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**WHOLESALE ELECTRIC QUADRANT**

**Business Practices Subcommittee**

**Western Interconnection Congestion Management Working Group**

**Conference Call**

**June 17, 2025 – 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM Central**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

1. **Welcome**

Mr. Phillips welcomed the participants to the meeting. Ms. Trum provided the antitrust and meeting policies reminder. The participants introduced themselves. Mr. Phillips reviewed the agenda. Mr. Watkins moved, seconded by Mr. Thappetaobula, to adopt the agenda. The motion passed a simple majority vote without opposition.

The participants reviewed the draft minutes from the May 16, 2025 meeting. Minor changes were made to correct the participant list. Mr. Thappetaobula moved, seconded by Mr. Watkins, to adopt the draft minutes as final. The motion passed a simple majority vote without opposition. The final minutes for the meeting are available through the following hyperlink: <https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps_WICM051625fm.docx>.

1. **Review and Discus Draft Standards Language to Address Standards Request R24005 / 2025 WEQ Annual Plan Item 1.b – Develop and/or modify the WEQ-008 Transmission Loading Relief – Eastern Interconnection Business Practice Standards to support congestion management processes for the Western Interconnection**

Mr. Phillips stated that BPA had submitted two work papers for discussion, [BPA Flow-Based Curtailment](https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_bps_WICM061725w4.pptx) and [BPA On-Path, Off-Path Examples](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps_WICM061725w5.xlsx). Mr. Johson reviewed the work papers, explaining the local congestion management procedures used by BPA. Mr. Thappetaobula noted that the examples provided by BPA highlight the difference between the use of a contract path methodology to make on-path, off-path curtailment priority designations and a flow-based methodology to make on-path, off-path curtailment priority designations. He explained that the WELR congestion management process uses a flow-based methodology. Mr. Watkins stated that the use of a flow-based methodology is why on-path, off-path curtailment priority designations under the WELR procedure will differ from those made under the Unscheduled Flow Mitigation Plan (UFMP) procedure.

Mr. Johnson stated that during the previous meeting, he had suggested there may be a need to require point-of-receipt and point-of-delivery mapping. He noted that this mapping would be important to carryout the WELR procedure as the ECC will need to accurately model the interconnection’s topology. Mr. Thappetaobula stated that as part of a separate process, SPP and CAISO/RC-West are working with the ECC software vendor identify points of constraint, benchmark flow calculations, and update service point model mapping.

Mr. Thappetaobula reviewed the [WELR On-Path Congestion Management Work Paper](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps_WICM061725w7.docx). He explained that Example 1 and Example 2 both address scenarios where there is a single owner for the constraint while Example 3 is intended to address a scenario where the constraint occurs at a jointly owned transmission facility. Mr. Johnson noted that the on-path, off-path and priority determinations in Example 1 and Example 2 are similar with how these determinations are made under existing congestion management processes but that Example 3 is not. He stated that in Example 3, under BPA’s local congestion management process, the curtailment priority would be based on the transmission service scheduled by the transmission service provider responsible for addressing the issue causing the constraint. Mr. Thappetaobula explained that the proposal in Example 3 to use the leg with the highest priority transmissions service to determine curtailment priority is meant to provide a starting point for discussion. He stated that the participants can develop a specific method to determine curtailment priority for constraints at jointly owned facilities or use a default determination, such as a rule that the curtailment priority will always be based on the highest or lowest priority transmission service of a leg.

Ms. Chung stated that it may be helpful for discussion if real examples could be provided to explain the scenario being addressed by Example 3. Mr. Watkins offered to provide this information for the next meeting. Mr. Johnson stated that the goal of the curtailment priority determination should be to support equitable management of energy flow based on transmission rights. He noted that an explanation of how the proposed rule for determining curtailment priority for constraints at jointly owned facilities will achieve this goal would also be helpful.

Mr. Johnson asked how the WELR procedure will be used in conjunction with other congestion management processes. Mr. Watkins explained that the draft standards make clear that local congestion management procedures can be used either with or in lieu of the WELR process. Mr. Thappetaobula stated that the reliability coordinators which have opted to use WELR will coordinate with balancing authorities and transmission service providers to determine how to best address the area of constraint. Mr. Watkins noted that in some constraint scenarios, it may be beneficial to first implement local procedures but that there are some circumstances in which it may be more effective to use WELR. He stated that WELR allows for the management of all impacts contributing to a constraint, and the ECC will support real-time modeling of new constraints under the WELR process. Mr. Thappetaobula agreed, noting that unlike local procedures, WELR can be used to manage and address loop flows.

