Southwest Power Pool, Inc.

ICT STAKEHOLDERS POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

March 17, 2011

Astor Crowne Plaza    New Orleans, LA

• Draft Meeting Minutes •

8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Agenda Item 1- Administrative Items

Bruce Rew, SPP, called the meeting to order at approximately 8:08 a.m. There were 42 in attendance in person and by teleconference.

Agenda Item 2- Agenda Review

Bruce Rew reviewed the agenda which was posted prior to the meeting on the SPP website and available at the meeting. An agenda change was made to have the Reliability Task Force and the AFC Task Force updates consecutive for discussion on the joint Reliability Task Force/AFC Task Force meeting. The ERSC Working Group update will not be given because they are meeting concurrently as the SPC.

Agenda Item 3- Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Bruce Rew asked for a motion of approval of the minutes for the previous meetings on January 20, 2011 and February 22, 2011. There were no objections, changes or modifications, and the motion was moved, seconded, and passed. Bruce Rew announced that the meeting materials are posted on the SPP website.

Agenda Item 4- Review of Stakeholder Survey

Tony Green, SPP, presented the 2010 Stakeholder Survey results and comparisons. Once again there were 17 stakeholders that participated in the survey. Overall results were slightly ahead of 2009, and the survey showed high satisfaction with ICT staff activity and customer service, but the processes used to resolve issues were frustrating to stakeholders and needed improvement.

Dr. Jim Karrh, MarketSearch, participated via teleconference. Dr. Karrh provided analysis and comments on the survey results. Jennifer Vosburg, NRG Louisiana Generating, asked Dr. Karrh about further improvements in the participation in the survey. Gary Newell, Thompson Coburn LLP, asked Dr. Karrh about other possible methods of conducting the survey or research with the stakeholders.

Agenda Item 5- ICT Regulatory Update

1
There were no formal updates from the ICT or Entergy this quarter.

**Agenda Item 7- Users Group Report**

Tim Phillips, SPP, presented the Users Group report. Mr. Phillips noted that the Users Group assessment on February 22\textsuperscript{nd} was not successful as Entergy was not able to produce all of the data required to perform the assessment. The SPP Internal audit staff met with Entergy’s IT staff in a working session March 1\textsuperscript{st}. Another assessment was performed March 7\textsuperscript{th} at which time Entergy was able to provide further assessment data, however several processes and data points could still not be determined. Mr. Phillips also reviewed the FERC filings summary chart along with the AFC-related errors filed this quarter.

Jennifer Vosburg raised several questions concerning Entergy’s lack of data availability and errors in the report. Ms. Vosburg asked Mr. Phillips if this was different from earlier audits. Mr. Phillips stated that this assessment was much different from recent assessments. Mr. Phillips also brought up that Entergy had a new staff member in the audit process and this had caused some delay. Kham Vongkhamchanh, Entergy, addressed several of the questions, stating data was not lost, but they are addressing documentation concerns. He also confirmed there had been a loss of key personnel which brought a transition to new personnel, but that additional personnel would be brought in to address these issues. Entergy is also looking at trying to automate these processes.

Jennifer Vosburg expressed her concern that process problems shouldn’t be occurring four years into the ICT. Kip Fox, AEP, asked if there were any violation or filings of the assessment with NERC or SERP. Carl Monroe, SPP, answered the assessment audits are performed pursuant to Entergy’s tariff. Mr. Fox inquired if a mitigation plan had been provided by Entergy. Mr. Phillips said no, but they have done “gap” plans with past issues. John Chiles, GDS Associates, asked if the ICT would be changing frequency of the audits based on the number and severity of these errors. Several comments were made from the group. It was determined that a Users Group meeting and conference call would be held to determine next steps and actions required.

Roberto Paliza, Paliza Consulting, inquired on the longer period of time to respond to the AFC errors listed in the report. Jennifer Vosburg asked what impact an AFC error would have on reliability. Don Shipley, SPP, stated reliability issues are addressed real-time, with quick knowledge of the issue and immediate mitigation. Mr. Paliza commented on the Issue Trak system and if it should be utilized for these issues. Mr. Shipley discussed the current use of Issue Trak by the stakeholders for other issues. Mr. Paliza commented on the response times for items in Issue Trak. Tony Green took an action item to verify the response times that are reported in the ICT Quarterly and Annual reports. Brenda Harris, Occidental Energy Ventures, asked if it is common to have this many data errors from a transmission service provider. Tim Phillips commented each would be different but is unaware of any comparisons. Kham Vongkhamchanh stated Entergy is the only transmission service provider required to report these errors.
**Agenda Item 11- Reliability Task Force**

Don Shipley presented the Reliability Task Force (RTF) update. This also included a review of the Joint RTF and AFCTF meeting March 16th. The main focuses of the update were work on AFC flowgates and real-time congestion, a process chart for generator outage approval, the forming of an AFC Benchmarking Focus Group, and evaluating comments on the Entergy Business Practices. Mr. Shipley stated that Roberto Paliza had submitted comments for the benchmarking group, and that Mr. Shipley was taking an action item schedule a meeting with Mr. Paliza and Jason Davis, SPP, to discuss those comments. Jennifer Vosburg asked if the Entergy Business Practices are now in effect. Glen Bernstein, Entergy, responded that the Entergy Business Practices had been filed at FERC, but that this was an informational filing only. Kham Vongkhamchanh responded later that by and large the business practices were not in effect at this time, but a table at the end of the filing shows which business practices are in effect.

**Agenda Item 8- AFC Task Force**

Jason Davis presented the AFC Task Force (AFCTF) update. The update delivered information on the AFCTF action for the data input into the AFC process, AFC flowgate analysis review including the addition of flowgates, improvements in Reliability Coordinator/Tariff Administration coordination, and progress on the consolidated list of issues from the stakeholders.

Roberto Paliza and Mr. Davis discussed the number of new flowgates and the overall number of flowgates. Cameron Warren, Entergy, discussed the status of the flowgates and their impact on the AFC process.

**Agenda Item 9- SIS Task Force**

Ben Roubique, SPP, delivered the System Impact Studies Task Force (SISTF) update. Significant progress has been made by the task force on reporting of negative AFC, failure to show TDF values, and lack of complete cost estimates. They have also reviewed the Attachment T Guiding Document.

**Agenda Item 10- ICT 2011 Base Plan Update**

Brandon Hentschel, SPP, provided an update on the ICT 2011 Base Plan including complete, future, and additional projects for the base plan. The update also included discussion on mitigation plans, the 2012 RA Scope document, and the 2011 Base Plan/Construction Plan Differences Report filed February 28th.

Several of the stakeholders had questions about the designations of load pockets, specifically the WOTAB area and the ALP. Mr. Hentschel took an action item to review and bring back to the stakeholders a response indicating whether those areas would be considered as load pockets in the Reliability Assessment. Jennifer Vosburg requested and Mr. Hentschel agreed to have a response no later than April 8, 2011.
Agenda Item 12- WPP Task Force

Antoine Lucas, SPP, presented the WPP Task Force report. The weekly summary of results was presented from January 22nd through March 18th. Mr. Lucas also discussed the WPP Task Force Transparency Recommendation and the second round of WPP QF Put proposal testing.

Roberto Paliza inquired about the summary of results, specifically the lack of Hold Harmless provisions. Mr. Lucas stated there were several factors, most notably the higher load conditions during the period.

Several stakeholders discussed Entergy’s responses to the Transparency Recommendation and the ICT’s response. Mr. Lucas stated the ICT is working with the SPP RTO on market monitoring to help with the response. Mr. Lucas took an action item to set up a conference call with the SPC to discuss the ICT’s response to the Transparency Recommendation. Jennifer Vosburg asked if the E-RSC would be addressing this subject. Sam Loudenslager, Arkansas Public Service Commission, stated the E-RSC Working Group would be waiting on the SPC and the ICT response before addressing the issue.

Tina Lee, KGen Power, discussed the offer period extension proposal. Glen Bernstein discussed timing within the offer extension period. Becky Turner, Entegra Power Group/UPP, asked if there would be any changes to the input format with the extension. Mr. Lucas responded that there would be none that he is aware of.

Open Items Review

Tony Green reviewed the changes for the ICT pages on the SPP website. The format will reflect the new task forces and ICT SPC structure, along with an ICT calendar of events and a common phone number for use by all ICT SPC task forces.

The next ICT SPC meeting will be held in June and will be a teleconference with WebEx. The meeting date will be set by the SPCCC.

Agenda Item 13- Action Items Review

Action items:

1. Tim Phillips, SPP, will organize a Users Group teleconference to discuss next steps in addressing the errors and lack of data reported in the Users Group Assessments.
2. Tony Green, SPP, will verify Issue Trak response times.
3. Don Shipley, SPP, and Jason Davis, SPP, will prepare a follow up meeting with Roberto Paliza for comments on the AFC Benchmarking Focus Group.
4. Brandon Hentschel, SPP, will provide a response on the analysis of load pockets in the 2012 Reliability Assessment prior to April 8, 2011.
5. Antoine Lucas, SPP, will organize a WPPTF teleconference on the response to the WPP Transparency Recommendation.
Agenda Item 12- Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce Rew
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Attending</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUCOIN</td>
<td>ERICA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:EAUCOIN@ENTERGY.COM">EAUCOIN@ENTERGY.COM</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon Petroleum Co LLC</td>
<td>Barfield</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td><a href="mailto:crbarfield@marathonpetroleum.com">crbarfield@marathonpetroleum.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bernstein</td>
<td>Glen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gbernstein@sidley.com">gbernstein@sidley.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broussard</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbrouss1@entergy.com">dbrouss1@entergy.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lcarlisle@smepa.coop">lcarlisle@smepa.coop</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExxonMobil</td>
<td>Chiles</td>
<td>John</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.childes@gdsassociates.com">j.childes@gdsassociates.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chiles</td>
<td>John</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.chiles@gdsassociates.com">john.chiles@gdsassociates.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lyles Cruthirds Attorney at Law</td>
<td>Cruthirds</td>
<td>David</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david@thecruthirdsreport.com">david@thecruthirdsreport.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entergy</td>
<td>Daspit</td>
<td>Laurence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ldaspil1@entergy.com">ldaspil1@entergy.com</a></td>
<td>Teleconferencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jdavis@spp.org">jdavis@spp.org</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estes</td>
<td>Chip</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chipestes@gmail.com">chipestes@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Electric Power</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Kip</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmfox@aep.com">kmfox@aep.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tgreen@spp.org">tgreen@spp.org</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occidental Energy Ventures</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brenda_harris@oxy.com">brenda_harris@oxy.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Harward</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mharward@spp.org">mharward@spp.org</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway Corporation</td>
<td>Heintzen</td>
<td>George</td>
<td><a href="mailto:george.heintzen@conwaycorp.com">george.heintzen@conwaycorp.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Water &amp; Light</td>
<td>Henley</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhenley@jonesborocwl.org">rhenley@jonesborocwl.org</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Hentschel</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bhentschel@spp.org">bhentschel@spp.org</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hicks</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mhicks@zacharydavidwilsonpa.com">mhicks@zacharydavidwilsonpa.com</a></td>
<td>Teleconferencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGen Power</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tlee@kgenpower.com">tlee@kgenpower.com</a></td>
<td>Teleconferencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Public Service Commission</td>
<td>Loudenslager</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sam_loudenslager@psc.state.ar.us">sam_loudenslager@psc.state.ar.us</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Antoine</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alucas@spp.org">alucas@spp.org</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Brittney</td>
<td><a href="mailto:britney_miller@psc.state.ar.us">britney_miller@psc.state.ar.us</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Energy Commodities Group, Inc.</td>
<td>Orr</td>
<td>John</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.orr@constellation.com">john.orr@constellation.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paliza Consulting, LLC.</td>
<td>Paliza</td>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roberto@palizaconsulting.com">roberto@palizaconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tphillips@spp.org">tphillips@spp.org</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entergy Services</td>
<td>Ralston</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aralsto@entergy.com">aralsto@entergy.com</a></td>
<td>Teleconferencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Rew</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brew@spp.org">brew@spp.org</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Roubique</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:broubique@spp.org">broubique@spp.org</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenaska Power Services Co.</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ascott@tnsk.com">ascott@tnsk.com</a></td>
<td>Teleconferencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entegra Power Group/UPP</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rturner@entegrapower.com">rturner@entegrapower.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entergy</td>
<td>Vongkhamchanh</td>
<td>Kham</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kvongkh@entergy.com">kvongkh@entergy.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRG Louisiana Generating, LLC</td>
<td>Vosburg</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jennifer.vosburg@nrgenergy.com">jennifer.vosburg@nrgenergy.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entergy Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cwarre1@entergy.com">cwarre1@entergy.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zahnow</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jessica.zahnow@argusmedia.com">jessica.zahnow@argusmedia.com</a></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPY</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>Kristine</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entergy</td>
<td>Tong</td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETEC</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETEC</td>
<td>Ritter</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette, et al</td>
<td>Newell</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUCT</td>
<td>Grelle</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entergy Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISO</td>
<td>Lawhorn</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLECO</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>System</th>
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<td>Dynegy Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>SPP</td>
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<td>Louis Town</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
</tr>
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<td>ETEC</td>
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<td>SPP</td>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Civil - Jonesboro, AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Chesnutt</td>
<td>Exxon Mobil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Slepak</td>
<td>SPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Anzalone</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>SPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>SPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>ETEC</td>
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<td>GDS</td>
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<td>Marathon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Griffin</td>
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<td>MPE/II/OCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Haddad</td>
<td>Oxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Taylor</td>
<td>Entegra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Neece</td>
<td>Lafayette, et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Wang</td>
<td>Entergy Service</td>
</tr>
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<td>Cisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Tona</td>
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• D R A F T A G E N D A •

8:00 a.m. - Noon

1. Introductions and roll call................................................................. Bruce Rew
2. Review of meeting agenda................................................................. All
3. Approval of prior SPC minutes and conference calls....................... All
4. Review of Stakeholder Survey Results ............................................. Dr. Karrh with MarketSearch
5. ICT Regulatory update ..................................................................... ICT/Entergy
6. ERSC Working Group update ......................................................... ERSC WG Representative
7. Users Group report .......................................................................... Tim Phillips
8. AFC Task Force ................................................................................ Jason Davis
9. SIS Task Force ................................................................................ Ben Roubique
10. 2011 BP and 2012 RA ................................................................. Brandon Hentschel
11. Reliability Task Force ..................................................................... Don Shipley
12. WPP Task Force ............................................................................ Antoine Lucas
13. Action Items review ........................................................................ All
14. Adjournment .................................................................................. Bruce Rew
Southwest Power Pool, Inc.

ICT STAKEHOLDERS POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

January 20, 2011

WebEx and Teleconference

• Meeting Minutes •

1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Agenda Item 1- Administrative Items

Bruce Rew, SPP, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:20 p.m. There were 28 in attendance by teleconference.

Agenda Item 2- Agenda Review

Bruce Rew reviewed the agenda which was posted prior to the meeting on the SPP website and available at the meeting.

Agenda Item 3- Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Bruce Rew asked for a motion of approval of the minutes for the previous meeting on October 20, 2010. There were no objections, changes or modifications, and the motion was moved, seconded, and passed. Bruce Rew announced that the meeting materials are posted on the SPP website.

Agenda Item 4- Review of Stakeholder Survey

Tony Green, SPP, announced that the 2010 Stakeholder Survey was being extended through January 24th. Through January 20th only 9 stakeholders had participated in the survey, and the extension was to allow more stakeholders to participate. Jennifer Vosburg, NRG Energy, added that this is an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the ICT. Ms. Vosburg asked if comments can be added to the survey. Mr. Green answered there are areas to add comments on each functional area of the ICT.

Agenda Item 5- ICT Regulatory Update

There were no formal updates from the ICT or Entergy this quarter. Jennifer Vosburg inquired on the updates for Attachments C, D, and E. Entergy responded that an e-mail from Mac Norton had been sent earlier in the week with an update announcing a teleconference Thursday January 27th to discuss stakeholder comments received and Entergy’s responses. Roberto Paliza, Paliza Consulting LLC, asked if the re-rating project had been completed. Kip Fox, AEP, also inquired about the dates of completion. Mark McCulla, Entergy, responded the rerating
project had been completed and the completion dates should be before summer and the actual
dates should be identified on the Entergy construction project list.

**Agenda Item 6- ERSC Working Group Update**

Sam Loudenslager, Arkansas Public Service Commission, reported on the ERSC Working
Group updates and the previous ERSC Working Group meeting. Mr. Loudenslager commented
on the latest Strategic Projects activities. Also, the Seams Cost Allocation process will be
addressed at the SPP Regional State Committee meeting next week. Mr. Loudenslager
announced there will be a technical conference March 22\textsuperscript{nd} in Little Rock and encouraged
everyone interested to attend. The Working Group also discussed the impacts of Entergy
joining an RTO such as SPP or MISO. The Working Group heard a presentation from Entergy
on the CODA and determined it was best not to discuss the issues in the Working Group. ERSC
President Davis has been asked to report on Entergy activity at the SPP RSC meeting next
week as well. Becky Turner, Entegra, asked if the ERSC Working Group was looking for
stakeholders to give feedback on the WPP comments. Mr. Loudenslager stated they were
looking for feedback, but would poll the stakeholders privately. Gary Newell, Thompson Coburn
LLP, asked if the load shedding event would be discussed at the RSC meeting. Don Shipley,
SPP, responded that SPP is making a presentation on Wednesday.

Jennifer Vosburg asked if the MISO meeting in February was discussed. Mr. Loudenslager
announced that February 22\textsuperscript{nd} in New Orleans MISO would be having an Advisory and Board
meeting. This would be a good opportunity for those stakeholders curious about MISO to attend
and review.

**Agenda Item 7- AFC Task Force**

Jason Davis presented the AFC Task Force report. Bruce Rew asked if Entergy was on
schedule for their action items from the Task Force and Mr. Davis stated they were. Jennifer
Vosburg addressed the stakeholders for more participation in the AFC Task Force as there was
lots of work left to do. Ms. Vosburg also emphasized coordination between the Reliability
Coordinator and the Tariff Desk.

Several discussions were held on Transmission Outage Coordination. Concerns from Ms.
Vosburg and Mr. Paliza included scheduled outages cancelled that were not in the models;
documentation on outages not shared with stakeholders; correctness of models with actual
outages; and processes for granting a transmission outage. Don Shipley responded that the
issues need to be addressed within Code of Conduct rules but transparency is very important.
Mr. Shipley took an action item for the Reliability Task Force to address this issue at their next
meeting.

**Agenda Item 8- SIS Task Force**

Ben Roubique presented the System Impact Studies Task Force. Kip Fox inquired on the
Attachment T guidance document. Jennifer Vosburg added comments on Attachment T and the
FFR document. Roberto Paliza also added comments on Attachment T and FFR values and
inquired on how to suggest changes to the process. Mr. Roubique and Ms. Vosburg commented
that the Task Force, just as the former working group was, is the avenue for stakeholders to
discuss and suggest changes in the process.
Ms. Vosburg again encouraged the stakeholders to participate in the Task Force and to communicate with Mr. Roubique for any feedback on any of the issues.

**ICT 2011 Base Plan Overview**

Eddie Filat, SPP, delivered the Base Plan overview presentation. Roberto Paliza, Charles Long of Entergy, and Ben Roubique discussed technical questions within the Base Plan. Mr. Paliza asked if Operating guides were used. Mr. Filat stated Reliability guidelines were used, but that he would take an action item to determine the usage of the Operating Guides. Ben Roubique also took an action item to provide one document that will discuss the decision process on the guidelines for the scope document and Base Plan.

