTP (12 gas generators – total capacity of 5,700 MW). Compared to the size of the entire category C (265 GW total across 1200+ projects). Thus, adding the full Cat C to the case would be a significant modeling lift. There would be too much generation in the queue – it would introduce additional factors of uncertainty and risk.  Andrew – there’s no requirement for ERCOT to incorporate stakeholder comment into the development of an RTP case and the methodology for selecting units included in the case. Believes there should be some guidelines written out in the PGRR. Open to ideas of how to achieve this outcome.  Ping – An overly proscriptive rule may handcuff ERCOT if it encounters an unanticipated situation and thus would have to open up the PGRR again for modifications. ERCOT does, however, understand the desire to have more consistency.  Brian Hithersay (BEPC) – Agrees with LCRA. The LL interconnections have added to the complexity of generation included vs. excluded.  Mina Turner (AEP) – Will there be a special designation in the planning cases if this generator is included? ERCOT - Yes, it will have a category listed.  Prabhu Gnanam (ERCOT) – This might not be the appropriate venue to address the methodology of including specific generation in the planning cases.  ***Action Taken: Tabled to the next PLWG meeting.*** | **ERCOT** |
| **12.** | **PGRR 128 - Regional Transmission Plan Review of Grid Enhancing Technologies**  Martha Henson spoke to Oncor Comments outlining why they oppose this approach. Comment also applies to TEBA’s comments on NPRR1274. The proposal is onerous and would introduce time delays in the review of projects.  Eric – appreciate comments that Oncor filed and acknowledged they reached out to discuss in advance. However, some concerns laid out give further examples for the need for a formalized process.  Martha – Suggests that if no further comments filed between now and next PLWG, then can advance to ROS without consensus.  ***Action: Tabled PGRR128 to next PLWG meeting.*** | **TEBA/Eric Goff** |
| **13.** | **Open Discussion**  **PLWG Meeting Date & Time**  PLWG discussed a consideration to move PLWG meetings to a day separate from RPG due to the full agenda load in the foreseeable future.  Katie Rich – Clarified that setting a specific start time would also help stakeholders as it’s difficult to time calling in when PLWG meetings follow the conclusion of RPG.  Mina Turner (PLWG Chair) – unable to commit to a start time a week in advance without knowing what the RPG agenda would be. Moving to another day would solve that issue, but may cause people to add another travel day if traveling to attend RPG/PLWG.  Eric Goff – It’s a real challenge. Also only interested in PLWG sometimes and just listening to RPG to get the start time.  Clayton Greer – wants to keep in person meetings for the interactions. Would lose out if going to full WebEx.  Martha Henson – Feel strongly for an in-person dialogue – very beneficial. Lots of people travel from out of town. Did confer with TIEC this morning and would be happy with a defined start time.  Kent (CES) – If wanted to pick 1 pm as a start time for PLWG and RPG is almost always over by then, just to make things easier to schedule. His organization often has different people attending the two meetings and wait around waiting for PLWG to start.  Kevin Hanson (Invenergy) – Could be “no earlier than 1 pm”  Nick Randall – Found it helpful in the past when RPG is wrapping, an email sent to PLWG listserv stating the start time of the meeting.  ***Action: PLWG agreed to keep the meetings on the same day following RPG, but will target adding a specific start time.***  **SSR mitigation timeline**  Chase Smith (Southern Power) is the ROS sponsor. Due to competing priorities and the PLWG full agenda, ROS sponsor has not made progress on coordinating with appropriate parties to review. Not an urgent/high priority item, so the plan is to start collecting feedback on current SSR timeline and if there are any potential improvements to the process later this fall. Advised if there are interested stakeholders, please reach out to Kristin Cook or Chase Smith with Southern Power.  **Other Action Items**  Mina – reminder that we have the “Load vs load” action item that will be added back to the agenda for a meeting when the planned agenda is lighter. | **Chair** |
| **14.** | **Adjourn**  Meeting adjourned at 2:27 pm. The next PLWG meeting will be September 25. | **Chair** |