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**WHOLESALE ELECTRIC QUADRANT**
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**Western Interconnection Congestion Management Working Group**

**Conference Call**

**August 13, 2025 – 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM Central**

**FINAL 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. Thappetaobula moved, seconded by Ms. Campbell, to adopt the agenda. The motion passed a simple majority vote without opposition.

The participants reviewed the draft minutes from the August 7, 2025 meeting. No modifications were offered. Ms. Davis moved, seconded by Mr. Thappetaobula, 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://www.naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps_WICM080725fm.docx>.

1. **Finalize 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 the [Draft Western Interconnection Equitable Loading Relief Standards & WEQ-000 Modifications](https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_bps_WICM081325w1.docx) posted for the meeting includes the redline modifications made by the working group in response to the submitted informal comments. He noted that the anticipated work papers to address the remaining action items were not available due to unforeseen circumstances and suggested the participants review the [Parking Lot](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps_WICM080725a1.xlsx) to determine the additional revisions that may be needed.

The participants discussed Action Item 12. Mr. West stated that as part of the Eastern Interconnection TLR process, the RCs define flowgates within the IDC and can mark if there is an applicable seams agreement for the flowgate. For coordinated flowgates, this allows the parties to coordinate as to who will fulfill an assigned relief obligation. Mr. West explained that within the ECC, flowgates are already defined. Mr. Phillips asked if the standards should address how seams agreements are to be accounted for as part of the WLR process. Mr. West suggested that language be included if seams agreements could impact the normal WLR process. Mr. Thappetaobula stated that seams agreements could impact how priority is defined if there are multiple owners for a flowgate experiencing a constraint. He suggested that language be added to WEQ-XXX-2.2 and WEQ-XXX-2.3 which define requirements for establishing priority for constrained facilities and flowgates. There was general agreement to add this language.

Mr. Johnson suggested the standards define the elements that the ECC tool will need to consider to determine if a constraint is on-path or off-path, including mapping POR/POD pairs, the associated Transmission Service Provider, and the Transmission Service Provider associated with the transmission at the constraint. Mr. Hundal stated that the WLR process does not incorporate the “on-path/off-path” concept as the process is meant to be able to address an area of congestion anywhere within the interconnection. Mr. Thappetaobula explained that constraints will be identified through ECC modeling based on actual flow using e-Tags and GTLs and not the contract path as is used in UFMP.

Mr. Johnson asked how priority will be determined without the identification of POR/POD pairs. Mr. Hundal stated that based on prior discussions, the working group determined that priority will be determined using the transmission rights of the Transmission Service Provider. If the Transmission Service Provider has transmission rights on the constrained facility or flowgate, the priority of transactions associated with that provider are determined using the constrained path method defined in WEQ-XXX-2.2. If the associated Transmission Service Provider does not have transmission rights on the constrained facility or flowgate, the priority is determined using the weakest link method defined in WEQ-XXX-2.3.

Mr. Johnson noted that there may be scenarios in which entities would want to use a different process to determine priority. He stated that there may be situations in which an entity would want to limit use of the constrained path method to only those transactions that are on the contract path which includes the constraint. Mr. Hundal stated that this would require a fundamental change to the standards and would necessitate the use of a complex mapping process for each constraint. Mr. Thappetaobula noted that the POR/POD combination mapping can be time consuming and could hinder the ability of RCs to use the WLR process in real time to alleviate congestion as is intended. He stated that this mapping is also prone to human error which has caused issues in UFMP. Mr. Hundal explained that entities are not required to use WLR as the standards allow for the use of local procedures as well. He stated that an entity could develop its own procedure that uses a different methodology for determining priority.