**Agenda Item 9- Reliability Task Force**

Don Shipley presented the Reliability Task Force report and reliability procedure updates. Kip Fox, Ben Roubique, and Mr. Shipley discussed issues within the report and the RA scope document. They also discussed the approval process of the RA scope document. Mr. Fox commented that stakeholders would like to see more effort to identify lower voltage projects along with the higher voltage projects. Don Shipley took an action item to establish a follow up meeting with Mr. Fox and Ben Roubique to discuss the RA scope document issues further. Gary Newell asked if the process of posting LAP step information was in real time. Mr. Shipley responded that was correct. Roberto Paliza inquired when the off-peak modeling would be implemented and Mr. Shipley stated that the end of the 1st quarter prior to the summer months.

Mr. Shipley discussed the findings of the Task Force on the suspension of AFC and supplemental curtailment process during a TLR. Roberto Paliza, Mr. Shipley, and Jason Davis discussed details of the flowgate analysis within the presentations. Ronnie Frizzell, Arkansas Electric Cooperatives, discussed the use of multiple flowgates on the same contingency. Mr. Shipley took an action item to follow up with Mr. Frizzell further and to make sure the ISES-Dell flowgate is on the agenda at the next Reliability Task Force meeting. Gary Newell asked if the data for curtailment during a TLR would be a part of the regular ICT metrics delivered to the ERSC. Mr. Shipley responded that this data was intended to be a supplement, but that the Reliability Task force could review the need for them on a regular basis.

**Agenda Item 10- WPP Task Force**

Antoine Lucas, SPP, presented the WPP report. Mr. Lucas discussed further the two WPP proposals at the ERSC. Roberto Paliza discussed the results of the proposals and how changes could be addressed. Mr. Lucas and Jennifer Vosburg reiterated that the Task Force could bring those changes to the SPC, then on to the ERSC if appropriate. Mr. Paliza asked on the weeks with no offers selected if there were problems with the program. Mr. Lucas stated the program was functioning properly, but that most of the situations were due to Hold Harmless provisions.

**Agenda Item 11- Users Group Report**
Tim Phillips presented the Users Group Report. Jennifer Vosburg asked about the data in the new FERC filings metrics table, specifically the human error numbers. Ms. Vosburg was interested in seeing if a new column could be added for when the issue started as compared to when the issue was reported. Mr. Phillips took an action item to determine if a column for occurrence could be added and in the case of human error, if the error could be identified as an ICT, Entergy, or customer error.

**Open Items Review**

Jennifer Vosburg stated the ICT needs to ensure that telecommunications are in working order prior to the start of meetings. Discussion was held to determine the next SPC meeting. It was determined the next ICT SPC meeting will be held in conjunction with the ERSC meetings March 16th and 17th in New Orleans. It was suggested there be Task Force meetings the afternoon of March 16th in order to have face to face conversation on the current topics. The ICT SPC meeting would be held the morning of March 17th prior to the ERSC meeting. It was also stressed there would not be a report delivered from these Task Force meetings at the next day's SPC meeting.

**Agenda Item 11- Action Items Review**

Action items:

1. Don Shipley, SPP, to address Transmission Outage Coordination at the next Reliability Task Force.
2. Eddie Filat, SPP, to determine the use of Operating Guides.
3. Ben Roubique, SPP, to provide one document that will discuss the decision process on the guidelines for the scope document and Base Plan.
4. Don Shipley, SPP, will prepare a follow up meeting with Kip Fox and Ben Roubique to discuss the RA scope document.
5. Don Shipley, SPP, will communicate with Ronnie Frizzell on the ISES-Dell flowgate and establish the issue on the agenda for the next Reliability Task Force meeting.
6. Tim Phillips, SPP, will determine if a column for date of occurrence could be added to the FERC filing metrics table. Also determine for those human error responses, if the error could be identified as an ICT, Entergy, or customer error.

**Agenda Item 12- Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:46 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce Rew
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2012 Reliability Assessment Scope

JANUARY 2011
INTER-REGIONAL PLANNING
2012 ICT Reliability Assessment (CPE) Scope

Objective
The objective of the Reliability Assessment is to assess the ability of the Entergy transmission system to perform according to the Planning Criteria in both near-term and long-term horizons.

Models
- Base Case 2010-Series Update1.
- Summer and Winter Peak 2013 and 2017 for near-term.
- Summer Peak 2020 for longer-term.

Model Preparation
The Base Case Model will be updated to reflect:
1. The latest confirmed transmission service reservations.
2. Updated topology: equipment which has been newly placed in-service.
3. Approved and Proposed project from the 2012-2014 DRAFT Construction Plan projects in the season in which the facilities are expected to be complete and for all seasons thereafter.

Software
- PSSE v30
- MUST 9.1

Contingency Scan

Category A
1. The Base Case Model will be evaluated under normal, system-intact conditions.
2. Monitored elements must remain within the thermal and voltage limits specified in Entergy’s Transmission Local Planning Criteria for Category A, currently flows less than 100% of RATEA; voltages between 0.95 and 1.05 per unit.
3. Identify all elements that do not meet the Category A limits.

Category B
1. An N-1 contingency scan will be run on the Base Case Models.
2. Monitored elements must remain within the thermal and voltage limits specified in Entergy’s Transmission Local Planning Criteria for Category B, currently flows less than 100% of RATEA; voltages between 0.92 and 1.05 per unit.
3. For each monitored element that does not remain within these limits, the breaker-to-breaker circuit for the contingency will be identified and an analysis will be done with the entire circuit out of service, if the breaker-to-breaker outage differs from the simulated outage.
4. The amount of load shed by breaker operation, Consequential Load, will be recorded and reported for constrained elements. (ICT 100MW rule) If there is more than 100MW of consequential load between breakers then the bus to bus contingency will used to identify overloads and voltage issues.
**Monitored Elements**
- Entergy Internal:
  - Transmission elements within Entergy’s footprint (including embedded Areas) with nominal voltage 69 kV and higher.
  - Ties to outside Areas at 69 kV and higher.
- CLECO & LUS: Transmission elements with nominal voltage 69 kV and higher.
- All other first-tier Areas (AECI, SOCO, TVA, SMEPA, SWPA, AEPW, OKGE, EMDE): Transmission elements with nominal voltage 345 kV and higher.

**Contingencies**
- Same as Monitored Elements
Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
ICT STAKEHOLDERS POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
October 20, 2010
Hyatt Regency Downtown, Austin, TX

- Meeting Minutes -
8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Agenda Item 1 - Administrative Items

Bruce Rew, SPP, called the meeting to order at approximately 8:00 a.m. There were 29 in attendance and 6 participating by teleconference.

Agenda Item 2 - Agenda Review

Bruce Rew reviewed the agenda which was posted prior to the meeting on the SPP website and available at the meeting.

Agenda Item 3 - Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Bruce Rew asked for a motion of approval of the minutes for the previous meeting on July 21, 2010, along with the teleconference meetings on August 26, 2010 and September 17, 2010. There were no objections, changes or modifications, and the motion was moved, seconded, and passed. Bruce Rew announced that the meeting materials are posted on the SPP website.

Discussion of the Revised SPC Charter and Task Force Structure

Bruce Rew began a review of the Revised SPC charter approved at the August 26, 2010 ICT SPC meeting. Specific items Mr. Rew brought forward for discussion were an appeals process, the organization of the SPC task forces, the clarification of the voting processes within the task forces, and the representation of members within the task forces. Mr. Rew further explained the concept of members identified within sectors was not for voting by sector but for representative purposes. Dave Wilson, Arkansas Cities, asked for some clarification on the discussion. Mr. Rew referred Mr. Wilson to the revised ICT SPC Charter.

Jennifer Vosburg, NRG Energy, discussed the SPC’s intent for the organization of the SPC task forces. Ms. Vosburg discussed specifics for the membership, structure, and voting procedures for the task forces. The intent for the task forces is to have a large membership of those stakeholders who have interest in those subjects, but a smaller group within the task force who are experts in that field that can make informed presentation of issues for the group. Several stakeholders added comments to the discussion. Dave Wilson stated there are several stakeholders within his representative sector that would be very interested in serving on a task force and should have the opportunity to do so. Tom Allen, GDF Suez Energy, inquired about
the meetings of the task forces being open. Ms. Vosburg confirmed that all meetings of the ICT SPC and its task forces are open meetings. Bruce Rew clarified the language in Section 6.2 of the Revised SPC Charter concerning the membership and openness of the SPC task forces. Kip Fox, AEP, also provided comments on this section of the ICT SPC Charter.

Jeff Price, Wright & Talisman, inquired if the SPC were looking to propose changes to Section 6.2. Jennifer Vosburg responded that the SPC would use the Guiding Document of each appointed task force to address representation and other issues for the structure of the task force and that no changes to the filed ICT SPC Charter are intended.

Jennifer Vosburg asked Don Shipley, SPP, to give some details about the success of the DNR Task Force. Mr. Shipley gave an explanation of how the previous DNR Task Force was successful in resolving issues. Mr. Shipley stressed the need for technical experts in the task force to determine the impact of the issues on different sectors and stakeholders of the ICT. These experts can step away from voting and deliver a technical consensus on the issue. Bruce Rew added that the task forces cannot have a narrow focus that doesn’t take into account all stakeholders. Dave Wilson commented that the explanations from Mr. Shipley, Mr. Rew, and Ms. Vosburg helped clarify the positions.

Don Shipley stated that a response was needed as soon as possible for those interested and willing to serve on the task forces. Mr. Shipley added that if necessary the ICT can help choose those members qualified to assist on the task forces. Jennifer Vosburg asked Mr. Shipley if the ICT reviewed the list of task force membership and they found a gap in expertise, could the ICT request the right member to fill that gap. Mr. Shipley responded the ICT was prepared to do that. Ms. Vosburg requested the stakeholders to respond to Mr. Shipley by the close of business Friday October 22, 2010 with those members willing and eligible to serve on the task forces, specifically the Reliability Task Force. If the ICT found that there was a gap in expertise or representation they would extend an invitation to a qualified stakeholder representative. No objections were received from the stakeholders. Tim Phillips, SPP, and Dowell Hudson, SPP, commented on the importance of the stakeholders to be involved in the task forces and take the leadership roles in those task forces.

The next steps for the task forces were discussed. Rick Henley, Jonesboro City Water & Light, stated that a message needs to be sent out as not all stakeholders attended the task force meetings last week. Jennifer Vosburg and Bruce Rew charged the task forces with choosing their chairs and co-chairs at their next meeting. Mark McCulla, Entergy, commented that it would help Entergy and the task forces if the task forces define the specific issues needed to be addressed. Sam Loudenslager, Arkansas Public Service Commission, asked for a summary of the tasks that are to be completed. Ms. Vosburg took an action item for the SPCCC to send out a message to the full ICT SPC summarizing the Task Force formation process discussed today and what is expected at each of the next Task Force meetings. This message will be distributed no later than end of business Friday October 22, 2010.

Bruce Rew commented on Section 2.2 of the Revised ICT SPC Charter. Jennifer Vosburg explained the specific issues with Section 2.2 and an appeals process within the SPC and ERSC structure. Brenda Harris, Occidental, agreed with the position of independence between the ICT SPC and the ERSC. Dave Wilson commented on the avenue of the public service commissions. Becky Turner, Entegra, stated a concern for FERC to be the venue for an appeal, and would be more comfortable with another process.
Agenda Item 4- ICT Regulatory Update

Jeff Price gave an update on the ICT Regulatory activity. The ICT Agreement has been extended from 1 to 2 years, but the commission has not acted upon the filing yet. Dave Wilson inquired about a discrepancy in the docket number. Erin Murphy, Entergy, commented the docket number had been corrected and no other changes were made to the filing and comments have been extended to Friday. Glenn Bernstein, Entergy, stated an attachment would be filed if the ERSC passes 205 filing rights. Jennifer Vosburg inquired about Attachment updates. Ms. Murphy responded that Business Practices had been distributed.

Agenda Item 5- ERSC Working Group Update

Sam Loudenslager reported on the ERSC Working Group updates. Mr. Loudenslager discussed the portfolio of economic upgrades and the need for feedback from the stakeholders on the projects chosen. Jennifer Vosburg and Bruce Rew discussed the economic projects. The ICT took an action item for Ben Roubique, SPP, to provide additional information on the economic projects discussed by the ERSG Working Group prior to their next meeting on November 17, 2010.

Kip Fox had questions from the previous ERSC meeting. The ICT took an action item for Ben Bright, SPP, to send Bruce Rew’s presentation from the previous ERSC meeting to the full ICT SPC.

Agenda Item 6- Long Term Report

Ben Roubique provided an overview of activities for long term transmission activity. Mr. Roubique reviewed the System Impact Studies Task Force questions that had been gathered from the stakeholders. The main issues were consolidated into 6 areas: the SIS Report, Cost Estimates, Modeling, SIS Coordination, FFR’s, and the SIS Study Process. Mr. Roubique and several stakeholders discussed the SISTF issues.

Jennifer Vosburg stated the SISTF needed to meet within the next two weeks with some direction. Becky Turner and Roberto Paliza, Paliza Consulting LLC, inquired on the prioritization of the SISTF issues and the actions to take. How the task force should address the issues was discussed by several stakeholders, the ICT, and Entergy. Ben Roubique and the ICT took and action item to answer and consolidate as many questions as possible from the SIS Task Force Issue List prior to November 5, 2010.

Becky Turner requested information about FFR issues and whether those should be addressed directly to Entergy or if they are at the task force level. Ms. Turner discussed the FFR issues in more detail. Mark McCulla stated that Entergy would need specific issues to address and would refer to Attachment T, but would try to answer any specific questions. Jennifer Vosburg added
that if Entergy could communicate the specific answers as they get them, rather than waiting until all questions were answered.

**Agenda Item 7- Near Term Report**

Dowell Hudson provided an update for the activities in the near term transmission area. Mr. Hudson presented a list of the AFC Task Force membership, the AFC Task Force issues provided by the stakeholders, and an update and review of the AFC Task Force meeting held October 12, 2010. Discussions were held by the stakeholders on the prioritization of the task force issues. Tim Phillips inquired if the SPC was comfortable with the task force setting the priority of the issues. No objections were received from the stakeholders. Roberto Paliza confirmed he was working with the task force to draft the scope for issue resolution. Mark McCulla and Mr. Paliza discussed details of several issues.

**Agenda Item 8- Reliability Coordinator Report**

Don Shipley discussed the reliability issues at hand and those the Reliability Task Force needs to address. Mr. Shipley discussed the details of the TLR Analysis Report and the recommendations of the Reliability Coordinator. Mr. Shipley also discussed the role of the Reliability Task Force in TLR5 reporting. Mr. Shipley reinforced the discussions held earlier on task force structure and formation.

Jennifer Vosburg inquired if there would be an opportunity for coordination between the AFC Task Force and the Reliability Task Force. Don Shipley responded that the ICT had already been looking at that possibility. The process would be looked at from both task forces, with a combined task force being considered.

**Agenda Item 9- WPP Report**

Antoine Lucas, SPP, presented the WPP report. During the review of the report, Mr. Lucas discussed the improvement in participation after the summer peak periods. Mr. Lucas also clarified the results of the WPP process with questions from Kip Fox, Roberto Paliza, Sam Loudenslager, and Brenda Harris.

Mr. Lucas also discussed the QF Puts Modeling and Offer Period Extension enhancements to the WPP process the WPP Task Force has been reviewing and the ICT positions for those enhancements. The QF Puts Modeling Proposal was not endorsed by the ICT and there were several discussions concerning this enhancement. Mark McCulla inquired if any further testing had been performed since the last meeting. Mr. Lucas stated there had been no further testing. Sam Loudenslager asked Entergy on their position. Glenn Bernstein responded Entergy was still looking into the issue and needed further discussion. David Cheshire, ExxonMobil, discussed a technical aspect of the process. Mr. Lucas responded with details.

Sam Loudenslager supplied comments on the Offer Period Extension enhancement. Antoine Lucas reviewed the proposal and stated the enhancement was endorsed by the ICT and was being evaluated by Entergy. Glenn Bernstein commented Entergy believes this is a good idea but has a few issues to resolve prior to endorsement. Mr. Bernstein stated the extension may
pose a legal issue with the Tariff on the day of the week the process is to be complete, and a review of the seasonal or holiday impact of the new hours needs to be reviewed.

**Agenda Item 10- Users Group Report**

Tim Phillips presented the Users Group Report. Mr. Phillips reviewed the results of the report, which included a new chart that tracks the FERC Filings for error reporting.

**Open Items Review**

Jennifer Vosburg opened for discussion the future meeting schedule for the SPC. David Cheshire commented that there was a need for meeting more often than quarterly, perhaps should be bi-monthly. Brenda Harris commented that there needed to be more meetings by teleconference, and noted the sparse attendance at the face to face meetings. There were discussions by several members of the group on teleconferencing or WebEx type meetings. Ms. Vosburg asked for a motion that the next ICT SPC meeting be held in January and that it be conducted as a WebEx/interactive teleconference meeting. The motion was moved, seconded, and passed. Ms. Vosburg took as an action item that the SPCCC will determine the specific date for the January ICT SPC WebEx meeting.

Kristine Schmidt, ERSC, made final comments asking the task forces to complete their Guiding Documents prior to the ERSC meeting in November so they could be presented at that time.

**Agenda Item 11- Action Items Review**

Action items:

1. SPCCC will send out a message to the full ICT SPC summarizing the Task Force formation process discussed today and what is expected at each of the next Task Force meetings. This message will be distributed no later than end of business Friday October 22, 2010.
2. Ben Roubique, SPP, will provide additional information on the Economic Projects discussed by the ERSG Working Group prior to their next meeting on November 17, 2010.
3. Ben Bright, SPP, will send Bruce Rew’s presentation to the ERSC to the full ICT SPC.
4. Ben Roubique, SPP, will answer and consolidate as many questions as possible from the SIS Task Force Issue List prior to November 5, 2010.
5. SPCCC will determine the specific date for the January ICT SPC WebEx meeting.

**Agenda Item 12- Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:46 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce Rew
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**ATTENDANCE LIST**

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna Harris</td>
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ICT STAKEHOLDERS POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
October 20, 2010
Hyatt Regency Downtown, Austin, TX

• D R A F T   A G E N D A •
8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

1. Introductions and roll call .......................................................... Bruce Rew

2. Review of meeting agenda ......................................................... All

3. Approval of prior SPC minutes and conference calls .................. All

4. ICT Regulatory update ............................................................. ICT/Entergy

5. ERSC Working Group update .................................................... ERSC WG Representative

6. Long Term Report ..................................................................... Jody Holland

7. Near Term Report ..................................................................... Dowell Hudson

8. Reliability Coordinator Report .................................................. Don Shipley

9. WPP Report .............................................................................. Antoine Lucas

10. Users Group report ................................................................. Tim Phillips

11. Action Items review .............................................................. All

12. Adjournment .......................................................................... Bruce Rew
Southwest Power Pool, Inc.

ICT STAKEHOLDERS POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

July 21, 2010
Sheraton North, Houston, TX

• Meeting Minutes •

1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Agenda Item 1- Administrative Items

Bruce Rew called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. There were 23 in attendance and 5 participating by teleconference.

Agenda Item 2- Agenda Review

Bruce Rew reviewed the agenda which was posted prior to the meeting on the SPP website and available at the meeting. Bruce emphasized the components of item 4, review of the SPC Charter.

Agenda Item 3- Approval of October 2009 Minutes

Bruce Rew asked for changes or modifications to the minutes; there were no objections. Bruce Rew announced that the meeting materials are posted on the SPP website.

Agenda Item 4- Review of the SPC Charter

Charter Review – Discussed options to improve the structure of the SPC and working groups. The ERSC is a major change that affects the structure of the stakeholder process. Bruce Rew mentioned the new contract extension and the study of the cost benefit analysis and how it impacts the set up of the stakeholder process.

SPC was formed in 2006 when the ICT was formed. SPC was formed by the stakeholders. The primary functions were:

- forum for interactions with the ICT
- place to address issues and concerns
- method to formulate consensus based solutions
- provide for majority and minority positions of stakeholders to be heard.