Mr. Phillips asked Mr. Watkins to review the [proposed revisions](https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_bps_WICM061725w3.docx) to the draft standards he provided as a work paper for the meeting.

Mr. Watkins stated that he struck XXX-2.4. He explained that requirements establishing transmission service sub-priorities are not needed as the participants agreed that generation-to-load should be considered firm. Mr. Phillips noted that XXX-3.3.3.4 references the sub-priorities established in XXX-2.4. Ms. Chung stated that XXX-3.3.3.4 is still needed as the language addresses reloads. She suggested that the references to sub-priorities be updated to the priority of the transmission service as described in XXX-2.4. There was general agreement with these changes.

Mr. Watkins stated that he revised XXX-3.1 to include more detailed information on the notification that reliability coordinators must provide when a WELR event has been initiated. He explained that the intent is to mirror the information provided by reliability coordinators as part of the Unscheduled Flow Mitigation Plan event notice. The participants made minor revisions to the formatting and proposed language.

Mr. Watkins stated that he revised XXX-3.3.2.4 to include more detailed information regarding intra-hour e-Tags. Ms. Chung proposed a minor change to replace the word “held” with “curtailed.” There was general agreement with these changes.

Mr. Watkins asked if the requirements addressing the methods to submit intra-balancing authority transactions in XXX-1.5 are still needed as the participants agreed that generation-to-load will be considered firm. Mr. Thappetaobula stated that XXX-1.6.1 makes clear that non-tagged generation-to-load impact is to be treated as firm. He proposed that the entire section could be struck, explaining that XXX-1.6.1 eliminates the need for a balancing authority to declare which method it will use to submit intra-balancing authority transactions. Ms. Chung noted that XXX-1.5.2 requires a balancing authority to submit e-Tags for intra-balancing authority transactions in a comparable method as interchange transactions. She suggested retaining this requirement. The participants agreed to strike XXX-1.5 in its entirety and move XXX-1.5.2 to under the requirement addressing secondary network transmission service transactions.

It was noted that by striking XXX-1.5, the defined term Generator Priority Schedule no longer appears in the draft standards language. The participants agreed to revise the standards to remove references to the Generator Prioritization Method.

Mr. Phillips reviewed the [Chair Work Paper](https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_bps_WICM061725w6.docx). He explained that the proposed revisions are intended to ensure the language is consistent with itself and other NAESB WEQ Business Practice Standards. Mr. Hundal stated that the phrase “interconnection-wide WELR procedure” is redundant. Mr. Watkins agreed. The participants revised the introduction section and agreed to use the phrase “WELR procedure” within the standards language for consistency.

Mr. Phillps noted that XXX-3.2, XXX-3.3.2.6, and XXX-3.3.2.7 are passively worded and do not identify who should be taking the action. The participants agreed that the reliability coordinator is the responsible party and made corresponding modifications.

The participants reviewed and updated the Parking Lot Issues List. The document as revised during the meeting is available at the following hyperlink: <https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps_WICM061725a3.xlsx>.

The Proposed Business Practice Standards Work Paper as revised during the meeting is available through the following hyperlink: <https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_bps_WICM061725a2.docx>.

1. **Discuss Next Steps and Future Meetings**

Mr. Phillips stated that during the last meeting, the participants had agreed to hold an informal comment period on the initial draft after making the additional modifications discussed during the call. Mr. Hundal suggested that the next meeting be moved to provide industry with four weeks to review the initial draft and provide a response. The participants agreed to request industry submit any comments by Tuesday, July 15 and to reschedule the next meeting to Thursday, July 17 from 1:00 – 4:00 PM Central.

Ms. Campbell asked the difference between an informal and formal comment period. Mr. Phillips stated that the purpose of an informal comment period is to obtain industry feedback on the direction of proposed standards. He explained that the working group will spend the next few meetings reviewing any comments or proposed alternative language and making additional revisions to develop a proposed recommendation. He noted that any developed recommendation will be presented to the WEQ BPS for approval. If approved, then a formal comment period will be held, and the recommendation and any submitted formal comments presented to the WEQ Executive Committee for consideration.

1. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 2:43 PM Central on a motion by Mr. Thappetaobula.

1. **Attendance**

| **First Name** | **Last Name** | **Organization** |
| --- | --- | --- |
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| Jeremy | West | OATI |