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

The participants reviewed the draft minutes from the April 16, 2025 meeting. No modifications were offered. Mr. Watkins 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://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps_WICM041625fm.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 Mr. Watkins submitted [revisions](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps_WICM041625w4.xlsx) to the Proposed Business Practice Standards Work Paper to address several Parking Lot Issues identified during the previous meeting. He asked Mr. Watkins to review the modifications.

Mr. Watkins stated that during the previous meeting, the participants identified a need for more detailed language to address the classification of interchange transactions that will be curtailed when it is unclear if a constrained facility or flowgate is on a particular contract path (Parking Lot Item 12). He explained that he revised XXX-2.2 to specify that the area of constraint will be considered “on-path” for transmission service providers if the transmission service provider is listed on the contract path for the e-Tag, meaning the RC should use the constrained path method to determine e-Tag priority, and XXX-2.3 to specify that the RC will use the weakest link method to determine priority of “off-path” contract path constraints.

Mr. Hundal asked if the amount of relief obligation issued under the WELR process will correspond to the transmission rights of each of the associated transmission owners when the area of constraint is a jointly owned facility. Mr. Watkins explained that under the WELR process, e-Tag curtailments and generation-to-load (GTL) relief obligations are issued on an equitable basis based on the priority of the transmission service relative to the physical impact of the transmission service on an area of constraint. He stated that XXX-2.2 and XXX-2.3 are meant to describe how a reliability coordinator will establish priority for interchange and inter-BA transactions and that the “on-path” and “off-path” designations are not the same as the UFMP qualified path designations.

Mr. Johnson asked if it would be helpful if the standards included requirements for how to map associated points-of-receipt and points-of-delivery for a transmission service transaction to an area of constraint. Mr. Thappetaobula stated that such mapping would likely not be needed, explaining that the issuance of WELR relief obligations is not dependent upon mapping a constraint to a specific transmission path. He noted that the first step is to reach consensus on how priority of transactions will be established and that similar to the TLR process used by the Eastern Interconnection, the standards can take into account seams agreements and other types of agreements parties have put in place. Mr. Watkins agreed, noting that the purpose of assigning priority is to make sure that curtailments and relief obligations are first issued to all transactions for non-firm transmission service, on an equal basis, that have an impact of greater than 5% on the system operating limit, before moving on to the next level of transmission service priority.

Mr. Hundal suggested that it would be helpful if additional examples could be provided to show how relief obligations will be issued for constraints occurring at jointly owned facilities. Ms. Anderson agreed, stating that a better understanding of how the process will account for unique circumstances in the Western Interconnection will help participants determine if the proposed revisions to XXX-2.2 and XXX-2.3 are sufficient or if additional changes are needed. Mr. Thappetaobula offered to provide examples for the next meeting to clarify how determinations for on or off contract path designations will be made for transactions of the same transmission priority level with jointly owned transmission facilities. Mr. West volunteered to provide additional information as to how seams and congestion management agreements are addressed as part of the TLR process within the Eastern Interconnection.

Mr. Watkins stated that he revised XXX-1.6.1 to provide additional clarity around the rules for GTL prioritization in response to Parking Lot Item 2. He noted that given the number of BAs participating in the Western Interconnection, it may be difficult to establish one common approach for making firm/non-firm GTL designations as each BA has its own tariff, governing documents, and market products that govern these decisions. He stated that the original language for XXX-1.6 is based on the process agreed upon by the Eastern Interconnection in WEQ-008 but that the participants may want to consider a simplified approach that would by default assume GTL is firm. Mr. Thappetaobula agreed with the proposal, noting that this is a complex issue that industry participants have been discussing for a number of years now. He stated that a more detailed methodology to differentiate firm and non-firm GTL for WELR could be developed if there was a need in the future. Mr. Hundal suggested that XXX-1.6.1 be revised to make explicit that non-tagged GTL impacts within a BA serving its own load will be treated as firm. The participants agreed to the language change.

Mr. Watkins stated that he added XXX-1.6.3 to incorporate the concept of market dispatch and clarify that a BA assigned a GTL relief obligation, if in a market area, can delegate to the Market Operator for determinations in how to best implement. Mr. Thappetaobula noted that XXX-1.7 may need further changes to ensure a BA receives the appropriate credit for relief obligations implemented by the Market Operator.

Mr. Thappetaobula reviewed a [presentation](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps_WICM051625w7.pptx) overviewing how a BA will receive credit for meeting its WELR relief obligations. He explained that in WELR, each BA will be issued a specific MW target for curtailment or relief obligation that must be met and the timeframe in which this must be done. Mr. Lowe stated that depending on the level of relief obligation, some BAs may have to redispatch a number of generators which could require significant manual action to achieve. Mr. Thappetaobula explained that as proposed, the intent is for the ECC to use real-time data to implement WELR. He stated that as part of tool implementation, there could be discussion around mechanisms to assist BAs in implementing relief obligations. Mr. Lowe noted that this could help streamline implementation and improve efficiency of redispatch. He suggested that this would likely be better addressed through tool design and functionality discussions rather than as part of standard requirements.

Mr. Hundal stated that it would be helpful if additional insights could be provided as to how GTL relief obligations would be addressed in relation to the Canada-U.S. interties. Mr. Johnson noted that as GTL is intended to serve load within a BA, there may not be very many instances in which a Canadian BA’s GTL is impacting congestion in the U.S. or a U.S. BA’s GLT is impacting congestion in Canada. Mr. Thappetaobula stated that it may be helpful to consider how Canadian BAs in the Eastern Interconnection have handled such occurrences. Mr. Hundal offered to discuss this area internally and provide feedback for the next meeting.

Mr. Watkins reviewed the notice [information](https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps_WICM051625w5.docx) that is currently provided under UFMP when a curtailment event is issued. Mr. Hundal stated that information about a WELR curtailment or relief obligation will be important for market participants, even those not directly impact. Mr. Watkins noted that any standards language will need to be careful not to violate any standards of conduct around information sharing and ensure protection of sensitive data. Mr. Johnson stated that the information about the curtailment and relief obligation does not need to be overly detailed but that some sort of notice would be beneficial. He explained that this information could help market participants determine possible future impact to their own transactions. Mr. Hundal offered to develop language for consideration at the next meeting.

Mr. Johnson asked if participants could discuss the reallocation and sub-priorities concept in more details as part of the next meeting. Mr. Watkins offered to provide additional information to help clarify the intent of the standards language.

The Parking Lot Issues List as revised during the meeting is available at the following hyperlink: <https://naesb.org/pdf4/weq_bps_WICM051625a2.xlsx>.

The Proposed Business Practice Standards Work Paper as revised during the meeting available through the following hyperlink: <https://naesb.org/member_login_check.asp?doc=weq_bps_WICM051625a1.docx>.

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

Mr. Phillips stated that during the last meeting, the participants discussed holding an informal comment period to obtain industry feedback on the direction of proposed standards. Mr. Watkins suggested that an informal comment period be postponed until after the next meeting to allow participants additional time to make the modifications discussed during the meeting. Mr. Phillips proposed lengthening the next meeting to ensure there is sufficient time for subcommittee discussion.

Mr. Phillips noted that outside of the informal comment period, any participant can offer language proposals for discussion. He asked participants to provide any feedback they may have ahead of the next meeting, explaining that written comments often help to further subcommittee discussion.

1. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 12:59 PM Central on a motion by Mr. Watkins.
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| Steve | Ashbaker | WECC |
| Rebecca | Berdahl | BPA |
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