The SPC would ultimately provide recommendations for changes to ICT policies based on the above process. The User’s Group was formed in the contract while the other groups were formed outside of the contract.
ERSC – Bruce reviewed the ERSC slides of the SPC presentation. Robert Mechler, RRI Energy, asked a question about the “mechanism to increase transmission” statement in the presentation. Dave Wilson, Arkansas Cities, asked about the role of the ERSC in the SEAMS agreement statement in the presentation. Sam Loudenslager, APSC, responded.

Sam Loudenslager disagreed with the “arbiter and enforcer” description of the ERSC; he asserted that FERC is the enforcer while the ERSC is a facilitator.

ICT Chairs the SPC- Mark McCulla asked what the difference is between the SPP structure and ICT structure. Bruce Rew explained in more detail the roles of chairs, etc. in the SPP structure.

Mark McCulla asked about confidentiality if a stakeholder were to chair the group. He stated that the ICT is different from SPP because Entergy is the only transmission owner, while all the other stakeholders are transmission users. It was discussed how to handle confidential information, Bruce Rew suggested some ways to keep confidential information confidential. Mr. McCulla stated concern with how these roles would be defined if a stakeholder chairs the group.

Mr. Loudenslager responded that the RTO is a member driven process, different people share different responsibilities with policy groups and working groups. When confidentiality issues are encountered, the RTO may form a task force with confidentiality agreements. Mr. Loudenslager reiterated that he likes the idea of a stakeholder chairing the SPC. Mr. McCulla mentioned again the transmission owner/transmission user issue that makes the ICT different from the RTO.

Mr. Rew suggested these details be put in the parking lot while we discuss the rest of the changes associated with changing the structure of the SPC. It was also mentioned that there may be contract/tariff changes if this structure is changed. Mr. Rew discussed how changes might impact the SPC charter document, and that input about possible changes to the structure would be needed before any changes are made.

ERSC and Working Groups- Sam Loudenslager took the floor to present “ERSC and Working Groups”. He spoke about comments from the previous meeting of the ERSC working group and how to utilize everyone’s resources for better use of our time. Preface to the presentation: “this isn’t the only option; it’s just what makes sense right now”. Bruce Rew will post the presentation on the SPP website.

Mr. Loudenslager presented a proposal that could result in a more effective structure of Entergy, ERSC, all the working groups, and the SPC. He suggests that the SPC/WGs handle technical issues and ERSCWG handle the policy issues. SPP would exist between these two functions. He also discussed the issue of “meeting fatigue” and ways to improve the meeting schedule.

Jennifer Vosburg, NRG/LAGN, pointed out that many of the attendees were at the ERSCWG meeting in Dallas, TX. She stated that the “re-explaining” of issues between meetings of working groups/ERSC/SPC is time consuming. She feels the group needs to be re-energized. She reiterated that “this is our stakeholder process”. She agreed that everyone needs to address how to get more progress. Ms. Vosburg acknowledged some of Mark McCulla’s concerns but mentioned that there will be ways to work through those issues.
Mr. Loudenslager also suggested that a tariff change to Attachment S may be needed to address the structure changes to this group. Sept 17 would be a target date to file the changes.

Dave Wilson expressed his agreement with Mr. Loudenslager’s assessment of the deadlines.

Robert Mechler asked about the time frame of the ICT’s contract extension as it could be a driver of decisions about the structure of the stakeholder process. He remarked that he’s seen many different structures, MISO, SPP, ERCOT, PJM, etc and that the ICT should look at their success or failures in their stakeholder processes.

Mr. Loudenslager stated that their processes can be slow; however, they are usually accurate with few issues encountered when they go to FERC. Robert Mechler suggested that Transmission Customers belong at the top of Sam’s “org chart” because they would be running the groups if they are the chairs. Mr. Mechler also commented about the technical problems of the stakeholder meetings. He stated that other RTO’s conduct the technology at meetings better than Entergy/ICT.

Tina Lee, KGEN, suggested combining the SPC and ERSC because they are both “policy” committees.

Dave Wilson supports having the regulators at the “bottom” of the org chart.

John Orr, Constellation Energy, asked how the ERSC decides between “technical” or “policy” type issues. Mr. Loudenslager said the ERSC, ICT and Entergy would discuss and decide which category issues will fall into.

Ms. Vosburg pointed at that overlap among groups exists. She stated that some issues would involve both the technical group and the policy group, which could increase the time to resolve issues.

Mr. McCulla pointed out another issue is resources. Entergy’s resources are overtaxed. He suggested that the group put some thought into prioritizing issues. Mr. Loudenslager responded the focus should be on the Sept 17th filing, even though there are a lot of issues that need to be resolved. Ms. Vosburg commented there could be a conflict on how stakeholders would prioritize things and how ICT/Entergy would prioritize issues.

Mr. Rew asked for more discussion on the individual working groups NTTIWG, LTTIWG, and WPPIWG. He noted that there are a lot of the same people in these meetings that are in the SPC. He asked if we should merge these groups together. Brenda Harris, Oxy, stated it appears that the NTTIWG, LTTIWG and WPPIWG should become part of the SPC. Ms. Vosburg commented that if we did that, we’d have to rely more on the task forces to get things done. John Orr agreed that we should combine the groups, and then break out task forces to address issues, and then deliver results back to the main group. Mr. Rew proposed keeping the User’s Group because it is specifically mentioned in the order.

Jeff Price, Wright and Talisman, stated that limited changes to attachments could provide the flexibility needed to address structure changes after the September 17th filing deadline.
**Action item**: Get tariff changes for August 8 meeting.

**Action item**: Form a Task Force for changing the Att. S language. Bruce Rew looking for volunteers for drafting and writing the charter. A WebEx meeting is scheduled for August 26, 2010 1pm to 3pm for SPC to discuss the draft of a new charter, task force deadline for draft is 8/20/2010.

**Agenda Item 5- ICT Regulatory Update**

Jeff Price reported on June 15th order approved the SEAMS agreement with modifications for SPP and Entergy. Mark McCulla stated a filing has been made with the LPSC concerning the contract end date. The filing states the decision is still pending.

**Agenda Item 6- LTTIWG Report**

Jody Holland, SPP, gave the LTTIWG report. In the LTTIWG meeting prior to the SPC and a teleconference on June 17th progress in the base construction plan evaluation and reliability assessment was discussed. Evaluation of the construction plan will be posted soon on SPP website. Mr. Holland discussed that the minimizing bulk power cost study, MBPC (which started as the RMR study) is now out for RFP. He said that they are looking for bids during the next few weeks with expectation of the awarding a bid within 6 weeks. Gary Newell, LVS, LEPA, MEAM, MDEA, asked how the MBPC study will be funded. Mark McCulla replied that Entergy will be funding the MBPC. Ben Bright, SPP, has posted that in the RFP. It was determined to put together a task force to review how a SIS is formatted regarding AFC’s showing negative or just zero.

Enrique Silva, Entergy, presented the Entergy economic study process at the LTTIWG.

John Orr provided feedback on the LTTIWG presentations. Mr. Orr suggested the ICT look at other’s reports from other RTO’s for improvements.

**Agenda Item 7- NTTIWG report**

Dowell Hudson, SPP, reviewed the NTTIWG presentation, which will be posted on the SPP website. It detailed action items that came from the NTTIWG meeting prior to the SPC meeting. Jennifer Vosburg commented that the presentation on the NSNF was helpful, however would like it in advance. The charts showed that progress has been made.

**Agenda Item 8- WPPIWG Report**

Antoine Lucas, SPP, presented the items from the WPPIWG. The presentation will be posted to the SPP website.

**Agenda Item 10- Users Group Report**

Tim Phillips, SPP, presented the User’s Group report, which was posted with the meeting materials.
Agenda Item 11- Action Items Review

Action items:

1. Tariff changes for the August 8th meeting
2. Form a Task Force for the changes in the Attachment S language
3. ICT will actively try to procure a better sound system for use in the ICT SPC meetings

Agenda Item 12- Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce Rew
Bruce Rew called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. There were 21 participating in the meeting (Attachment 1- Attendance List). Proxies were received as follows; Jennifer Vosburg for Brenda Harris and David Cheshire, Becky Turner for Tina Lee, John Chiles for Seth Brown, and John Heisey for Becky Turner. The purpose of the meeting was to review the proposed SPC charter revisions.

Jeff Price presented the overview of the proposed SPC Charter changes (Attachment 2 – Charter Presentation). The SPC asked several questions during the presentation. Gary Newell asked about the division of responsibilities between the ERSC Working Group and the SPC. The document does not provide details and is that appropriate? It was discussed that at this time the details should not be included in this charter. Dave Wilson mentioned the transition of current working group activities to the SPC in regards to how and when that will be done. The working groups will be presenting the action item list to the SPC. A special SPC meeting was setup on September 17 to have the working groups present their action items and for the SPC to review.

Jeff Price presented specific comments he received from Ronnie Frizzell with Arkansas Electric Cooperatives. Comments were discussed in Section 2.1.1, and 8.1.2. Al Ralston with Entergy also noted that Section 4.5 had an old reference to Section 6 that should be Section 5. In Section 2.1.1 the SPC recommended changes as shown in the attached document (Attachment 3 – SPC Charter revisions) based on comments and discussion. This was to better represent the scope of responsibilities of the SPC. Section 8.1.2 was modified to provide the possibility that an ERSC member may be the appropriate representative rather than an ERSC working group member. Jennifer Vosburg recommended approval of the revised SPC Charter and John Chiles seconded the motion. The SPC approved the changed document (Attachment 4 – Voting). Gary Newell asked for additional time to vote on the Charter until Friday at 5 pm. The SPC granted that extension for those who needed additional time.

The next SPC webex meeting will be held on September 17 at 10 am until noon. The LTTIWG, NTTIWG, and WPPIWG Chairs will distribute their action items list on September 3.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce Rew
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<td><a href="mailto:john.chiles@gdsassociates.com">john.chiles@gdsassociates.com</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConocoPhillips</td>
<td>Clynes</td>
<td>Terri</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Terri.Clynes@Conocophillips.Com">Terri.Clynes@Conocophillips.Com</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Gorter</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kgorter@spp.org">kgorter@spp.org</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>Dowell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dhudson@spp.org">dhudson@spp.org</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenaska</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:slane@tnsk.com">slane@tnsk.com</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Public Service Commission</td>
<td>Loudenslager</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sam_loudenslager@psc.state.ar.us">sam_loudenslager@psc.state.ar.us</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entergy Services, Inc.</td>
<td>McCulla</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmccul1@entergy.com">mmccul1@entergy.com</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Coburn, LLP</td>
<td>Newell</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gnewell@thompsoncoburn.com">gnewell@thompsoncoburn.com</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entergy Services</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:price@wrightlaw.com">price@wrightlaw.com</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Rew</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brew@spp.org">brew@spp.org</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRG Louisiana Generating, LLC</td>
<td>Vosburg</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jennifer.vosburg@nrgenergy.com">jennifer.vosburg@nrgenergy.com</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConocoPhillips</td>
<td>Walker-Ratliff</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joan.walker-ratliff@conocophillips.com">joan.walker-ratliff@conocophillips.com</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entergy</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cwells@entergy.com">cwells@entergy.com</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary David Wilson, P.A.</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td><a href="mailto:zdwpa@cei.net">zdwpa@cei.net</a></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPC Charter Reform Task Force Update

Jeffrey W. Price
Wright & Talisman, P.C.

Overview

- ERSC Coordination
  - SPC Formal Positions
  - Appeal Process
  - Meeting Coordination
- Stakeholder Representative
- Working Group Revision
- SPC/ERSC Coordination Committee
**ERSC Coordination**

- Formal Positions of the SPC – Section 7
  - ERSC and/or ERSC WG now included in SPC formal position process
  - ICT still provides final independent opinion after considering SPC position, Entergy Response, and any ERSC/ERSC Working Group Response.
  - Addition of specific response time unless otherwise agreed upon
- Appeal Process – Section 7.5
  - If a stakeholder requests SPC consideration of a specific issue and the SPC declines, the stakeholder may appeal the decision to the ICT or ERSC for consideration and further discussion
- Meeting Coordination – Section 4.1
  - SPC will coordinate meeting schedules with ERSC Working Group meetings.

**Stakeholder Representative**

- Section 4.5 now provides for an Elected Stakeholder Representative
  - Elected Annually by approved voting process
  - Works directly with ICT to develop SPC agenda
  - Participates on Coordination Committee
  - Potential delegation of tasks by the ICT
**Working Group Revisions**

- LTTIWG, NTTIWG and WPPIWG will be disbanded and all open issues will be referred to the SPC

- Section 6 provides for limited duration SPC Task Forces to consider specific issues and develop information for the SPC

- Stakeholders are allowed to chair/lead SPC Task Forces

- SPC Task Forces are required to issue written opinion/recommendation to the SPC

---

**SPC/ERSC Coordination Committee**

- Section 8 provides for the formation of a Coordination Committee primarily to coordinate the schedules and issues arising in the each forum to prevent duplication of efforts.

- The SPC/ERSC Coordination Committee will also maintain a list of issues and action items and ensure that each member of the committee is fully informed on the status of the various issues working through the SPC and ERSC

- The Coordination Committee will be made up of the ICT, the Stakeholder Representative, an Entergy staff member and a member of the ERSC Working Group
Next Steps

- Final Meeting of the Working Groups
- Next Meeting of the SPC
  - Election of Stakeholder Representative
  - Development of Issue List and Prioritization
  - Discussion of Permanent Agenda Items (i.e. WPP report, Attachment K process report, etc.)

Questions?

Contact Information:
Jeffrey W. Price
Wright & Talisman, P.C.
1200 G Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005
202-393-1200
202-393-1240 (fax)
price@wrightlaw.com
REVISED DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE, ROLE AND OPERATION OF ENTERGY
STAKEHOLDER POLICY COMMITTEE AND USERS GROUP

(August 20, 2010)

1. PURPOSE

1.1. This document ("The Revised SPC Charter") is intended to replace the "Description of Structure, Role, and Operation of Entergy Stakeholder Policy Committee and Users Group" dated August 23, 2006 which established a framework for conducting stakeholder meetings and processes referred to in the ICT Agreement, the Entergy OATT and FERC’s April 24, 2006 order in Docket No. ER05-1065-000. This document is not intended to and shall not modify in any respect any provision of the Entergy OATT or the ICT Agreement. Any conflict between (i) this document and the stakeholders processes established herein and (ii) any applicable provision of the Entergy OATT or the ICT Agreement shall be resolved by the ICT in favor of the Entergy OATT or the ICT Agreement.

2. STAKEHOLDER POLICY COMMITTEE

2.1. Entities with a direct interest in transmission services and/or wholesale power transactions in the Entergy region shall form a Stakeholder Policy Committee ("SPC"). The SPC shall be a forum for transmission customers, market participants and other interested parties to interact with the ICT and Entergy for the purpose of addressing issues and problems of concern and seeking consensus-based solutions to those issues and concerns. Among other things, the SPC may provide the ICT and/or the Entergy Regional State Committee ("ERSC") specific recommendations as to ICT or Entergy policies, practices and procedures (as described in Section 7 below), and the ICT shall assist and provide information to the SPC as may be necessary and appropriate to facilitate the SPC’s informed consideration of potential recommendations.

2.1.1. In accordance with Section 4 herein, the ICT shall organize meetings of the SPC with the goal of addressing and developing mutually satisfactory solutions to issues relating to the Entergy OATT or services there under brought to the attention of the ICT or Entergy by the SPC as a whole, any member of the SPC, or any other directly interested party, including the Entergy Regional State Committee ("ERSC") and its Working Group.

2.1.2. Subject to the applicable provisions of the ICT Agreement and the Entergy OATT and any valid claim of privilege or confidentiality, the ICT shall provide to the SPC such information as may be reasonably requested by the SPC for its own use, or for the use of a SPC Task Force formed to study a specific issue (as described in Section 6 below). The ICT shall not be required to provide information reasonably available to the SPC or its members from other sources accessible by the SPC.
2.1.3. The ICT shall in good faith consider and give due regard to the views and positions of the SPC formally adopted in accordance with Section 7 herein in formulating the ICT’s policies, practices, procedures and formal recommendations to Entergy.

2.2. In its reports to FERC and other regulators, the ICT shall provide a narrative discussion of positions of the SPC that have been adopted by a formal vote of the SPC pursuant to Section 7 herein.

2.2.1. The ICT’s determinations regarding any recommendation tendered by the SPC shall be discussed in the ICT’s next-following set of reports to regulatory agencies.

2.2.2. Upon the request of a majority of SPC members that vote against a formal recommendation or resolution, the ICT shall include in its reports a description of the “minority position” of those members.

2.2.3. Provided that no person, party or agent is granted authority to screen the ultimate findings, conclusions, and recommendations developed by the ICT as provided for in Attachment S of the Entergy OATT, the ICT shall endeavor to consult with the SPC prior to making any filing that includes a description of a SPC position and/or minority position. The ICT shall endeavor to accommodate comments received from the SPC or any member thereof that are intended to improve the accuracy of the ICT’s description of the SPC and/or minority position to be included in the ICT’s report.

3. USERS GROUP

3.1. Pursuant to FERC’s April 24, 2006 order, a “Users Group” shall be formed for the following purposes:

3.1.1. to assess how the Entergy transmission and data (IT) systems are performing, especially in terms of data access, quality and retention (Order at P 109);

3.1.2. to conduct with the ICT annual reviews of error rates associated with Entergy data in accordance with the metrics discussed in the April 24 Order, including any relevant information (Order at P 110);

3.1.3. to recommend to FERC and/or Entergy’s state regulators, as appropriate, either in conjunction with the ICT or separately, changes to Entergy IT systems and IT resource allocations (id.);

3.1.4. to receive notification from Entergy if Entergy discovers that it has lost data, or reported inaccurate data, or otherwise believes that it has mismanaged data, such notification to be provided within 15 days of any such discovery (id.);

3.1.5. to address concerns raised by Entergy’s transmission customers that they lack sufficient feedback from Entergy after they have been denied transmission service (Order at P 111);
3.1.6. to propose to FERC an appropriate means by which transmission customers can be given access to inputs into the AFC and planning processes and the models used under the direction of the ICT (id.);

3.1.7. to work with Entergy to alleviate any problems related to the completeness and accuracy of Entergy’s data and the preservation of such data (including but not limited to AFC-related data) (Order at P 304); and

3.1.8. to provide the ICT with information that will help FERC in assessing the performance metrics identified in paragraph 304 of the April 24 Order (id.).

3.2. Not less often than quarterly, the Users Group, the ICT and IT experts from Entergy shall meet so both Entergy and the ICT are made aware of any problems with the those systems. At such meetings, the Users Group also shall discuss proposed solutions with the ICT and IT experts (Order at P 109).

3.3. The Users Group shall be an adjunct to the SPC

3.3.1. The Users Group shall keep the SPC informed on an ongoing basis regarding all matters being addressed by the Users Group in its interactions with the ICT. The Users Group shall coordinate and consult with the SPC with regard to positions to be asserted by the Users Group in its interactions with the ICT.

3.3.2. In the event the Users Group and the ICT identify issues concerning any matter being discussed that cannot be resolved, the matter shall be brought to the attention of the SPC. The SPC shall determine what, if any, stakeholder action should be taken to obtain resolution of the matter. The Users Group shall not have authority to make any representations on behalf of the SPC without the express authorization of the SPC.

4. STAKEHOLDER POLICY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

4.1. The ICT shall convene meetings of the SPC in conjunction with the ERSC Working Group or as the Chairman of the SPC otherwise determines is appropriate. In addition, if any five (5) or more stakeholder entities jointly call for a meeting of the SPC, the ICT shall convene such a meeting as soon thereafter as practicable.