Mr. Johnson stated that the standards do not address how priority will be determined under the constrained path method if the e-Tag associated with a Transmission Service Provider has multiple links of varying priority. Ms. Chung stated that the standards need to clearly establish the process for determining priority in these scenarios or identify the party who will be responsible for doing so. Mr. Hundal suggested that the standards specify the priority determination. He explained that allowing individual Transmission Service Providers to determine how priority will be chosen on a constraint-by-constraint basis will result in unnecessary complexity and create inconsistency in the congestion management process. Mr. Johnson proposed that the standards establish that the RC is to use the lowest transmission service priority if there are multiple transmission links. There was general agreement, and the participants created WEQ-XXX-2.2.3. Action Item 12 was closed.

The participants discussed Action Item 14. Mr. Hundal noted that this issue was created to address his informal comments but that the item may have been addressed by the confirmation from past meeting discussions that all Interchange Transactions are required to be tagged and the priority of the e-Tag will be used. Mr. Thappetaobula noted that participants had also discussed the need to capture real-time information for dynamic schedules and pseudo-ties. He suggested adding “real-time power output” to WEQ-XXX-1.4.1.1. There was generation agreement with the proposal. Action Item 14 was closed.

The participants discussed Action Item 15. Mr. Hundal suggested that only WEQ-XXX-1.4.2.1 needed to be retained. Mr. Thappetaobula agreed, stating that the differentiation in transactions is not needed as this is a carry-over from the Eastern Interconnection TLR process which has methodologies for determining the priority of Intra-BA Transactions that are not tagged. He explained that participants previously determined that this would not be necessary for the Western Interconnection and all non-tagged Intra-BA Transactions are to be treated as firm. There was general agreement that WEQ-XXX-1.4.2.2 through WEQ-XXX-1.4.2.5 are not applicable to the WLR process and could be deleted. Action Item 15 was closed.

The participants discussed Action Item 16. Mr. Johnson suggested that the WLR process not incorporate the credit for redispatch concept. He stated that the concept adds unnecessary complexity without adding value to the WLR process. Ms. Chung agreed, explaining that if a relief obligation is assigned, an entity has an obligation to meet that relief assignment. Mr. Johnson noted that the concept does not appropriately account for changes in the system that may take place between the current and next hour. He stated that there could be scenarios in which an entity that provided more of its assigned relief obligation the previous hour would still need to provide relief in the next hour or an entity that underprovided would not need to provide relief in the next hour. Mr. Hundal noted that the credit for redispatch concept may have been included to incentivize the redispatching of generators to provide relief obligation which can be more efficient but costlier than curtailment in some scenarios. Mr. Thappetaobula stated that if the participants can always revise the standards if there is a need to incorporate the concept at a later date. There was no objection to deleting WEQ-XXX-1.6.1.

Mr. Hundal suggested WEQ-XXX-1.6.2 be moved to the section addressing Interchange Transactions to become WEQ-XXX-1.4.1.2. Ms. Chung stated that the current language may be too proscriptive and imply that dynamic schedules and pseudo-ties cannot be curtailed. Mr. Thappetaobula confirmed that the intent is for the BA, working with the RC, to have an option of curtailing or providing relief through redispatch. The participants made clarifying changes to the language. Action Item 16 was closed.

The participants reviewed Action Item 17 and confirmed that “on-path/off-path” language no longer appears in the standard. Action Item 17 was closed.

The standards as revised during the meeting are available at the following hyperlink: <https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_bps_WICM081325a2.docx>.

The Parking Lot Issues List as revised during the meeting is available at the following hyperlink: <https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps_WICM081325a1.xlsx>.

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

Mr. Phillips stated that the participants had discussed holding a second informal comment period on the revised draft standards. Mr. Hundal stated that this would be beneficial to help ensure that all issues have been resolved and any standard gaps addressed before finalizing the draft language for WEQ BPS consideration. Mr. Thappetaobula agreed. Mr. Phillips suggested the working group ask for feedback to be submitted by August 27, 2025 and that the working group extend its meeting on Tuesday, September 2, 2025 to 10:00 AM – 4:00 PM Central. There was general agreement.

1. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:08 PM Central on a motion by Ms. Berdahl.
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