At this stage, we have limited comments on the scope of work, as mentioned in our last call. This includes some minor wording clarification changes. Major items include the following:

- As discussed earlier, we would like Cleco Power folded-in as a transmission owner. No additional cases or scenarios would be needed since it is assumed that Cleco is *not* in the SPP in the Base Case and moves to the SPP in the Change Case – same as the Entergy System. (We have confirmed this in discussions with Cleco Power.)

- Per our last call, the “basic” scope of work should not include studies of future economic transmission projects (i.e., projects that are not currently part of an Entergy or SPP plan), unless such a project can be directly linked and “caused by” Entergy joining the SPP. It was agreed that this would be moved to the Addendum as an optional topic. However, this might raise a funding issue.

- We requested (as did the APSC) that results for the current SPP footprint be reported. This was accepted by the group.

- There is some confusion over the allocations issue and the TPC’s role. Presumably, the TPC’s study will produce cost/benefit metrics for the Entergy footprint. These results then must be split between the Entergy System and the non-System wholesale transmission customers. This is missing from the write-up. (Cleco Power results fall in there somewhere as well.) Is this part of the main (FERC-funded) study or the Addendum? Right now it is in neither place. If possible, we prefer this to be in the main study.

We just received the Addendum and have not previously had an opportunity to comment on it. Our main concern with it is organizational, in order to make it clearer for Commissioners and those that have not been involved in these discussions. We have taken a crack at
reorganizing the document with some largely non-substantive clarifications. We suggest organizing the Addendum into three sections: (A) an introduction to explain the purpose of having an Addendum; (B) an explanation concerning how intra-System or “intra-footprint” allocations will be performed (by Entergy); and (c) a listing of the additional requested studies identified to date. We did not include a write-up for the economic transmission planning studies since we were not sure how to word that. We ask the SPP to add that (although it is not clear to us who would fund the effort).

**Language Changes or Minor Clarifications**

1. **Page 1, third paragraph, last sentence -- please add “(referred to as the Base Case)” after “the existing ICT services arrangement”, and “(referred to as the Change Case)” at the very end of that sentence.**

2. **Page 2, item (l)(j) – the reference to “economic value of seams” is somewhat ambiguous since economic value is more of a study result than a data input. Suggest deleting the words “economic value”. If another descriptor is needed, it could be changed to “attributes of seams”.**

3. **Page 2, item (1)(l) – after “extended” add the words “or extrapolated” to convey the notion that we do not expect formal modeling after year 10.**

4. **Page 2, item (4) – reword and simplify to state: “all current bi-lateral transactions and other market mechanisms remain options for both the Base and Change cases”. (However, the WPP will not be in the Change Case.)**

5. **Page 3, item (3) – make it clear that this task will be done by the SPP (with Entergy’s assistance), not by the TPC.**

6. **Page 3, item (4) – change “could” to “would” and delete “consistent with the current System Agreement.” (SPP allocations have nothing to do with the System Agreement.)**
(7) Page 3, under confidentiality discussion – add in the need for the SPP to be included as a supplier of confidential data.

(8) Page 4, sentence beginning with “Assumptions” – please add TPC. It is appropriate for the contractor to provide input on the study assumptions, specification of scenarios, modeling protocols, etc.

(9) Page 5, first paragraph under Phase IV – eliminate references to economic transmission projects. Third paragraph – add “or extrapolated” after “extended”.

(10) Page 6, third line, sentence starting “In addition,” -- switch “SPP” and “TPC”. The TPC should determine allocations with the assistance of the SPP. This is just a difference in emphasis.

(11) Page 6, Phase VI – are we still using the “Study I” and “Study II” terminology? This appears to be the first time it appears in the document.

(12) Page 6, Phase VI – we think it is more accurate to state that the TPC presents cost/benefit findings than makes policy recommendations. Thus, the title should be “Report and Study Findings”. Under item (5) change “offers a recommendation” to “presents findings”. Also, this may be the appropriate place to indicate that CBA results for the current SPP footprint would be reported as well.