4.2. Any transmission customer, market participant or other entity with a direct interest in transmission or wholesale power service in the Entergy region may attend and participate in SPC meetings. Other than as necessary to maintain good order, the Chairman of the SPC may not preclude any interested party from participating in a SPC meeting, except the Chairman may, in the exercise of its reasonable discretion, limit attendance and/or participation in portions of SPC meetings by attendees that are not stakeholders eligible to vote on matters pending before the SPC, when such a limitation is deemed by the Chairman to be conducive to the goals of the stakeholder process.
4.3. Any regulatory body that has jurisdiction over any part of Entergy Corp. and its regulated affiliates (hereinafter “Entergy”) may attend and participate in SPC meetings.

4.4. Except as otherwise provided in Section 4.2, any representative of Entergy may attend and participate in SPC meetings, but Entergy will not be considered a stakeholder or stakeholder member of the SPC and will not vote as such.

4.5. The ICT shall arrange for all meetings and shall appoint an ICT staff member as the Chairman of all SPC meetings, which are designed to develop consensus-based resolutions to any issues or concerns raised by any stakeholder or otherwise brought before the SPC. The Chairman has the authority to delegate tasks, including facilitating meetings, to the Stakeholder Representative described herein or any other member of the SPC. Further, a stakeholder shall be elected annually as a Stakeholder Representative, through a vote pursuant to Section 5 herein, and will work directly with the Chairman to set the agenda of SPC meetings and participate in the Coordination Committee as described in Section 8 herein. The Chairman of the SPC shall utilize reasonable, efficient and fair procedures in conducting SPC meetings. In the event of any disagreement concerning those procedures, the Chairman’s position shall control pending further discussion of the matter or other form of dispute resolution.

4.6. Notice of SPC meetings shall be provided as follows:

4.6.1. Notice of each SPC meeting shall be posted on a dedicated node on the SPP website as far in advance of the date of each meeting as practicable. The final agenda and background materials for the meeting shall be posted no later than 5 business days prior to the date of the meeting.

4.6.2. The ICT shall maintain an e-mail ListServ of SPC representatives and other interested parties, which shall be used for disseminating notice of SPC meetings and meetings of SPC Task Forces to address specific issues, and for issuing any other communications that the SPC wishes to publish to interested parties.

4.6.3. At least 15 business days before any SPC meeting, the ICT shall circulate by ListServ a proposed agenda for the meeting (except in the case of special or emergency meetings, for which the ICT shall circulate by ListServ a proposed agenda as soon as practicable after the need for the meeting has been determined). Any stakeholder may request one or more additions to the draft agenda, and the ICT shall include such additional items on the agenda for the SPC meeting provided that the proposed agenda items are within the ambit of matters subject to the consideration of the SPC.

5. STAKEHOLDER POLICY COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

5.1. The SPC shall develop all such rules and procedures for its own governance as necessary. This Revised SPC Charter specifically adopts the voting procedures adopted by the SPC on September 20, 2006 and procedures for communicating
individual stakeholder positions to the ICT and/or regulatory bodies adopted by the SPC on June 19, 2008.

5.2. The SPC procedures and rules shall be posted on the node of the SPP website dedicated to ICT activities.

5.3. This Revised SPC Charter also adopts the standards regarding meetings via conference phone and any notice deadlines required for each such meeting adopted by the SPC on September 20, 2006.

6. STAKEHOLDER POLICY COMMITTEE TASK FORCES

6.1. The SPC may form an SPC Task Force upon recommendation of an SPC member or the ICT through a majority vote of the SPC membership in accordance with the voting rules described in Section 5 herein. The purpose of any such SPC Task Force shall be to conduct focused consideration and interaction with the ICT, Entergy and/or the ERSC Working Group on particular matters and to provide technical basis for any position/recommendation of the SPC. Such SPC Task Forces shall be formed for a limited duration and shall report back any findings or information to the SPC as required by the SPC. SPC Task Forces shall also provide a written report for publication to the SPC upon request of a majority of the SPC membership.

6.2. Stakeholders shall appoint a representative set of individuals to act as the members of each SPC Task Force. Those representatives shall appoint a Chair and a Co-chair from among the ICT and individual stakeholders appointed to serve on each SPC Task Force. Meetings of the SPC Task Forces shall be open to any interested stakeholder, any representative of Entergy, and any interested regulatory body that has jurisdiction over Entergy. Notice of a SPC Task Force meeting shall be posted on the SPP Website as soon as practicable after the date for the meeting is set, but in no event shall such posting be made less than 7 business days in advance of such meeting.
7. **FORMAL POSITIONS OF THE STAKEHOLDER POLICY COMMITTEE**

7.1. In the event that the SPC adopts a formal position and/or recommendation on an Entergy-related issue pursuant to the voting procedures outlined in Section 5 herein, the SPC shall present this position/recommendation in writing to Entergy and the ICT. The ICT will also provide the same to the ERSC through its Working Group.

7.2. After receipt of such position/recommendation, Entergy shall be required to prepare a formal response in writing no later than three weeks after receiving the recommendation, unless a different deadline is specified by the ICT, provided that nothing in this Revised SPC Charter prevents Entergy from submitting additional information regarding a matter after the time specified in this Section 7.2. The Entergy response must detail Entergy’s reasons for adopting or rejecting the SPC position/recommendation including any supporting documentation relied upon to develop the response.

7.3. The ICT will then consider the SPC position/recommendation, the Entergy response, and the position of the ERSC (or its Working Group), if any, and develop a written response regarding its independent position supporting or declining to support the SPC position/recommendation no later than three weeks after receiving the recommendation, the Entergy response and any ERSC/ERSC Working Group response, unless a different deadline is specified by the ICT. The ICT response must detail the ICT’s reasons for supporting or declining to support the SPC position/recommendation including any justifications relied upon to develop its response.

7.4. The SPC position/recommendation (including a minority response if applicable), the Entergy response, any ERSC/ERSC Working Group response, and the ICT response will be included in the ICT’s quarterly reports to the FERC pursuant to Section 2.2 herein.

7.5. In the event the SPC declines to address a specific issue after a request by a member of the SPC, the member may appeal the SPC decision in writing to either the ICT or ERSC for further consideration. The ICT or ERSC will provide a written response to the appeal for discussion at the next available SPC meeting. Such response will provide an independent determination by the ICT or ERSC whether the issue should be addressed by the SPC as well as a recommendation on the next steps to address the stakeholder concern.

8. **SPC/ERSC COORDINATION COMMITTEE**

8.1. The SPC and ERSC shall form a SPC/ERSC Coordination Committee designed to coordinate the issues, action items and topics being discussed by each group and to provide updates on the progress of each group. No Committee member shall have the authority to bind any other party or group but each member shall in good faith attempt to gain consensus regarding the correct forum for the action item or issue to
be addressed and provide regular updates to the other members of the Committee on on-going issues being discussed in each group.

8.1.2. The SPC/ERSC Coordination Committee shall be comprised of the Chairman of the SPC, the Stakeholder Representative for the SPC, an Entergy staff member and a member of the ERSC or ERSC Working Group.

8.1.3. The SPC/ERSC Coordination Committee shall hold regular meetings and/or teleconferences not less than once per month and as often as necessary to coordinate the activities of the SPC, the ERSC, and the ERSC Working Group and provide updates to each group.

8.1.4. The SPC/ERSC Coordination Committee shall maintain a schedule of action items and due dates that shall be reported to the SPC and ERSC. Key metrics of the schedule shall be included in the ICT quarterly reports.

8.1.5. The SPC/ERSC Coordination Committee shall regularly report to the ERSC and SPC on the status and progress of issues, action items and topics being discussed in each forum.

9. **MISCELLANEOUS**

9.1. No individual or member may speak on behalf of the SPC without the SPC’s express authorization, as adopted through formal vote.

9.2. No SPC member shall be responsible for the costs of any other SPC member.

9.3. No SPC member shall be responsible for any costs, other than the costs incurred by its own staff or representatives in participating in SPC activities, without such member’s express agreement to bear such other costs.

9.4. The availability of the issue identification and resolution processes established herein shall not affect any party’s right to exercise at any time any other legal remedy or process that may be available to that party, and the party shall not be required to pursue or exhaust any process described herein before pursuing such alternative relief, remedy or form of dispute resolution.

9.5. No SPC member shall be bound by any SPC position, including those positions as may be adopted by formal vote, in any regulatory or other proceeding.
**Recommendation:** To approve the revised SPC Charter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Obstention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Cities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Electric Coop. Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Electric Power Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton Arkansas Utilities System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calpine Corp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargill Power Markets, LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Water &amp; Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksdale Public Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleco Power LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConocoPhillips</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway Corporation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Energy Company, LP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entegra Power Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExxonMobil Power and Gas Services Inc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDF SUEZ Energy North America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Water &amp; Light</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGen Power Management (Hinds, Hot Spring)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Utilities System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Energy &amp; Power Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon Petroleum Co LLC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss.Delta Energy Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Energy Agency of MS (MEAM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Little Rock Electric Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRG Energy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occidental Chemical Corp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG Industries, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenaska Power Services Co.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Empire District Electric Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Memphis Util. Comm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Power Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Approving</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation Approved?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
ICT STAKEHOLDERS POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
September 17, 2010
Net Conference

• Meeting Minutes •
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Agenda Item 1- Administrative Items

Bruce Rew, SPP, called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 a.m. There were 30 in attendance by teleconference.

Agenda Item 2- Review of Current Activities by the ICT Working Groups

The main purpose of the meeting was to review the current activities of the ICT Working Groups to make certain work is continued as the transition is made to Task Forces within the SPC.

LTTIWG- Jody Holland, SPP, started the review by going through the current activities of the LTTIWG. The question was raised as to which items the LTTIWG was passing to the SPC. Jennifer Vosburg, NRG Energy, stated there would be a System Impact Studies (SIS) Task Force that would handle issues with SIS. Dave Wilson, Arkansas Cities, commented on the membership of the SIS Task Force. Sam Loudenslager, Arkansas Public Service Commission, asked once the Task Force was formed that members be posted on the SPP website.

Gary Newell, LVS, LEPA, MEAM, MDEA, questioned that perhaps generation dispatch in the SIS ties into a NTTIWG issue. Dowell Hudson, SPP, commented that the merit order dispatch issue is similar to the SIS but is not the same and will be handled separately. Jennifer Vosburg commented that the existing action items presented would be addressed by a task force from the SPC, but that there would be other “long-term” responsibilities that would also need attention, such as Base Plan and Construction Plan input.

Bruce Rew summarized that an action item for the SPC meeting in October would be to determine which standing ongoing responsibilities will be addressed. Ms. Vosburg added that there should be two recognized categories of activities: action items and ongoing tariff responsibilities.

NTTIWG- Dowell Hudson led the discussion of the current activities of the NTTIWG. After the review, Mr. Hudson stated he would follow up with two action items: 1) provide list of 18 ATC/AFC Stakeholder items received by the AFC Task Force, and 2) issue a list of the current members of the AFC Task Force.
Mr. Hudson made a suggestion that when forming the SPC task force for the AFC issues the committee should look into membership and how technical the task force needs to be. Bruce Rew commented that the membership of this particular task force will need guidance from the SPC as to possibly limiting the number of members and insuring voting parity within the group. Mark McCulla, Entergy, and Dowell Hudson both commented on the recommended size of the task force. Mr. Hudson inquired if there would be a need for a task force meeting prior to the October SPC meeting. Jennifer Vosburg stated it is likely but not set yet.

Ms. Vosburg inquired as to the why TLR5 issues were not an ongoing item listed by the NTTIWG. Don Shipley, SPP, answered that the E-RSC was being presented a new report for the TLR5 items, and that the ICT would like to continue the pursuit in that avenue. Mr. Shipley then gave a short review of the open items. Dowell Hudson brought up the suggestion of forming a reliability task force, and Ms. Vosburg stated that suggestion should be reviewed.

WPPIWG- Antoine Lucas, SPP, provided a review of the current WPPIWG activities. Mr. Lucas announced there would be a final WPPIWG conference call meeting on September 21st. Jennifer Vosburg inquired if the WPP tasks will be addressed between both the SPC and the E-RSC based on the previous E-RSC meeting. Sam Loudenslager agreed that they should. Mr. Loudenslager voiced a concern about a hold on WPP activities during the SPC transition. Mr. Lucas assured the SPC the WPP was still moving forward.

User’s Group- Tim Phillips, SPP, gave a brief overview of the User’s Group activities and the newly proposed AFC Related Errors report. Jennifer Vosburg stated the new report would be well received. Tina Lee, KGEN Power, had some suggestions for improving the report. Mr. Phillips stated he would follow up with her for further action.

**Agenda Item 3- Selection of E-RSC Representative**

Bruce Rew reminded the Committee that as part of the new charter, a Stakeholder Representative from the SPC would be elected and would serve on the SPC/ERSC Coordination Committee. Mr. Rew opened up for discussion the nomination of the Stakeholder Representative. David Cheshire, ExxonMobil, nominated Jennifer Vosburg. Becky Turner, Entegra Power, seconded the nomination. Dave Wilson moved to elect the nominee by acclamation. Joan Walker-Ratilff, Conoco-Phillips, seconded the motion. With no dissent, Jennifer Vosburg accepted the election as Stakeholder Representative of the SPC.

**Agenda Item 4- Review of the SPC/ERSC Coordination Committee**

Discussion was held on the other members of the SPC/ERSC Coordination Committee. Kristine Schmidt will be the representative for the ERSC. Mark McCulla will be the representative for Entergy. Bruce Rew will be the representative for the ICT.

**Agenda Item 5- Additional Transition items**

David Cheshire commented that the plan is to organize and prioritize the current items between the ERSC and the SPC and could this be done before the October SPC and ERSC meetings.
Jennifer Vosburg agreed with the comments and that it is possible that multiple task forces will need to meet prior to the October meetings. Ms. Vosburg also reminded the Committee that stakeholders can lead the SPC task forces. Antoine Lucas brought to the SPC’s attention that the use of e-mail exploders via SPP have been used to communicate to the working groups. This would need to be changed and an interim method may need to be established. An action item was established to deliver to Kristine Schmidt an interim list that could be used until further work is completed on the SPC task force structures.

**Agenda Item 11- Action Items Review**

Action items:

1. Publish list of 18 items from the AFC Task Force
2. Issue list of current members of the AFC Task Force
3. Provide interim list of SPC contacts to Kristine Schmidt

**Agenda Item 12- Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:35 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce Rew
Jason Davis, SPP, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. There were 16 in attendance by teleconference.

The main purpose of the meeting was to review and prioritize the 18 identified issues submitted by the former Near Term Transmission Issues Working Group (NTTIWG) and also the formation of the new AFC Task Force.

Jennifer Vosburg, NRG Energy, stated that a goal would be to produce a prioritized list of the 18 items, with them broken down by those that be could be addressed in the short term, and those that would require a longer term to address. Roberto Paliza, Paliza Consulting LLC, also stated that some of these issues could be consolidated reducing the total number of issues. Robert Lona, GDF Suez, questioned as to how work would be accomplished if two items are similar but one item is a short term issue while another is a long term issue. Ms. Vosburg added that it is possible for two similar items to be prioritized as short term and long term. Jason Davis, SPP, commented that as work was completed on items deemed short term, the groundwork for those items that are similar but are long term will be established, making the long term issues easier to resolve.

The group determined to start prioritizing the items in the list. Kristine Schmidt, ERSC, sent out a revised list from Roberto Paliza that had done a preliminary prioritization of short term vs. long term issues. After the list was received by everyone in the teleconference, several questions were asked by the group. The first question was for issue #16. It was suggested that this issue was completed. Tim Phillips, SPP, and Cameron Warren, Entergy, provided details of the actions taken. Mr. Paliza agreed with the action resolving the issue at this time, but that seasonal changes may require the solution to be monitored. Mr. Warren will review the item and report back to the Task Force before November 12th.

Robert Lona asked if issues 1 and 13, 3 and 15, and 8 and 11 are similar enough to be combined from 6 to 3 issues. Roberto Paliza agreed that 1/13 and 3/15 could be combined but 8/11 are different. Mr. Paliza commented that the ICT had written a white paper on issue #8. John Chiles, ETEC, asked if these issues had been given to Entergy. Cameron Warren stated it
had not been turned over to Entergy, but had been discussed at a LTTIWG meeting and Entergy was waiting on a statement from the ICT before resolving.

John Chiles asked Roberto Paliza which issues he recommended as short term. Mr. Paliza recognized that issues regarding improved reliability coordination should be addressed as listed in item 3. After group discussion, Jason Davis asked the stakeholders to better define the improvements needed. Reference was made to the latest improvements on the stop sale of non-firm transmission service during TLR. Mr. Paliza further identified that day ahead firm service needs to be improved so that the AFC process sees the same flowgate as the Reliability Coordination (R/C) process.

Issue #4 on speeding up the process of incorporating new flowgates to the AFC process was discussed and several comments were made. Cameron Warren stated that Entergy had put in place procedures for using placeholders for temporary flowgates in the studies and increasing the number of these placeholders available is under investigation. This would provide a much smaller turnaround. Vinit Gupta, Entergy, added that temporary flowgates could not be added on the fly, but can be added quicker than a new flowgate, and a new flowgate takes 7-9 days to be added.

Roberto Paliza suggested that the AFC Benchmarking process could be done quickly to produce benefits. Jason Davis commented that the ICT is still working on the process and is currently interpreting data that has been collected. Several in the group asked if a date could be set for the ICT to complete its analysis. Erin Murphy, Entergy, stated that Entergy needs more definition of what the stakeholders are looking to have produced. John Chiles requested the stakeholders get the ICT more specifics and then the ICT can give dates of completion. Mr. Davis stated the ICT can provide the current progress of the ICT benchmarking efforts to the stakeholders.

The next issue discussed by the group was #12, which addressed improving the current, official notification timeline for new transmission projects to be placed in the AFC/ATC calculation process. Several stakeholders expressed an opinion on the issue, including posting the notice after the project goes into the model, or coordinate the time frame with the same approach used for #s 8 and 11. Cameron Warren will research issue #12 and should be complete no later than November 12th.

The group then had discussions on what issues had been determined as short term at this point and what their rank would be. There was consensus in the group Issue #12 should be ranked first and R/C Coordination should be second. Roberto Paliza agreed to define the scope of issues #3, 4, and 15 to determine if they can be consolidated.

The group then discussed structural items relating to the AFC Task Force, including timeline for resolution of tasks, how the Task Force will be formed, what should be reported to the SPC. Specific items included:

1. Number of participants in the task force to be larger or smaller (previous AFC Task Force was 22 members)
2. Should the participants be polled from the SPC or the old task force
3. How should the AFC Task Force members be chosen
Tim Phillips discussed some ideas on the membership of the task force and provided a description of the task force process. John Chiles made a recommendation to set up the AFC Task Force by sector, similar to how other RTO organizations do. Roberto Paliza asked if that should apply to all newly formed SPC task forces. Mr. Chiles responded that all task forces should be formed in that manner, and that it should be proposed to the SPC. Kristine Schmidt recommended that the group produce an outline on the formation of the AFC Task Force and present it to the SPC. Roberto Paliza then provided a review of the actions taken to this point in the meeting.

Action items:

1. Cameron Warren will review enforcement of load pocket requirements during AFC/ATC calculations actions (issue #16) and report findings by November 12.
2. Mr. Warren will also review issue #12, to improve the current, official notification timeline for new transmission projects to be placed in the AFC/ATC calculation process. He will be providing his analysis by November 12.
3. Roberto Paliza will define the scope of issues #3, 4, and 15 for the purpose of consolidating them into one issue.
4. The group to provide a recommendation to the SPC Coordination Committee for the membership of the AFC Task Force.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tony Green
Don Shipley, SPP, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. There were 22 in attendance by teleconference.

The main purpose of the meeting was to review the Reliability Task Force Guiding Document, the TLR Investigation Report, and the TLR5 Analysis Report.

