

[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Friday, February 6, 2026 1:36 PM

**To:** LLWG\_Feedback <LLWG\_Feedback@ercot.com>

**Subject:** Feedback on New Batch Process from a Landowner & Permit Applicant

**Importance:** High

\*\*\*\*\* **EXTERNAL Email** \*\*\*\*\*

**Please be cautious and evaluate before you click on links, open attachments, or provide credentials. As a reminder, please report phishing emails via the Report Phishing button. If the button is not available, then please forward to 'ReportPhishing@ercot.com'**

I am a landowner & permit applicant on a Large Load interconnection request to support a potential Data Center on my family's property where I am now working along with a Data Center Developer through this process. After listening to the Large Load Workshop, I had several comments that I would like ERCOT to consider:

- Preliminary cutoff date for having completed Steady State study submitted to ERCOT for eligibility for inclusion in Batch 0 B, was preliminarily listed as January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2026.
- However, per slide 17 of the Large Load Interconnect Workshop the Final release date of PUCT Implementation guidance for SB6 (rule 58481) is yet to be announced.
  - Additionally, per Slide 17 Proposed Batch Zero B is linked to 58481, “so timing is difficult to establish” in the interim, which could also mean that the prelim date of start of Batch 0 B of August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2026 could also still be subject to **delay**.
  - Given the possibility of delays related to PUCT implementation guidance for SB6 (rule 58481) & that these rules have yet to even be finalized, I believe it is **premature** for ERCOT to set the cutoff date for submittal of the Steady State study to ERCOT by January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2026. Would respectfully propose that ERCOT consider revising this cutoff date for submittal of the Steady State study to the date that SB 6 Project 58481 is actually finalized.

This helps reduce the risk that if the timing of Batch 0 B, gets delayed past August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2026 that there would not be an **even longer time difference** between the January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2026, steady state study & the actual start of Batch 0 Study B. Or simply change the cutoff date from January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2026, to the end of March 2026 to better account for this risk of the August 1<sup>st</sup> timeline getting delayed.

- While overall move to the Batch Study Process will be a long term positive, it is also critical that current participants in the process be treated equitable with respect to their current positions, and that the same **6-month window concept continues to apply** as we conduct this drastic change in the process for many participants who are already in the middle of the process.
- Under the proposed structure, you can have participants who began the interconnection process in April 2025 for example, who could have their steady state reports completed in February 2026, just a month after the current proposed cutoff of January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2026. Per the current proposed draft these participants would then be pushed to Batch 1, which is not currently slated to start until **March 1<sup>st</sup> 2027** and that March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2027 date is still subject to **being delayed** due to this being a **first-time process** & the rules of SB 6 still not being finalized.
- Per my understanding participants in Batch 1 in March 2027 will **not** be required to have completed a steady State Study & therefore participants who start the interconnection process in late 2026 can still be eligible to participate in the Batch 1 in March 2027. This would mean that participants who began the process in April 2025 would be in the exact same batch 1 as someone that began the process as late as November 2026 (**almost 20 months later** after the April 2025 participant). This proposed format is entirely inconsistent with the overall “6 month” batch process, where we are seeking to align participants to be in the same batch as other participants who started or began the process within the **same 6-month batch..**
  - One solution would be to make the “**TSP initial Studies for screening**” **required** and **not optional** and therefore **requiring** that a steady state study be submitted to ERCOT as a requirement of participating in the Batch 1. Process needs to be clear & concrete for all participants and therefore items that are “**Optional**” will only result in confusion & unequitable treatment among participants.
  - Additionally, the required TSP studies should follow the exact same 6-month

cutoff for Batch 1 for Batch 0 B. Therefore, if Steady state studies are required to be completed by the end of January 2026 for eligibility in Batch 0 B, then the cutoff for eligibility for Batch 1 should then be the end of July 2026 to ensure that participants in a given Batch (in this case Batch 1) are still grouped within 6 months of other participants who started the process at a similar time.

- This is the only way to ensure that current participants are treated equitably as you institute a massive change in the process, after many participants have already been working under the old process for some time.
  - In order for the 6 month batch process to be fair & equitable, it needs to continue to have participants in the Batch who are within a **6 month** window of each other.
- Lastly, the more information that ERCOT can provide that could be summarized in a non-technical fashion to provide guidance to Landowners the better.
    - We were approached by a potential Buyer of our family land who provided us guidance regarding the process to “secure the power”
    - After contacting the TSP and researching the interconnection process, and having now gone through a portion of the actual interconnection power process, I now know that the information provided to us by these potential Buyers was **misleading and incorrect** regarding the process to secure power.
    - Landowners should be a constituent in this process along with Developers & End Users, and the more **summary** publications info that ERCOT could provide in a non-technical high-level format the more Landowners can make a more informed decision with respect to their properties and how Landowners should best proceed in the process.
  - Lastly, my sincere apologies, but I was unaware that my prior email (sent Feb 5<sup>th</sup> at 3:19 pm) was going to be published to the public, so it had information that needs to **remain confidential**. Christina Switzer with ERCOT was kind enough to notify me that these emails would be publicly published, so I would respectfully request that you **fully delete and not publish the email I sent on Feb 5<sup>th</sup> at 3:19 pm and fully replace it with this email where I have removed Confidential information**, so that this email can be publicly published.

Thanks for your consideration of our proposed requests to further improve the proposed process.

Landowner & Permit Applicant