**Item 1- Reliability Task Force Guiding Document**

Don Shipley, SPP, delivered opening comments on the purpose and intentions of the Reliability Task Force, specifically to be able to review issues and come to resolution in a timely and equitable manner. Mr. Shipley also introduced the Reliability Task Force Guiding Document which outlined the proposed main structure and duties of the Task Force. Mr. Shipley went through some points in the document, including the voting structure where representation on the Task Force would be by Business Sector. Jennifer Vosburg, NRG Energy, stated the AFC Task Force has a similar document.

Ms. Vosburg discussed some of the concepts of the Reliability Task Force Guiding Document, specifically where the consultants would fall in the membership structure and voting procedure clarification. Ms. Vosburg also commented if the representative doesn’t vote on the SPC, then they shouldn’t get a vote on the Task Force. Don Shipley agreed, giving the example that SPP would have a representative in order to give the ICT position and opinions, but would not vote. Mr. Shipley also added that consultants could have the proxy of one group, or could be chosen as an expert by the Task Force.

Todd Peterson, West Memphis Utilities, asked for a clarification of the representative levels within the document and what would be considered an Entergy Network Customer. The group discussed the different representative levels and sector voting or representation. Jennifer Vosburg gave an example of how NRG would qualify in several sectors. Kristine Schmidt, ERSC, suggested that there could be information provided based on sector voting, but not voting by sector. Bruce Rew, SPP, commented that sector voting was not in the SPC charter. Mr. Shipley stated that the intent was to have every organization represented fairly, but let the Task Force be small enough to get things done. Reliability decisions need diversity because
they impact the sectors of the stakeholders differently. Ms. Vosburg stated she would work with Mr. Shipley to clarify voting rights in the Reliability Task Force Guiding Document.

Ronnie Frizell, Arkansas Electric Coop. Corp., asked if the Task Force was intended to number 8 representatives. Don Shipley stated that was the intent, with the addition of experts as deemed necessary by the Task Force; but that the Task force meetings would be open to all of the SPC members. The group discussed the need for the meetings to be open to all stakeholders and interested parties. George Heintzen, Conway Corporation, was interpreting the document stating if you were a representative of the Task Force you could attend meetings. Mr. Frizell added that there are stakeholders and interested parties that are not SPC members that have the right to attend meetings. Mr. Shipley commented that the intent of the document was not to exclude anyone from attending the Task Force meetings, but to make voting fair. The group agreed that further discussion was necessary. Jennifer Vosburg recommended that a determination be made on who was interested on being on the Reliability Task Force, similar to the actions taken by the AFC Task Force. Ms. Vosburg also stated that the voting and member procedures will need to be approved at the SPC. Mr. Shipley agreed and took an action item to send an e-mail gathering who has interest in being a member of the Task Force.

Bruce Rew added that those stakeholders who vote must also participate in the meetings and Task Force activities. Mr. Frizell agreed with Mr. Rew that the ability to vote should be related to participation. Tina Lee, KGen Power Management, suggested if a sector chose not to participate in the Task Force activities that the Task Force can continue to move forward in completing its activities. Mr. Shipley concurred.

**Item 2- TLR5 Investigation Report**

Don Shipley discussed the TLR5 Investigation Report, which gives greater detail of a specific TLR event. Entergy Operations has reviewed the details and confidentiality within the report. Mike Boustany, Lafayette Utilities, inquired on the additions to the document, as this document had much more detail than the previous document. Mr. Shipley took an action item to send the original and updated reports prior to the SPC meeting so that they could be reviewed side by side for the changes.

Roberto Paliza, Paliza Consulting LLC, commented on the report, citing several specific issues and technical questions with the report. Don Shipley stated he would respond to Mr. Paliza’s questions as soon as possible.

Jennifer Vosburg inquired about footnotes within the document and how those may be used to address disagreements. Mr. Shipley noted that there were confidentiality concerns with information in the footnotes, but that discussion was warranted. Mr. Shipley stated that the material had been posted both at the SPC and the ERSC.

**Item 3- TLR5 Analysis Report**

Don Shipley then discussed the TLR5 Analysis Report, which adds clarity to the TLR5 events that occurred during the year. Jennifer Vosburg added that the Reliability Task Force will have input on this report via the SPC and the ERSC. George Heintzen asked about the distribution of the report. Mr. Shipley replied the ERSC had requested the document be created and it was first distributed to the ERSC and the ERSC Working Group.
The group discussed the specifics of the report and the relation to AFC’s. Ms. Vosburg stated that there may be an opportunity for a joint task force with the AFC Task Force and Mr. Shipley stated those discussions had started. Roberto Paliza added discussions on generation outages and existing processes. Tina Lee asked questions on the details of the flowgates listed and the charts available. Mr. Shipley responded to Ms. Lee’s questions.

Jennifer Vosburg inquired if this is a document that will continue to be produced. Don Shipley stated the request for the document came from the ERSC and the ICT would need to wait on a position from them.

Ms. Vosburg asked for any additional questions from the Stakeholders on other Reliability issues. Mr. Shipley stated the ICT is still working on two open items from the previous Reliability discussion. Mr. Shipley took an action item to solicit any Reliability issues from the Stakeholders and present those at the next meeting.

Action Items:

1. The ICT will poll the Stakeholders to determine those that are interested in serving on the Reliability Task Force.
2. The ICT will provide the original and updated copy of the TLR5 Investigative Report to the Stakeholders prior to the SPC meeting.
3. The ICT will send an e-mail to the Stakeholders requesting any Reliability issues that the Stakeholders would like to have addressed.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tony Green
SIS Reports

1) Reporting of Negative AFC in SIS Reports – The current SIS report shows a zero for any AFC value that is negative due to a Base Case Contingency Overload. At a minimum, Entergy/ICT need to show the actual AFC/ATC values.

2) Failure to Show TDF Values – The SIS report would be more valuable to the Transmission Customer if the TDF values on impacted elements were given. I recognize could be issues of confidentiality, but a redacted version of the study could be posted on OASIS, and a non-redacted version could be made available to the Transmission Customer upon request.

3) Lack of detail in the presentation of SIS results. SIS reports only present the ATC for each limiting equipment identified in the study. When an ATC is negative, the ATC value is set to zero masking the real value which could be significantly negative, i.e. Base Case Overload. To improve the usefulness and transparency of SIS reports, the following should be presented for each limiting equipment identified in the report:
   a) Actual ATC value
   b) Pre-transfer flow
   c) Post-transfer flow
   d) Rating of limiting element
   e) OTDF (Outage Transfer Distribution Factor) value

Cost Estimates

1) More Accurate Cost Estimates for Potential Solutions – Currently, there is a wide disparity between what is shown for SIS upgrade costs and FS upgrades costs, even if the list of overloaded elements is unchanged between the studies. Entergy should provide a “weak link” database to ICT for use in developing cost estimates. If the Entergy Facility Rating Methodology requires the listing of each transmission element then such list could be made available to determine the items that need to be upgraded in order to provide the necessary ampacity to alleviate the overload. For example, a transmission line with a conductor rating of 350 MVA may have a significantly lower rating due to the rating of wave traps, switches, fuses, etc on the circuit.

2) Lack of complete cost estimates ("tbd") for upgrades and financial compensation for FFRs in the SIS reports. An SIS study is not useful if it does not include a complete estimate of the total cost of upgrades and financial compensation for FFRs. Unfortunately, this is the case with most of the SIS studies conducted by the ICT.

Modeling

1) Model Coordination with ICT – There have been documented instances whereby model data for a specific transaction has not been handled correctly due to not coordinating with the Transmission Customer on Network Customer assumptions for generating resources and dispatch. This needs to be part of the SIS process to avoid multiple studies.
Study Process

1) Cluster Study Process for Load – Currently, the ICT has the ability to study multiple requests from the same generator to different load points as a single cluster study. The OATT has provisions for studying requests as part of “a competitive solicitation.” A Transmission Customer participating in a competitive power supply solicitation should have the ability to have multiple requests from varying sources to the same sink studied as a cluster.

2) Treatment of Third Party Impacts in SIS Process – Coordination between the Entergy/ICT TSR queue and the SPP TSR queue needs to take place to make sure that third-party transactions are properly identified, queued and treated.

3) How are prior required transmission upgrades for previous transmission service requests incorporated in an SIS? If this process was changed, when was it changed and why?

4) In the SIS process, what is the internal process within the ICT and Entergy that tracks common transmission upgrades associated with different transmission service requests? How is this commonality conveyed to the market participants associated with these SIS?

5) Due to load variations, transmission topology changes and generation dispatch variations, has the ICT and/or Entergy ever performed an updated study for any FIS previously studied?

6) All ICT Base Plan upgrades should be included in the SIS models used to evaluate long-term TSRs. The ICT does not include the upgrades in the models rather it uses an "after-the-fact check" to determine whether a Base Plan upgrade mitigates an overload or not. This is an inaccurate method to evaluate the benefits of Base Plan upgrades.

   a) The report should also list upgrades included in the models. This could be done using the ICT Base Plan as a reference so only additions/deletions need to be identified.

7) Some network resources are not properly dispatched in SIS studies. The ICT uses a default dispatch for network resources. But a network customer can provide a specific dispatch order or methodology for its network resources. If the network customer provides this information, the ICT should use this dispatch in all SIS studies. This issue needs a thorough discussion which should lead to the development of guidelines for submitting dispatch data, type of resources to be dispatched (owned vs. contracted), frequency of dispatch changes, and events triggering changes in network customer's dispatch.

8) Evaluation of network resources re-dispatch of a network customer in SIS studies. Typically, the ICT does not include an evaluation of network resources re-dispatch to mitigate overloads identified in SIS studies. But this evaluation is performed if requested by the network customer after the initial study is completed. Network customers should be given an option up front to request the use of re-dispatch and/or delisting of their network resources as mitigation in SIS studies.

9) Improve planning re-dispatch methodology and presentation. Discuss and clarify this issue. It is not clear whether this is a real option for customers in Entergy.
**SIS/FS Coordination**

1) The dispatch should be the same in both SIS and FS. Modification of the dispatch to account for transactions, loading, etc. needs to be coordinated so the results are the same in both cases.
2) Network topology should be consistent in both studies.
3) Unless there can be improvements to bring the SIS and FS results into a much more consistent pattern, we would be better off to drop the SIS step and go directly to FS with a shorter time window for results.

**FFRs**

1) What is the process and procedure that will be used to calculate the FFR capacity and financial compensation?
2) Does the process and procedure take into account impact of BBCOs and loop flows on FFRs capacity and financial compensation?
3) Where is this process and procedure documented?
4) What is the time frame for providing the FFR information to requesting customer? Will this information be included in SIS? If not, please explain. Does the ICT and Entergy consider a SIS issued without the FFR amount or total cost to be a completed SIS? If so, what is your justification? What is the plan to be able to perform these costs as part of the SIS?
5) Who will calculate the FFR?
6) If the FFR is not calculated as part of the SIS, will the queue be frozen until the FFR is calculated?
7) Please reference OASIS #s 74412181, 7426230_7426230[1], 74262367
   a) Was service confirmed for these requests (and others) for Cargill under a “higher of” pricing?
   b) How was that determination made if FFRs needed to be calculated?
   c) How can a requesting party timely confirm service without knowing the price impact of the FFR?
   d) Can a party withdraw its confirmation without penalty if the FFR cost makes the request uneconomical to the requesting party?
   e) How is that a SIS report that does not provide a total cost (including FFRs compensation) meet the tariff obligations of Entergy and the ICT.
   f) If service is granted using the higher-of methodology, how is it determined as to how much of the PTP revenues go to the funding customer and how much go to offset the network revenue requirement? Is there a minimum offset to the network revenue requirement considered in granting service? For example, if PTP service is going to bring in $1mm of revenues but the FFR would be 950k, is there only going to be 50k
allocated to the network revenues requirement even though the vast majority of the atc being used by this transaction is being supported by the general rate base?

g) Describe the impact of Base Case Overloads, loop flows or changes in network resource dispatch on the FFR calculation. For example, if a funded supplemental upgrades originally creates 100 MW of AFC, of which 30 is needed for the funding customer, and 50 mw of the remaining 70 mw of AFC is taken up by the next resync of the model due to load and dispatch changes, how is the cost of the FFR allocated to the next customer who request service under this flowgate?

h) How are FFR’s allocated among different customers with different lengths of transmission service request? For example, if Customer A needs 100 MW from 2015 through 2045 on a given flowgate, and Customer B needs 100 mw on the same flowgate from 2015 to 2016, how would their FFRs be calculated.

i) In example above, assuming Customer B pays same as customer A, then how would Entergy/ICT allocate FFR beyond 2016 once Customer Bs transmission is over but there may/may not still be FFR rights.

j) If a customer gets an FFR because of upgrades needed for his TSR, and later redirects or annuls the TSR such that ATC is created due to his upgrades, is the customer compensated for releasing his upgrade capacity? How?
Reliability Task Force Guiding Document

1. PURPOSE
1.1 This document is intended for the sole purpose of establishing the framework for the Reliability Task Force which was approved to exist as an *ad hoc* working group of the ICT’s Stakeholder Policy Committee. This group will address reliability issues laid out in detail in Section 2 below.

2. DESCRIPTION
2.1 Pursuant to FERC’s April 24, 2006 Order conditionally approving the ICT, the stakeholder process, ICT Stakeholder Policy Committee (SPC), provides for the development of *ad hoc* working groups to support the resolution of stakeholder issues within the Entergy transmission system.

2.2 The Reliability Task Force is an *ad hoc* group whose purpose is to:
- Understand and explore the complexity of the reliability issues.
- Facilitate open discussion amongst group members.
- Seek consensus within the group as to what are the most efficient and fair alternatives to correct any gaps in reliability processes.
- Assist the ICT to make a reasonable decision based upon the information gleaned from the group’s discussions.

3. REPRESENTATION
3.1 The Reliability Task Force will be composed of:
- 4 representatives from the Entergy Stakeholder group
  - a) Qualifying Facilities (QF)
  - b) Independent Power Producers (IPP)
  - c) Municipalities and Cooperatives
  - d) Power Marketers and Power Brokers
- 4 representatives from the Entergy Network Customer group
  - a) Transmission Level Customers
  - b) Industrials
  - c) Investor Owned Utilities
  - d) Load Serving Entities
- Don Shipley, ICT, Reliability Coordinator
- Additional ICT personnel
- Additional experts as determined time to time by the group

3.2 Transparency and Voting Rights
- Any ICT Stakeholder Policy Committee member can participate in the meetings
- Reliability Task Force Recommendations will be voted on by the representative members of the task force only.
4. DURATION
3.1 The Reliability Task Force is intended to be a technical working group to address the specific reliability issues described in Section 2. The intent is to produce a recommendation to the reliability issue for the ICT Stakeholder Policy Committee to consider as soon as possible.
3.2 The team will meet as required to create a recommendation until the issue is resolved, or until the team decides to discontinue meetings.

5. REPORTING
4.1 The Reliability Task Force is a formal sub group of the ICT Stakeholder Policy Committee and formal reporting to the ICT SPC is required.
4.2 Discussion documentation and meeting minutes will be posted for public viewing via the Reliability Task Force exploder and on the ICT webpage at www.spp.org.
4.3 The team will develop recommendations and present them to the ICT Stakeholder Committee, however ICT Reliability Coordinator has ultimate authority to make, accepts or implement recommendations. Any changes to procedure will be implemented by the ICT Reliability Coordinator.
4.4 Depending on the scope of change and/or necessity to engage a regulatory body (NERC) or other Reliability Coordinators from adjacent systems, the team may need to seek informal or formal support from the ICT SPC.
4.5 If formal support from the ICT SPC is requested, then the team will develop a position document, including a majority and minority position, to present to the SPC at the next time ICT SPC meeting.

6. MEETINGS
6.1 Meetings regularly held until the issue is resolved.
6.2 Meetings will either be a conference call or in person at a place TBD. Conference call dial in numbers will be distributed before the call to team members.
6.3 Notice of the date of each Reliability Task Force meetings will be posted on the SPP website and noticed via the exploder as far as advance as practical. The final agenda and any background materials will be posted no later than 3 business days prior to the date of the meeting.
6.4 Minutes will be distributed of all meetings within 5 business days after a meeting.

7. Attendance
7.1 Attendance by the voting members of the Reliability Task Force is encouraged and there will be a 60% attendance by voting members required for a quorum.
7.2 No recommendation will be voted on without a quorum.
7.3 A roster of the Reliability Task Force voting members will be maintained and attendance will be recorded in the minutes of the meetings.
7.4 All meeting attendees will be noted in the meeting.
ICTE TLR 5 Investigation Report  
Flowgate 1324  
(Whitebluff - Sheridan 500 kV for the loss of Mabelvale - Sheridan 500 kV)  
TLR Level 5: May 22, 2010

1. Description of purpose/cause of hold/curtailment.
This report is submitted in accordance with the NERC Transmission Loading Relief Investigation Procedure for the TLR 5 event that occurred on Flowgate 1324 on May 22, 2010. Flowgate 1324 is an Entergy flowgate. The TLR 5 was in effect from 12:13 AM until 9:29 AM on May 22, 2010. Projected post-contingent flows on the Whitebluff - Sheridan 500 kV line for the loss of the Mabelvale - Sheridan 500 kV line exceeded the SOL.

2. Facility/flowgate limitations and flows at the time the TLR was initiated.
At the time the TLR 5b was issued, the Limiting Element was rated at 1732 MVA. Flow on the Limiting Element was 1220 MVA. Flow on the Contingent Element was 923 MVA. The LODF was approximately 80%. Post-contingent flow on the Limiting Element was approximately 1958 MVA.

3. TLR levels, timing, and relief requested amounts.
TLRs levels, timing and relief requested amounts are shown on pages 3 and 4.

4. Transmission and generation outages or changes from prediction that may have contributed.
   - There were no unplanned outages on the ICTE system associated with this flowgate.
   - There were no abnormal load changes.
   - There was 0 mw of non-firm service impacting the flowgate day of since the RC was in a TLR 5 event.

There were no unplanned/planned transmission outages that significantly impacted the TLR 5 event. The constraint is a North to South flowgate. Units in the Entergy BA (including internal IPPs and QFs) North of the constraint have an average Generation Shift Factor (GSF) of -25%, while units south have an average GSF of 30%. The base loaded units north of the constraint (WhiteBluff 1 & 2, ISES 1 & 2, and ANO 1 & 2) were for the most part loaded at their PMAX for the duration of the event. There were key planned base loaded generation outages south of the constraint on Nelson 6 (approx. 550mw) and Grand Gulf (approx. 1300). LAGN Big Cajun 2 unit 2 was in a forced outage (approx. 600mw) during the TLR event. Other base loaded units south of the constraint including Waterford 3 and Riverbend were for the most part operating at PMAX during the event. Other generating units south of the constraint including Lewis Creek 1 & 2, Sabine 1,2,3,5, Nelson 3, Toledo Bend 1 & 2, Sam Rayburn, St. Gabriel, Little Gypsy 3, Ninemile 4 & 5, Waterford 1, Michoud 2, Andrus, Baxter Wilson 1, and RexBrown 4 had lowered due to a decrease in load and for regulation reasons.

---

1 Redacted at Entergy's request. GSF values are confidential operating reliability data subject to the NERC ORD Agreement under NERC standards and Entergy believes that neither it nor the ICT may disclose such information.
Before the TLR 5 event the Independent Power Producers located south of the flowgate including Frontier, Cottonwood, DukeHinds, and Cypress, total output was 1491 mws.\(^2\) When the TLR 5 event started the total output of the IPPs was approximately 74 mws. PUPP generation south of the constraint was approximately 1446 mws before the TLR 5 event and at the time of the TLR 5 event PUPP generation was at 0 mw. The Qualified Facilities (QF) south of the flowgate total net output before the TLR 5 event was approximately 1938 mw, at the time of the TLR 5 event the QF net output was approximately 1630 mws.

See the Generation Summary, labeled as Appendix 1, for generation levels before, during and after the TLR 5 event.

At 23:07 on May 21, 2010 the ICTE issued a TLR 4 with Post Contingent loading on the flowgate at 107%. There were 521 mws of non-firm schedules curtailed for the current hour.

At 00:11 on May 22, 2010 the ICTE RC issued a TLR 5b with Post Contingent loading on the flowgate at 111%. The initial schedule curtailment of the TLR 5b included 206 mw of firm schedules and 159 mw of NNL responsibility.

At 11:11 on May 22, 2010 the ICTE RC issued a TLR 0 with Post Contingent loading on the flowgate at 75%. At this time all curtailed schedules were reloaded. The Post Contingent loading on the flowgate reduced because of the load and generation increase.

5. Procedures implemented prior to hold/curtailment.

Curtailed non-firm transactions, not enough non-firm to alleviate the flowgate. The system was not re-dispatched to prevent curtailment of firm service. The ICT RC verifies with Entergy’s Shift Supervisor before a TLR 5 event is called if there are any re-dispatch options available.

6. The initial investigation shall compare all transaction curtailment lists as generated by the IDC with the list of transactions flowing as determined by the IDC (Whole Transaction Lists) both before and after curtailment. The reasons for any transactions that were excluded from curtailment shall be provided. For those transactions not curtailed, the Reliability Authority will identify those entities and any affiliation with said entities.

There were no known transactions excluded from curtailment for this TLR.

\(^2\) Entergy notes that there is more generation south of the constraint than the ones listed that could be included in this description of the conditions leading to this TLR.

\(^3\) This number represents the amount of generation that would have been subject to NNL. NNL is distributed according to the impact of generation which meets the threshold of 5% or greater impact in GLDF. Entergy notes that this number does not include all generation which impacts the flowgate, including that which does not meet the 5% threshold established by NERC.
7. List of known transactions not in the IDC with Transaction Contribution Factors greater than the curtailment threshold and actions taken to curtail such transactions.
There were no known transactions not in the IDC.

8. Excerpts from the RA Operations Log containing information relevant to the TLR event.
Information was provided to Reliability Coordinators through the IDC and the RCIS. Also the ICTE Reliability Coordinators logged information describing the actions taken at each issuance of the TLR, included below.

9. Flowgate limitations as identified by security analysis processes conducted by the Reliability Authority for the day prior to the TLR event.
The Whitebluff-Sheridan FTLO Mabelvale-Sheridan flowgate was not seen as a contingency in the next day study analysis. The issue was off peak, next day study analysis are for the peak hour only. 4

No actions were taken day ahead to coordinate between the RC and TA or RC to external RC's. The next day peak analysis did not show the Whitebluff-Sheridan FTLO Mabelvale-Sheridan as overloaded.

10. State Estimator snapshots and security analysis, including any contingency analysis or stability analysis, along with any other recorded data indicating need for TLR.
The ICTE Reliability Coordinator was monitoring their state estimator for potential issues during this time. Screen shots were taken during each issuance of the TLR level 5.

11. ATC limitations before, during, and after the TLR event.
ICT Tariff Administration grants transmission service using an AFC process. This process evaluates each transmission request on a case by case basis. There are no ATC values for individual corridors to or from the Entergy system. ICT Tariff Administration was not granting any transmission requests that impacted the congested flowgate by 3 % or greater at the time of the TLR 5.

Entergy disagrees with this general statement made by the ICT about Entergy's next-day study process. Entergy does perform an off-peak study for days in which a planned outage is scheduled that may create off-peak issues. Since there was no such scheduled outage related to the TLR 5 in this report, there was no off-peak study performed on this day.

| AFC Initialization Summary Report Timestamp | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
|---------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 5/20/10 20:03                              | 1183|1183|1188|1208|1192|1192|1221|1240|1206|1182|1107|1013|914|805|775|763|744|734|775|854|867|880|996|1059|
| 5/21/10 10:27                              | 1158|1162|1172|1180|1208|1213|1184|1091|1083|1100|1011|920|893|819|784|749|744|755|801|869|875|881|970|1106|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TFC of WHBSHE_MABEL</th>
<th>1732</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4 Entergy disagrees with this general statement made by the ICT about Entergy's next-day study process. Entergy does perform an off-peak study for days in which a planned outage is scheduled that may create off-peak issues. Since there was no such scheduled outage related to the TLR 5 in this report, there was no off-peak study performed on this day.
**12. Description of actions taken to avoid future hold/curtailments.**

This TLR was caused by a combination of generation patterns, load, and system flows. Due to this situation, no actions were taken to avoid future hold/curtailments.

The ICTE RC uses the congestion management process to mitigate Post Contingent overloads. This includes using the NERC accepted IDC TLR process.

This was an identified issue in the 2009 ICT Strategic Transmission Plan (ISTEP) located under Central Arkansas Constraint.

**13. Provide IDC generated Congestion Management Reports showing transaction curtailment list and Control Area NNL (network and native load) curtailment responsibility.**

Congestion Management Reports for each issuance of the TLR have been reviewed and kept on file. These screen shots are not being provided to reduce the size of this report.

**14. Re-dispatch actions taken.**

Entergy achieved their NNL obligation by moving generation on White Bluff and Independence 1 and 2.

---

### AFC Initialization Summary Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timestamp (CST)</th>
<th>AFC available on WHBSHE_MABEL (MW)</th>
<th>Average of 24 hours on 5/22/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 10:24</td>
<td>574 270 660 242 216 245 541 416 915 917 863 867 901 753 695 867 794 698 788 867 788 712 972 849 844 871 824 891 844 891</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 20:03</td>
<td>576 471 460 487 491 551 571 563 621 666 768 822 891 941 957 1001 999 939 875 961 863 812 729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 10:27</td>
<td>576 455 420 488 547 568 567 633 707 804 859 928 980 997 1041 1036 976 911 994 847 825 737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 16:16</td>
<td>576 455 420 488 547 568 567 633 707 804 859 928 980 997 1041 1036 976 911 994 847 825 737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 20:15</td>
<td>329 376 385 512 547 531 594 650 744 797 867 917 934 977 972 914 849 932 785 781 693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 23:14</td>
<td>329 478 499 581 592 656 740 837 891 960 1010 1027 1059 1065 1007 942 1024 877 879 791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 4:14</td>
<td>397 513 503 685 747 786 882 968 1054 1104 1120 1162 1156 1097 1032 1015 968 930 845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 9:31</td>
<td>397 525 506 686 837 938 982 1041 1110 1125 1167 1190 1103 1038 1120 962 872 771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 15:15</td>
<td>48 693 801 959 1112 1172 1245 1297 1315 1337 1347 1287 1218 1266 1123 1029 884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 7:14</td>
<td>59 614 788 933 985 1066 1119 1137 1180 1171 1112 1040 1110 963 874 769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 8:13</td>
<td>348 590 808 921 1001 1065 1085 1128 1116 1045 1048 1120 975 935 847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 9:13</td>
<td>486 758 839 1010 1075 1105 1157 1136 1064 1072 1144 990 891 820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10 10:12</td>
<td>-23 829 930 1110 1145 1194 1177 1108 1106 1164 1013 904 832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Event History

**Issuing RC:** ICTE  
**Flowgate:** 1324 - WhiteBluff-Sheridan for loss of Malevole-Sheridan  
**Event Begin:** 2016-05-21 22:20  
**Event End:** 2016-05-22 10:25  
**Event Duration:** 12 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Level</th>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>TLR Confirm Time</th>
<th>Run Time</th>
<th>Requested Relief</th>
<th>Remaining Relief</th>
<th>Relief Provided</th>
<th>Total Cuts</th>
<th>MW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLR Level 1</td>
<td>05/21/2016 22:20</td>
<td>05/21/2016 22:20</td>
<td>05/21/2016 22:07</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLR Level 5B</td>
<td>05/21/2016 23:25</td>
<td>05/21/2016 23:13</td>
<td>05/21/2016 23:11:01</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>255.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLR Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 00:00</td>
<td>05/22/2016 00:29</td>
<td>05/22/2016 00:26:54</td>
<td>154.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>317.8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLR Level 4</td>
<td>05/22/2016 00:11</td>
<td>05/22/2016 01:29</td>
<td>05/22/2016 01:27:16</td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>321.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 01:00</td>
<td>05/22/2016 02:33</td>
<td>05/22/2016 02:31:24</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>355.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 01:10</td>
<td>05/22/2016 03:30</td>
<td>05/22/2016 03:26:26</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>330.2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 01:20</td>
<td>05/22/2016 04:31</td>
<td>05/22/2016 04:29:03</td>
<td>146.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>286.0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 01:30</td>
<td>05/22/2016 05:35</td>
<td>05/22/2016 05:31:14</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>163.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 02:00</td>
<td>05/22/2016 06:30</td>
<td>05/22/2016 06:28:30</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>162.0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 02:30</td>
<td>05/22/2016 07:30</td>
<td>05/22/2016 07:29:33</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>131.2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 03:00</td>
<td>05/22/2016 08:29</td>
<td>05/22/2016 08:28:27</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL Level 1</td>
<td>05/22/2016 09:40</td>
<td>05/22/2016 09:29</td>
<td>05/22/2016 09:28:01</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL Level 2</td>
<td>05/22/2016 10:20</td>
<td>05/22/2016 10:11</td>
<td>05/22/2016 10:11:30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Event Summary

**Incident:** ICTE_1324_301005513220  
**Date:** 05/21/2016 (CST)  
**Rating:** 17/2  
**Reliability Coordinator:** ICTE  
**Flowgate:** 1324 - WhiteBluff-Sheridan for loss of Malevole-Sheridan  
**Effective Start Time:** 05/21/2016 22:20 (CST)  
**Effective End Time:** 05/22/2016 11:25 (CST)  
**TLR Duration:** 12 Hours and 5 Minutes

### TLR Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>TLR Level</th>
<th>Effective Time</th>
<th>Total Tags</th>
<th>OFC Cut</th>
<th>OTC Cut</th>
<th>RAC Cut</th>
<th>OIF Cut</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>MW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>TLR 1</td>
<td>05/21/2016 22:20</td>
<td>11/0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXT</td>
<td>TLR 1</td>
<td>05/21/2016 22:20</td>
<td>11/0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>TLR 5B</td>
<td>05/21/2016 23:25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXT</td>
<td>TLR 5B</td>
<td>05/21/2016 23:25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>TLR 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 00:00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXT</td>
<td>TLR 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 00:00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>TRL Level 4</td>
<td>05/22/2016 00:11</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXT</td>
<td>TRL Level 4</td>
<td>05/22/2016 00:11</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 00:29</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXT</td>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 00:29</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 01:29</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXT</td>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 01:29</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 02:33</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXT</td>
<td>TRL Level 5A</td>
<td>05/22/2016 02:33</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 of 113
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Operator Name</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/21/10</td>
<td>2302</td>
<td>Flow Gate</td>
<td>Wayne/Chad</td>
<td>Assessed FG as ICP PC 102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/21/10</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>TLR - 4</td>
<td>Wayne/Chad</td>
<td>Issued TLR 4 PC 107% Ref # 259670, no internal nonfirm tags available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/10</td>
<td>0011</td>
<td>TLR - 5b</td>
<td>Wayne Johnson</td>
<td>Issued TLR 5B PC 113% Ref # 259670, no internal nonfirm tags available. NNL: EES 144.1, SMEE 5.1, SPA .2, TVA 9.7. TVA dropping Allen units 105mws. Informed SWPP RC that SPA could hold generation at present levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/10 01:26</td>
<td>TLR - 5a Wayne Johnson</td>
<td>Issued TLR 5A PC 93%, no internal nonfirm tags available. NNL: EES 129.3, SMEE 4.9, SPA .2, TVA 8.3. TVA raising Allen units 14mws.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/10 02:27</td>
<td>TLR - 5a Wayne Johnson</td>
<td>Reissued TLR 5A PC 95%, no internal nonfirm tags available. NNL: EES 124, SMEE 4.6, SPA .2, TVA 7.7. TVA setting Allen units at 84mws.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/10 03:31</td>
<td>TLR - 5a Wayne Johnson</td>
<td>Reissued TLR 5A PC 95%, no internal nonfirm tags available. NNL: EES 124.3, SMEE 4.7, SPA .2, TVA 7.8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/10 04:36</td>
<td>TLR - 5a Wayne Johnson</td>
<td>Reissued TLR 5A PC 97%, no internal nonfirm tags available. NNL: EES 123.6, SMEE 4.6, SPA .2, TVA 7.7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/10 05:29</td>
<td>TLR - 5a Wayne Johnson</td>
<td>Reissued TLR 5A PC 92%, no internal nonfirm tags available. NNL: EES 123.3, SMEE 4.6, SPA .2, TVA 7.7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/10 06:30</td>
<td>TLR - 5a Heath Martin</td>
<td>Re-issued TLR 5a, PC 94% EES NNL 48.4, SMEE 1.8, SPA 0.1, TVA 3.1, no internal non-firm identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/10 07:30</td>
<td>TLR - 5a Heath Martin</td>
<td>Re-issued TLR 5a, PC 96% EES NNL 62.3, SMEE 2.1, SPA 0.1, TVA 3.9, no internal non-firm identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/10 08:30</td>
<td>TLR - 5a Heath Martin</td>
<td>Re-issued TLR 5a, PC 93% EES NNL 53.1, SMEE 1.7, SPA 0.1, TVA 3.5, no internal non-firm identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/10 09:30</td>
<td>TLR - 5a Heath Martin</td>
<td>Re-issued TLR 5a, PC 84%, NO NNL, JEFF026 Internal Non-firm tag identified. As provided in the email to the Shift Supervisor, the ICT RC has issued a TLR Level 5a on Flowgate 1324 WhiteBluff-Sheridan for loss of Mabelvale-Sheridan. At this time Entergy is instructed to curtail the non-firm portion of the following Schedules JEFF026. These curtailments should remain in place until the TLR level is reduced below a TLR Level 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>TLR Level</td>
<td>Tag Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/10</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Heath Martin</td>
<td>Issued TLR 4, PC 89%, 0045131 Internal non-firm tag identified for 1030 TLR 4 issue. As provided in the email to the Shift Supervisor, the ICT RC has issued a TLR Level 4 on Flowgate 1324 WhiteBluff-Sheridan for loss of Mabelvale-Sheridan. At this time Entergy is instructed to curtail the non-firm portion of the following Schedules 0045131. These curtailments should remain in place until the TLR level is reduced below a TLR Level 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/10</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Heath Martin</td>
<td>Issued TLR 0, PC 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1

Generation Summary

5 Redacted due to the confidential nature of the information.
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1. Executive Summary

This report analyzes Transmission Loading Relief (TLR) level 5 events issued by the Southwest Power Pool (SPP) Reliability Coordinator in the Independent Coordinator of Transmission (ICT) reliability area. The analysis used statistical data from January 1, 2010 through September 30, 2010, and is divided into three sections: total number of TLR 5 events, arrangement of TLR 5 events by flowgates, and the overlap of TLR and Local Area Problem (LAP) flowgates.

The TLR 5 events are arranged by the state, in which the flowgate contingent element is located, and include the flowgate name and interchange distribution calculator (IDC) identifier, dates and number of events and TLR level for the flowgate during the reporting period, cause of the TLR 5 event, and a proposed mitigation plan to limit future TLR 5 events on the flowgate. The report also includes a list of each state’s total number of TLR5s and amount of firm curtailment in gigawatt hours.

The overlap of TLR/LAP flowgates is listed, along with an explanation of the transmission congestion management assessment process. This explanation includes the assessment formula for determining the TLR or LAP and an example of the calculation using the formula.

The SPP Reliability Coordinator makes the following recommendations:

- Perform off-peak engineering analysis on all transmission outages.
- Schedule transmission upgrades as soon as possible on the flowgates with the greatest TLR 5 activity.
- Provide greater accuracy between the projected generation and the actual generation in the Available Flowgate Capacity (AFC) model.
- The SPP Reliability Coordinator should be given approval rights for generation outages in the ICT reliability area.

This report acknowledges the following limitations to the analysis performed on the TLR 5 events:

- The research is from the SPP Reliability Coordinator’s perspective and does not include economic considerations.
- It is difficult to project generation dispatch in real-time.
- Most of the TLR 5 activity is on the 500 kV transmission grid, which is owned by Entergy but used by multiple entities.
2. TLR 5 Statistics

The following chart represents the TLR 5 activity by state and gigawatt hours curtailed.

For the ICT footprint, the 500 kV transmission grid in Arkansas incurred 73% of gigawatt hours curtailed and 60% of TLR 5 events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># TLR5’s</th>
<th>GWH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>87.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana/Texas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>120.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. TLR 5 Events by Flowgates

Arkansas

1324 - Whitebluff-Sheridan for loss of Mabelvale-Sheridan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/15/2010 22:00</td>
<td>5/17/2010 06:40</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17/2010 23:00</td>
<td>5/18/2010 06:40</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/18/2010 22:00</td>
<td>5/19/2010 05:45</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/2010 22:00</td>
<td>5/20/2010 06:30</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/20/2010 21:45</td>
<td>5/21/2010 06:45</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cause:
This is an off-peak issue created because of a north-to-south power transfer during the off-peak hours. Nelson 6 is a coal unit in the south portion of the Entergy system that was not available during this time due to planned maintenance activities.

Mitigation Plan:
This issue is addressed in the 2009 ICT Strategic Transmission Expansion Plan (ISTEP). There are two short-term opportunities to limit TLR 5 activity on this flowgate:

- A generation ratio between the north and south generation should be established to limit the north to south power transfer. The appropriate ratio would be determined by engineering analysis and could be established on a daily or seasonal basis.

- The second opportunity for mitigation would be to provide the Reliability Coordinator with approval authority for planned generation outages. Currently, the Reliability Coordinator manages the system without this authority; in many instances, generation maintenance activities create transmission constraints that require the congestion management process to relieve the constraint.
1913 - Keo-West Memphis 500 kV for the loss of Independence-Dell 500 kV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/22/2010 06:35</td>
<td>07/22/2010 22:35</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/20/2010 08:00</td>
<td>7/20/2010 21:40</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/21/2010 06:20</td>
<td>7/21/2010 23:30</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
This on-peak issue was created from high loads and large west-to-east power transfers. Most of these power transfers were generated from the west side of the Entergy transmission system and sent to Tennessee Valley Authority and Southern Company.

**Mitigation Plan:**
Review the AFC methodology to ensure greater accuracy between model and real-time generation dispatch; this would limit flows across the transmission system from west to east.

Long-term planning should investigate possible upgrades to these 500 kV transmission facilities to allow greater transfer capability from west to east.

1966 - Sheridan - Mabelvale 500 kv fto White Bluff - Keo 500kv

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/22/2010 10:00</td>
<td>6/22/2010 21:15</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/17/2010 12:00</td>
<td>7/17/2010 20:35</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19/2010 10:05</td>
<td>7/19/2010 23:00</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26/2010 09:45</td>
<td>7/26/2010 22:00</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/27/2010 09:30</td>
<td>7/27/2010 22:00</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/29/2010 08:45</td>
<td>7/29/2010 21:30</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12/2010 10:00</td>
<td>8/12/2010 22:00</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2010 10:00</td>
<td>8/13/2010 21:20</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14/2010 11:30</td>
<td>8/14/2010 21:00</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/2010 10:00</td>
<td>8/20/2010 22:00</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/2010 14:00</td>
<td>8/21/2010 22:00</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/2010 11:20</td>
<td>8/30/2010 22:35</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31/2010 11:00</td>
<td>8/31/2010 22:30</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cause:
This is typically an on-peak issue resulting from south-to-north power flow due to off-system sales from an internal generation-only control area. Amite South and Gulf States Utilities (GSU) are dispatched to serve native load during high load periods.

Mitigation Plan:
Review AFC model to ensure that generation dispatch in the model is comparable to real-time generation dispatch.

Long-term planning should investigate transmission upgrades to provide additional transfer capability to support off-system sales.

The North-to-south generation ratio recommended in the ICT Reliability Improvement Plan would assist in managing this transmission constraint.

**14804 - Russellville E-Russellville S 161 kv FTLO ANO - Ft. Smith 500kv**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/9/2010 15:30</td>
<td>8/9/2010 18:00</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cause:
OG&E de-rated several units when a 345 kV transmission line from Ft. Smith to Muskogee tripped due to grass fire underneath line. Generation at the Muskogee generation plant also tripped for unrelated reasons on August 9, 2010. The combination of these events led to a reverse flow on the Entergy ANO – Ft. Smith 500 kV line, which is the contingent element for this flowgate. The flow on the contingent element created the constraint and required the TLR action.

The market-coordinated flowgate listed below (16556) was created at 18:00 on August 9, 2010 to achieve the required relief from the SPP market that was not available until the original flowgate (14804) was coordinated with the market.

Mitigation Plan:
There is no mitigation planned for this event, as it was created by a forced outage on the transmission system.
16556 - Russellville E-Russellville S 161 kv FTLO ANO-Ft.Smith 500kv (MKT COOR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/9/2010 18:00</td>
<td>8/9/2010 22:45</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/11/2010 11:00</td>
<td>8/11/2010 23:00</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
The cause of this event is listed above.

**Mitigation Plan:**
No mitigation required.

16288 - Marshall-Botkinburg 161 kv ftlo Dardanelle Dam-Russellville S. 161kv

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/6/2010 19:00</td>
<td>4/7/2010 00:00</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
Arkansas Nuclear One (ANO) planned outage.

**Mitigation Plan:**
The Reliability Coordinator should have approval authority for generation maintenance outages.

Review the AFC methodology to ensure greater accuracy between the model generation dispatch and real-time generation dispatch.

16314 - Mabelvale-Bryant 115 KV for the loss of Sheridan - Mabelvale 500KV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/13/2010 00:40</td>
<td>4/13/2010 06:15</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
The Sheridan - White Bluff 500 kV outage was planned to perform SERC-required relay calibration and check direct current control for the breakers. The testing was performed at the Sheridan substation.

The TLR activity was off-peak; the Reliability Coordinator’s next day on-peak analysis did not reveal this transmission constraint, and the outage was approved.
**Mitigation Plan:**
The Reliability Coordinator should perform off-peak analysis for all request outages; the off-peak model is being created for this analysis.

### 16445 - Wmempolis - BirminghamST 500 KV FTLO SanSouci-Shelby 500KV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/24/2010 09:55</td>
<td>7/24/2010 22:30</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/2010 09:00</td>
<td>7/30/2010 22:00</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/16/2010 8:00</td>
<td>8/16/2010 21:40</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/17/2010 9:00</td>
<td>8/17/2010 21:35</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/2010 8:00</td>
<td>8/18/2010 21:40</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19/2010 9:00</td>
<td>8/19/2010 21:40</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
This on-peak issue was created from high loads and large west-to-east power transfers. Most of these transfers were generated from the west side of the Entergy transmission system and sent to Tennessee Valley Authority and Southern Company.

**Mitigation Plan:**
Review the AFC methodology to ensure greater accuracy between model and real-time generation dispatch; this would limit flows across the transmission system from west to east.

Long-term planning should investigate possible upgrades to these 500 kV transmission facilities to allow greater transfer capability from west to east.

### 16470 - Melbourne-Calico Rock 161 kV ftlo ISES-Dell 500kV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/14/2010 10:20</td>
<td>7/14/2010 22:55</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/2010 19:00</td>
<td>7/15/2010 22:00</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10/2010 20:00</td>
<td>8/10/2010 22:15</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/9/2010 9:00</td>
<td>8/9/2010 23:30</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
This issue was caused by south-to-north power transfers due to high loads in the area; additional impact was caused by the lack of Southwestern Power Administration (SPA)hydro generation due to water restrictions placed by the Army Corps of Engineers.

**Mitigation Plan:**
The 161 kV transmission system should be evaluated for transmission upgrade opportunities due to increasing load in the area. No upgrades are planned for this area at this time.
16500 - Sage-Melbourne 161 kV FTLO Independence-Dell 500 kV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/15/2010 10:30</td>
<td>7/15/2010 19:00</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
This event was declared on the incorrect line section; 16470 was the correct flowgate for this transmission constraint. At 19:00 on 7/15/10, the Reliability Coordinator switched the TLR activity to the correct flowgate. There was no adverse impact from this action, as the same relief requirements are in effect for both flowgates.

**Mitigation Plan:**
The mitigation plan for 16470 also applies to this flowgate.
**Louisiana**

### 1347 - Wilbert-Livonia for loss of Webre-Wells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/9/2010 05:00</td>
<td>4/9/2010 22:40</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
The Nelson 6 generating unit was in a planned maintenance outage, which reduces generation on the west side of the Entergy system that is available to balance flow across the contingent 500 kV Webre–Wells element.

**Mitigation Plan:**
The Reliability Coordinator should have approval authority for generation maintenance outages.

This was a single occurrence, so no other mitigation action is planned at this time.

### 15867 - Webre-Willow Glen 500 kv ftlo Big Cajun-Fancy 500 kv

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/8/2010 11:00</td>
<td>7/8/2010 21:35</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31/2010 08:40</td>
<td>7/31/2010 21:00</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2010 09:50</td>
<td>8/1/2010 22:00</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2/2010 09:00</td>
<td>8/2/2010 20:50</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3/2010 08:00</td>
<td>8/3/2010 20:40</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4/2010 08:00</td>
<td>8/4/2010 18:45</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
On 7/8/10, the Ninemile 4 generating unit was forced offline due to a tube leak in the boiler.

All other TLR events on this flowgate were due to the Riverbend planned outage to correct an ID fan problem.

**Mitigation Plan:**
No mitigation is planned at this time; the circumstances that created the TLR event were either forced or associated with a Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) directive to make repairs to the nuclear unit. The load was high during this time; typically the units would have been in service.
16132 - Nelson-LakeCharlesBulk1 138 kv for the loss of Nelson-Richard 500kv

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/8/2010 16:00</td>
<td>7/8/2010 21:20</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
The Whitebluff #2 generation unit was offline due to a tube leak, and was replaced with generation from the Sabine and Lewis Creek units, which has a negative impact on this flowgate.

**Mitigation Plan:**
This was a one-time occurrence created by a forced outage on a major generating plant that is typically dispatched during high load periods; there is no mitigation plan.
**Louisiana/Texas**

1388 - Mt. Olive - Hartburg for the loss of Webre - Wells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Cause:**
The Nelson 6 generating unit was forced offline due to a tube leak.

**Mitigation Plan:**
The circumstances that led to this TLR event do not require a mitigation plan.

16272 - Nelson AT1 500/230 for the loss of Hartburg 500kv - Cypress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/23/2010 08:00</td>
<td>3/23/2010 16:00</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/30/2010 10:30</td>
<td>5/1/2010 01:40</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/16/2010 08:00</td>
<td>5/16/2010 22:50</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/2010 09:25</td>
<td>5/19/2010 23:20</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18/2010 10:00</td>
<td>9/18/2010 23:00</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2010 9:45</td>
<td>9/20/2010 0:40</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2010 6:00</td>
<td>9/25/2010 22:40</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
The TLR 5 events for March through May were created by the planned maintenance outage of the Nelson 6 generating unit. The TLR 5 events for September were due to a forced outage of Nelson 6.

**Mitigation Plan:**
The Reliability Coordinator should have approval authority for generation maintenance outages.

No other mitigation plan has been created.
Mississippi

1330 – McAdams 500-230 for loss of McAdams-Lakeover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/12/10 07:00</td>
<td>2/12/10 13:25</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/19/2010 12:55</td>
<td>4/20/2010 00:55</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/11/2010 08:30</td>
<td>5/12/2010 00:40</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/2010 20:00</td>
<td>5/20/2010 00:45</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/2010 15:00</td>
<td>5/21/2010 18:40</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
2/12/10: The Baxter-Wilson-Ray Braswell EHV switch upgrade was in progress as part of the Ouachita project. Loads were higher than expected, and the combination of negative-impacting Entergy and TVA generation created a post-contingent overload that was controlled with a TLR.

4/19/10: The El Dorado–Sterlington 500 kV element was in a planned outage to perform SERC-required relay calibration and check direct current control for the breakers. This testing was performed at the El Dorado substation.

All other TLR 5 events were due to planned outages of the Grand Gulf nuclear generating facility and the Nelson 6 generating facility.

**Mitigation Plan:**
McAdams substation upgrades are planned for 2011.

The Reliability Coordinator should have approval authority for generation maintenance outages.

16373 - McAdams-Pickens 230 kV ftlo McAdams-Lakeover 500kV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/18/2010 12:55</td>
<td>5/18/2010 20:45</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
The Grand Gulf nuclear facility was in a planned outage.

**Mitigation Plan:**
There is a proposed 230 kV line upgrade on the McAdams–Pickens 230kV line for 2011. This upgrade is also part of the Generation Interconnection study PID 221.

The Reliability Coordinator should have approval authority for generation maintenance outages.
16487 - McAdams AT1 ftlo Choctaw-West Point 500kV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLR Date</th>
<th>Return To Zero</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/22/2010 15:50</td>
<td>07/22/2010 23:00</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/23/2010 11:00</td>
<td>7/23/2010 22:35</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2010 16:00</td>
<td>9/2/2010 0:00</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/2010 12:00</td>
<td>9/2/2010 21:00</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cause:**
July 2010: The Gerald Andrus generator was offline in an unplanned outage.
September 2010: The Gerald Andrus generator was offline in an unplanned outage.

**Mitigation Plan:**
These TLR events were due to unplanned generation outages; there is no mitigation plan other than the McAdams substation upgrades.
4. TLR/LAP Overlap Assessment Process

The Reliability Coordinator uses two types of congestion management processes to relieve congestion on the Entergy transmission system: the NERC-defined TLR process that provides relief from schedules and generation, and the Local Area Process used to relieve congestion in areas for which only Entergy dispatch can provide relief.

The Reliability Coordinator is responsible for determining the most effective method to provide relief for a transmission constraint, using the following assessment process:

A. The first part of the assessment process describes an interconnect problem (ICP) and is defined as follows:

If the total Firm and Non-Firm Schedule impact on the constrained element/flowgate is greater than 10% of the Post-Contingent Flow, the problem will be deemed an ICP.

All Schedules with a 5% or greater impact will be subject to curtailment during this procedure. The NERC IDC will be used to determine the impact of the schedules on the constrained element/flowgate, and the most current set of NERC TLR procedures will apply.

Problems typically involve interchange transactions with other Balancing Authorities and transmission service reserved under the Entergy OATT and are “regional” in nature, probably caused due to parallel path flows, loop flows, or OATT service.

The formula that represents an ICP during the assessment process is:

\[
\text{Interconnection (NF + F) Impact / PC Flow} > 10\%
\]

An example of this formula is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NF Schedules} & = 40 \\
\text{Firm Schedules} & = 60 \\
\text{Post Contingent Flow on the limiting element} & = 120 \\
(40 + 60) & = 100 / 120 = .83 \text{ or } 83\% > 10\%
\end{align*}
\]

This issue would be declared by the Reliability Coordinator to be an ICP and the TLR process would be used.

B. The second method for relieving a transmission constraint is the Local Area Problem or LAP, defined below:

If the total Firm and Non-Firm Schedule impact on the constrained element/flowgate is 10% or less than the Post-Contingent Flow, the problem will be deemed a LAP.

All generators with a 3% or greater impact and that meet the other below requirements will be subject to curtailment during this procedure. The generation shift factors will be used to determine the impact of generators on the constrained element/flowgate.

Problems are inside the Entergy Balancing Area and “local” in nature, probably caused due to import limitations, and/or an imbalance between generation and load. Potential
examples of this type of problem would be the Amite South Area and the GSU Western Division.

The formula that represents an LAP during the assessment process is:
Interconnection (NF + F) Impact / PC Flow <= 10%

An example of this formula is:
  NF Schedules equals 10
  Firm Schedules equals 0
  Post Contingent Flow on the limiting element equals 120
(10 +0)= 10 / 120 = .08 or 8% >10%

This issue would be declared by the Reliability Coordinator to be a Local Area Problem (LAP) and the Local Area process would be used.
The Reliability Coordinator has assessed as an Interconnect Problem and Local Area Problem for the following flowgates during the reporting period. These flowgates are subject to either process, depending on the scheduled flow when it was assessed by the Reliability Coordinator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ICP</th>
<th>LAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1309</td>
<td>Terrebonne-Greenwood for loss of Webre-Wells</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>Rilla-Riverton for loss of MtOlive-ElDorado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316</td>
<td>Scott-Semere 138kv FTLO Wells-Pont Des Mouton 230kv</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>McAdams500-230 for loss of McAdams-Lakeover</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Wilbert-Livonia for loss of Webre-Wells</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>North Crowley-Scott 138kV for loss of Richard-Scott 138kV</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14764</td>
<td>Morrilton-East Gleason ftlo Pleasant Hills-Mayflower</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14804</td>
<td>Russellville E-Russellville S 161kv FTLO ANO-FtSmith 500kv</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15008</td>
<td>Nelson XF 500/230 ftlo Cyress-Hartburg 500 kv</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15447</td>
<td>Ringgold-Sailes 115kv ftlo El Dorado-Longwood 500kv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15745</td>
<td>Woodstock-Vulchlor 230kV ftlo Willow Glen-Waterford 500kV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15909</td>
<td>North Crowley - Scott 138kv ftlo Wells - Pont D Mouton 230kv</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15912</td>
<td>El Dorado 500/115 XFMR (ftlo) Mcneil 500/115 XFMR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15913</td>
<td>Newton Bulk - Hollsprings 138 kv (ftlo) Hartburg - Cypress 500 kv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15942</td>
<td>Smackover-Camden 115KV FTLO McNeil AT1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16177</td>
<td>Cecela Moril 138kv ftlo Scott-Judice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16184</td>
<td>Ringgold-Sales 115kv ftlo Dolet Hills-SW Shreveport 345kV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16272</td>
<td>Nelson AT1 500/230 (ftlo) Hartburg 500kV - Cypress</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16320</td>
<td>Danville_Ola 115KV FTLO Mabelvale-Sheridan 500kV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16373</td>
<td>McAdams-Pickens 230kV ftlo McAdams-Lakeover 500kV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16398</td>
<td>Jackson Rankin - Jackson Airport 115kv ftlo Rankin AT1 230/115kv</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16418</td>
<td>Blakely-Mountain Pine South 115kv ftlo Hot Springs South-Carpenter Dam 115kv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16445</td>
<td>Wmernpise-BirmingST 500KV FTLO SanSouci-Shelby 500KV</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16470</td>
<td>Melbourne-Calico Rock 161kv ftlo ISES-Dell 500kV</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16487</td>
<td>McAdams AT1 ftlo Choctaw-West Point 500kV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16500</td>
<td>Sage-Melbourne 161kv FTLO Independence-Dell 500kv</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16524</td>
<td>Baxter Wilson-Vicksburg SE 115 ftlo Vicksburg-Vicksburg W 115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16538</td>
<td>Mountain Pine N-Blakely 115kV ftlo Carpenter-Hot Springs S 115kv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Hot Springs-Bismark for loss of El Dorado-Longwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Cecelia-Moril 138 kV for loss of Flanders-Hopkins 138 kV</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Sterlington-Oak Ridge 115 kV for loss of Perryville-Baxter Wilson 500 kV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Brookhaven-Mallalieu 115 kV for the loss of Franklin-Bogalusa 500 kV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Hartburg-Inland Orange 230 kV for the loss of Hartburg-Cypress 500 kV</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Mayflower-Morgan 115 kV for the loss of Mayflower-Sylvan Hills 115 kV</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>St. Gabriel-AAC Corp 230 kV for the loss of Coly-Vignes 230 kV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>St. Gabriel-AAC Corp 230 kV for the loss of Willow Glen-Waterford 500 kV</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Newport-Fisher 161 kV for the loss of Independence-Dell 500 kV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Arkansas (ANO) - Pleasant Hills 500 kv (ftlo) Arkansas - Mabelvale 500 kV</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Conclusion

This report documents the TLR 5 activity during the reporting period and offers the following recommendations:

- Perform off-peak engineering analysis on all transmission outages.
- Schedule transmission upgrades as soon as possible on the flowgates with the greatest TLR 5 activity.
- Provide greater accuracy between the projected generation and the actual generation in the Available Flowgate Capacity (AFC) model.
- The SPP Reliability Coordinator should be given approval rights for generation outages in the ICT reliability area.

The report offers an explanation of the Reliability Coordinator transmission constraint assessment process, and provides examples of the formula used by the Reliability Coordinator during the assessment process.

The report lists the transmission facilities that have been assessed as an Interconnect Problem and a Local Area Problem during the reporting period.
# AFC Model Improvement Task Force Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Shook</td>
<td>ETEC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jason.shook@gdsassociates.com">jason.shook@gdsassociates.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chiles</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deral Danis</td>
<td>Constellation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:deral.danis@constellation.com">deral.danis@constellation.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Walkup</td>
<td>AECC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bwalkup@aecc.com">bwalkup@aecc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Wolf</td>
<td>EMO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hwolf1@entergy.com">hwolf1@entergy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Paliza</td>
<td>Paliza Consulting LLC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Roberto@Palizacounseling.com">Roberto@Palizacounseling.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Harward</td>
<td>SPP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mharward@spp.org">mharward@spp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Henley</td>
<td>CWL – Jonesboro, AR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhenley@jonesborocwl.org">rhenley@jonesborocwl.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lona</td>
<td>Suez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robert.Lona@gdfsuezna.com">Robert.Lona@gdfsuezna.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Vosburg</td>
<td>NRG</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jennifer.vosburg@nrgenergy.com">Jennifer.vosburg@nrgenergy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinit Gupta</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:VGUPTA@entergy.com">VGUPTA@entergy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Lane</td>
<td>Tenaska</td>
<td><a href="mailto:slane@tnsk.com">slane@tnsk.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Phillips</td>
<td>SPP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tphillips@spp.org">tphillips@spp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Brown</td>
<td>SPP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bsbrown@spp.org">bsbrown@spp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Rogers</td>
<td>SMEPA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jrogers@smea.coop">jrogers@smea.coop</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Goar</td>
<td>SMEPA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jigoar@smea.coop">jigoar@smea.coop</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Cripps</td>
<td>CLECO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matthew.cripps@cleco.com">matthew.cripps@cleco.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenisha Webber</td>
<td>EMO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kwebber@entergy.com">kwebber@entergy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Boustany</td>
<td>LAFA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbous@lus.org">mbous@lus.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Warren</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CWARRE1@entergy.com">CWARRE1@entergy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Turner</td>
<td>Entegra</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BTurner@entegrapower.com">BTurner@entegrapower.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Davis</td>
<td>SPP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jdavis@spp.org">jdavis@spp.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATC/AFC Stakeholder Issues/Questions

1. Improve interregional coordination and representation of neighboring systems in the daily AFC models.

2. Improve generations dispatch in AFC models so that forecasted MW flows are consistent with flows on the operating day.

3. Improve coordination between Tariff Administration and Reliability Coordination processes. These two processes need to be in synch especially in the day-ahead and operating day timeframes. The purpose of this is to prevent overselling of transmission service.

4. Speed-up the process to incorporate new flowgates in the AFC process so that Tariff Administrators do not oversell a flowgate in TLR because the flowgate was not included in the AFC model.

5. Fix Base Case Contingency Overloads in AFC models.

6. Resolve the QF put modeling issue in the AFC models.

7. Complete AFC benchmark effort and distribute findings and recommendations to stakeholders.

8. Finalize policy on timeframe to incorporate approved transmission upgrades in the AFC models. A proposal was developed by the AFC Improvement Task Force.

9. Review modeling assumptions to calculate Transfer Distribution Factors (TDFs) and determine whether changes are needed especially for small network customers.

10. Finalize policy on use of automatic operating guides in the calculation of AFCs.

11. Proposal to include transmission projects in the current Entergy Construction Plan that are scheduled for completion within a xxx month period.
a. Eliminate time-lag for insertion into model

12. Improve the current, official notification timeline for new transmission projects to be placed in the AFC/ATC calculation process. Consider a monthly or as-needed basis. This could be distributed to market participants via a defined e-mail list to ensure prompt (real-time) market notification.

13. Improvements in scheduled transactions (TIE FLOWS) outside the Entergy footprint that affect AFC/ATC Calculations.
   a. Estimation of ATC on seams transactions

14. Update stability runs that limit transmission lines below their thermal rating.
   a. Calculated limit is currently used throughout the year
   b. Consider seasonal or more frequent reviews

15. Improve coordination between real-time operations and AFC/ATC calculation. Example: Over selling of transmission system during TLR/LAP declarations.

16. Review enforcement of load pocket requirements during AFC/ATC calculations and possible improvements to this process.

17. How are case studies developed for AFC/ATC calculation, checked for accuracy in terms of line ratings, generator max/min capability, etc?

18. Investigate the possibility of using a short-term higher transmission line rating for hourly/daily transmission service.
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AFC Task Force Update

• October 20, 2010
AFC Task Force

• Conference Call held October 12, 2010
• Reviewed the list of 18 items
• Discussed the formation of the taskforce
Review of the 18 items

• The list of 18 was reviewed to see if any of the items could be consolidated

• Question about #16 was completed
  • The group agreed that the item has been resolved at this time, but changes may require the solution to be monitored. Item to be reviewed and reported back to task force by November 12.

• Started prioritization of the open items
Consolidation of Items

- The group determined that items 1 and 13 were similar enough to be combined
  - Improve interregional coordination and representation of neighboring systems in the daily AFC models.
  - Improvements in scheduled transactions (TIE FLOWS) outside the Entergy footprint that affect AFC/ATC Calculations.
    1. Estimation of ATC on seams transactions
Consolidation of Items cont.

• Items 3, 4, and 15 similar enough to combine
  • Improve coordination between Tariff Administration and Reliability Coordination processes. These two processes need to be in synch especially in the day-ahead and operating day timeframes. The purpose of this is to prevent overselling of transmission service.

• Speed-up the process to incorporate new flowgates in the AFC process so that Tariff Administrators do not oversell a flowgate in TLR because the flowgate was not included in the AFC model.

• Improve coordination between real-time operations and AFC/ATC calculation. Example: Over selling of transmission system during TLR/LAP declarations.
Prioritization of issues

- The group determined that item 12 should be ranked as the first priority
  - Improve the current, official notification timeline for new transmission projects to be placed in the AFC/ATC calculation process. Consider a monthly or as-needed basis. This could be distributed to market participants via a defined e-mail list to ensure prompt (real-time) market notification.

1. Entergy is researching this item and will provide an update by November 12.
Prioritization of issues cont.

• The group determined that the consolidated items (3, 4, and 15) should be ranked as the next item
  • Improve coordination between Tariff Administration and Reliability Coordination processes. These two processes need to be in synch especially in the day-ahead and operating day timeframes. The purpose of this is to prevent overselling of transmission service.
  • Speed-up the process to incorporate new flowgates in the AFC process so that Tariff Administrators do not oversell a flowgate in TLR because the flowgate was not included in the AFC model.
  • Improve coordination between real-time operations and AFC/ATC calculation. Example: Over selling of transmission system during TLR/LAP declarations.

• An action item was taken to better define the issues between RC and TA coordination
AFC Task Force Membership

• 3 options briefly discussed, but no resolution for recommendation to SPC
  • Representation by sector
  • Poll members of the old task force
  • Poll the members of the SPC for membership

• All the Task Forces’ under the SPC should have the same structure
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WPP Operations
## WPP Weekly Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th># of Offers Submitted</th>
<th>Total MWs Offered</th>
<th># of Offers Accepted</th>
<th>Total MWs Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 79:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/10 – 10/1/10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 80:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/10 – 10/8/10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 81:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/10 – 10/15/10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 82:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/10 – 10/22/10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WPP Enhancements Update
WPP QF Puts Modeling Proposal

• Testing results were provided to stakeholders at the September WPPIWG and ERSC WG meetings.

• Results showed a net decrease in offers selected, MWs forecast to be purchased, and estimated savings.

• Transmission line flows improved, relative to the accuracy of the QF put forecast.

• Hourly Flexibility violations decreased.

• Binding or violated Load Balance (Dump Energy) requirements increased.
WPP QF Puts Modeling Proposal (ICT Position)

• Testing results suggest the QF Put modeling proposal shifts software constraints (i.e. Hourly Flexibility vs. Dump Energy) rather than reducing constraints.

• The ICT believes the emergence of issues with the Dump Energy constraint may risk the stability of the WPP software beyond the benefits of the QF Puts modeling proposal.

• As a result, the ICT does not endorse the QF Puts modeling proposal.
WPP QF Puts Modeling Proposal (Entergy Position)

- Entergy currently is considering the input provided by the ICT and stakeholders.
WPP Offer Period Extension Proposal

• Testing results were provided to stakeholders at the September WPPIWG and ERSC WG meetings.

• This proposal produced an increase in hours that Third Party Suppliers could submit offers to the WPP.

• Testing results showed a net increase in offers selected, MWs forecast to be purchased, and estimated savings.
WPP Offer Period Extension Proposal (ICT Position)

• This proposal increases the number of hours in which Third Party Suppliers can compete to reduce Network Customer production costs and requires no modifications to the WPP software.

• The testing results showed minimal risk of increasing soft constraint violations.

• As a result, the ICT endorses this proposal for implementation in the WPP.
WPP Offer Period Extension Proposal (Entergy Position)

• Entergy is currently evaluating the WPP Offer Period Extension Proposal.
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Entergy Users Group
Report to the ICT Stakeholders Policy Committee
October 20, 2010
Assessment

- Performed on 08/31/10 for the period 05/10 through 07/10
- Examined AFC and WPP data retention:
  1. Sampled evidence of the full and incremental backup processes
  2. Sampled evidence of the test restoration process
  3. Sampled AFC data storage on EMS and online file server
  4. Verified evidence of tape storage maintenance
  5. Discussed AFC/HDR data and end of life issues
  6. Reviewed FERC Filings
Findings

• Backup and Restoration Processes

• Issues from previous assessment:
  1. The revised backup process has corrected the extend run times and increased the stability of the full weekly B&R
  2. Veritas Version 6 media server hardware was installed

• Issue Updates/New Issues:
  1. The B&R process are still being revised to include the additional steps that are required to shorten B&R run times.
  2. ICT will continue to follow up to ensure the process documentation is updated with the additional steps.
  3. Weekly Full backup did not run on July 17, 2010. ICT confirmed that the daily differential data backups ran successfully until the next weekly full backup ran on July 29. Entergy staff failed to document the backup issue as required by the documentation. Entergy is researching the cause and will report back to the ICT.
Findings

• AFC and WPP Date Archive:

  • Issues from previous assessment:
    1. Entergy is now fully current with all data backup processes
       A. At the time of the assessment, data was archived through April 2010
       B. Gap plan was completed ahead of schedule
       C. Extended run time issues are resolved

  • Issue Update:
    1. Entergy remains current will data backup processes
# FERC Filings

Summary of Docket No. ER05-1065-000 Filings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Issues Filed</th>
<th>AFC Related</th>
<th>Discovered By:</th>
<th>Caused By:</th>
<th>Issues Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
<td>Customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10 - 07/10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/10 - 04/10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08 - 01/10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08 - 10/08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09 - 07/09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09 - 04/09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Work continues to produce this same chart dating back to 11/06.
FERC Filings

• June 3, 2010: Modeled Reservation File
  • On 05/24/10 Entergy confirmed an issue identified by the ICT had the potential to affect certain reservations in the Operating and Planning Horizon.
  • For certain TSRs, the modeled MW capacity printed in the “MOD file” was inconsistent with actual modeled MW capacity in the base flow MW sent to webTrans. AREVA determined that the issue only existed where “Load of a network customer is fully met without modeling any reservations in basecase and the local variable used in RFCALC code for writing reservation modeled capacity to MOD Files have a non zero value from previous runs”.
  • This issue did not impact RFCALC’s ability to model reservations correctly, hence it did not impact base flow calculations or response factors in RFCALC.
  • This error was introduced with the implementation of webTrans on 09/28/09. Areva provided a software patch to prevent further occurrences of this issue on 7/13/2010.
FERC Filings

- June 3, 2010: Load Schedules for External Control Areas
  - On 5/20/10 Entergy identified that load schedules for some external control areas (AECD, CSWS, EDE, AMIL, SPA, OKGE and LEPA) were constant for all seven days of the week from 1000 5/19/10, until corrected around 0900 on 5/20/10.
  - During the daily manual load forecast process an error was made which resulted in incorrect load forecast values. The error may have impacted base flow values for Operating and Planning Horizons. However, the impact to specific TSRs cannot be determined.
  - Entergy took three corrective actions to mitigate this issue:
    1. Scripts were modified to eliminate the manual step for file renaming.
    2. A control point was added after the first script creates the file containing 7-day loads to ensure the data used is valid. Additionally, as part of this control point, a spreadsheet was created to compare values in the ldsked.csv file to those in the NETMOM database to ensure a wider sample of areas from all different sources will be captured. This spreadsheet also reads and displays the timestamps of the value2.csv and ldsked.csv files to ensure that correct files are being used.
    3. A checklist was created and added to the procedure to further mitigate the likelihood of human error.
FERC Filings

● June 3, 2010: EMS Network Model

   • During the Weekly Procurement Process (WPP) quality checks on 5/20/10, it was identified that a topology error in the network model used in the Operating and Planning Horizons existed.

   • The 115 KV line between NLR Palm Street and NLR Dixie substation was incorrectly showing out of service for all time points in RFCALC. A breaker connecting the load at the station to the rest of the system was incorrectly designated as normally open in the network model resulting in RFCALC model being incorrect.

   • The error existed from 1705 5/13/10, until it was corrected at 1005 on 5/25/10. No corrective actions were identified for this issue. The error may have impacted the base flow and response factors for Operating and Planning Horizons; however, the impact, if any, would have been minimal because the load was only approximately 20 MW.
FERC Filings

- June 3, 2010: Inconsistent AFC Values
  - On 5/21/10, it was identified that for most hours of 05/24/10, PUPP was oversold by 100MW in AFC.
  - It was determined that webTrans was not properly removing “Recall credits” resulting in the AFCs to be incremented.
  - A manual workaround was implemented by the ICT on 5/21/10, and continued until the software fix was put in production on 5/24/10. This error potentially impacted the Operating, Planning and Study Horizons.
FERC Filings

• June 24, 2010: Network Model Reservation File
  • On 6/10/10, Entergy identified an issue where the EMS Network Model incorrectly identified Plum Control Area’s only generator as an Independent Power Producer (IPP). This resulted in RFCALC not modeling the generator in Plum Control Area as an Automatic Generation Control (AGC) unit.
  • RFCALC has controls to disable AGC status of IPPs and Qualified Facilities (QF) to ensure that units are dispatched based on reservations and schedules. Plum is defined as an area type source in RFCALC and RFCALC requires at least one generator on AGC in the control area to model any reservations and schedules on area type sources.
  • Because of this error, the Plum area had no generator on AGC; thus, RFCALC was unable to model any reservation and schedules with Plum as source in the Operating and Planning Horizons. This error was introduced on 5/10/10 and Entergy corrected the issue on 6/11/10.
  • To prevent this type of error in the future, the Network Model User Guide will be converted to a procedure and checklists will be developed along with periodic reviews to ensure that procedure is followed. These are due by 10/31/2010.
FERC Filings

- **July 1, 2010: Network Model Reservation File**
  - On June 18, 2010, Entergy identified an issue where the participation factor used for Willow Glen Unit G4 was incorrect.
  - Since July 2009, the participation factor file used in the AFC process contained Willow Glen Unit G5 instead of G4 resulting in the participation factor for Unit G4 to be incorrectly set. Willow Glen Unit G5 had been placed on inactive reserve and was not used in response factor calculation since it was modeled as offline.
  - The issue was discovered during the software testing and was corrected on 6/18/10. Test cases used for participation factor file upload testing were modified to ensure that there is a one-to-one match between units specified in the participation factor file and units specified in the EMS network model for response factor calculation.
  - The impact on the response factors calculated for paths with EMO as the sink would be minimal since this was only one unit with an incorrect participation factor out of a total of 57 units used in the EMO sink.
FERC Filings

- July 8, 2010 Filing: Duplicate Flowgates

  - On 6/24/10 the ICT identified an error in the file containing the response factors and baseflows for the Operating and Planning Horizon.
  
  - The data file created by RFCALC contains up to the 15 most limiting flowgates for each transfer path for each hour/day of the horizon resyncs.
  
  - This error resulted in the file containing duplicate flowgates with incorrect response factors for several transfer paths for certain hours/days of resync.
  
  - Entergy determined that an error existed in a piece of code that was deployed into production on 6/21/10 at 1400. A temporary fix was implemented on 6/25/10 at 1700 until a permanent software fix was developed by the vendor. The permanent software patch was tested and deployed on 7/13/10.
  
  - This issue may have potentially impacted firm and non-firm reservations in the Operating and Planning Horizon that were queued between 6/21/10 at 1405 and 6/25/10 at 1700.
FERC Filings

• July 28 2010 Filing: Incorrect Modeling of Stack Reservations

  • On 7/12/10, Entergy identified an error in the way RFCALC was using the stack reservation files in the Planning Horizon.

  • The stack file is provided by customers and includes reservations for peak and off-peak hours for each day of AFC operating and planning horizon. The duration of reservations specified in peak hour may span the off-peak hours and vice versa; however, RFCALC should only model the reservations as specified by the customer in the stack file.

  • Due to a software error, RFCALC was using some peak hour reservations to meet the network customer load in an off-peak time point.

  • This error was introduced in an April 2009 code release. A manual workaround was put in place on 7/13/10. A permanent software fix for the issue was put in place on 7/21/10. This issue only affected certain reservations modeled in the Planning Horizon where ENTEMO was the sink.

  • At his time Entergy cannot determine the specific impact of this error on AFC values.
Questions?
ICT 2011 Base Plan Overview

January 20, 2011

Brandon Hentschel
bhentschel@spp.org
501.688.1603
Activities Since Posting of November Draft Base Plan

• Completed analysis of out-year projects.
• Reviewed Construction Plan and made final adjustments to the Base Plan.
• Posted Entergy’s Final Construction Plan and ICT Final Base Plan on OASIS on 12/30/2010.
• 2011 Base Plan is now in effect for cost allocation purposes.
Changes made to BP since 2011 Draft BP U1

- **Added to 2011 BP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT Project Name</th>
<th>ICT Need-by Date</th>
<th>CP Current Projected In-Service Date</th>
<th>ICT Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russellville East to Russellville South 161 kV line: Replace jumpers and risers at Russellville East</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navasota to Magnolia Anderson 138kV: Upgrade relay CT</td>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatican 138 kV Substation: Cut in Scott to Acadia 138 kV line to Vatican 138 kV Substation, Add breakers at Vatican.</td>
<td>Winter 2015</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moril - Add 2nd 138 - 69 Auto</td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis 69 kV substation - Add 69 kV capacitor bank</td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Bluff Voltage Support Project - Phase 1</td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Bluff Voltage Support Project - Phase 1 (Poyen 115 kV Substation: Add 21.6 MVAR Capacitor Bank)</td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayflower - Reconfigure 500 kV bus (eliminate breaker failure impact on autos)</td>
<td>Winter 2013</td>
<td>Winter 2013</td>
<td>needed for new TPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deweyville (JNEC) - Add 69 kV capacitor bank</td>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>Needed to close normally open point at Deweyville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Louisiana Improvement Project - Phase 1</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td>Winter 2012</td>
<td>Entergy is evaluating a possible load addition in this area so they accelerated this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartz to Oakridge - Construct new 115 kV Line (1272 ACSS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate Sterlington to Oakridge normally open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Louisiana Improvement Project - Phase 2</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>Entergy is evaluating a possible load addition in this area so they accelerated this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakridge to new Dunn Substation - Construct new 115 kV Line (1272 ACSS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add 115 kV breakers at Dunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add 115 kV, 32.4 MVAR capacitor bank at Dunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolbs 230 kV - Add capacitor bank</td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>New TPL - N1G1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Changes made to BP since 2011 Draft BP U1

#### Moved to Potential Future BP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT Project Name</th>
<th>ICT Need-by Date</th>
<th>ICT Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getwell Area Improvements</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
<td>The cap bank at Senatobia and new Church Road to Getwell 230kV line pushes the need for this project out to 2017S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct new 230 kV line from Getwell to new Senatobia Industrial 230-115 kV substation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add new 230-115 kV autotransformer at new Senatobia Industrial substation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut in Senatobia to Sardis 115 kV line into new substation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin 500 kV Substation - Relocate Franklin to Bogalusa 500 kV and Autotransformer positions</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Needed for new TP and Entergy molded this out in the CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conroe area switching station - tie lines Longmire to Fish Creek and Conroe to Woodhaven 138 lines together.</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
<td>With College Station project in-service this project isn’t needed until 17S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes made to BP since 2011 Draft BP U1

- **Removed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT Project Name</th>
<th>ICT Need-by Date</th>
<th>ICT Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Smithdale - Arlington 115kV</td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>SMEPA’s line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Moved to Load Related Sections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT Project Name</th>
<th>ICT Need-by Date</th>
<th>ICT Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeland-Madison Reliability Improvement Build Sunnybrook and Radial 115 kV Transmission Line</td>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>moved to load section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Completed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT Project Name</th>
<th>ICT Need-by Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Station 138kV Switching Station</td>
<td>Winter 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct new 3 terminal 138 kV Switching Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close normally open switch at Speedway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2011 Base Plan Scope

• Ten-Year Span for Reliability Projects
  – 2011 - 2015 Summer & Winter Models were used to flag potential problems in years 1-5 (NERC “near-term”). Drill-down to year/season to identify projects needed within the 3-year cost-allocation period.
  – 2019 Summer model was used to identify projects for years 6-10 (NERC “longer-term” listed as Potential Future BP Projects).

• Load-Related and Asset Management projects are included as Base Plan projects under Attachment T.

• Supplemental and other projects are listed for information only.
Outline of Base Plan Format

• Side-by-side format with Entergy Construction Plan
• Table 1: All “official” Base Plan projects – within the 3-year cost allocation window
  – Reliability Projects
  – Load-Related Projects
  – Asset-Management Projects
• Table 2: Everything else
  – Completed Projects
  – Displaced Projects
  – Supplemental Projects
  – Potential Future Projects
Reliability Projects

• 204 Reliability Projects
  – 182 Inside the 3-Year Window for Base Plan cost allocation (Table 1)
    ▪ 128 Approved Construction Plan
    ▪ 51 Proposed & In-Target Construction Plan
    ▪ 3 Non-Construction Plan, ICT Identified Projects
  – 22 Outside the 3-Year Window for Base Plan cost allocation
    (Potential Future BP Projects in Table 2)
• 53 Projects Added to the 2011 Base Plan 3 Year Window
  – 30 Reliability Projects Section
  – 12 Load Related Section
  – 11 Asset-Management Section
Comparison with Previous Base Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Projects within the 3-Year Window</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Entergy's Construction Plan</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed &amp; In-Target</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Construction Plan (ICT-Only)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly identified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Today:
  ➢ Presentation of Final 2011 Base Plan

• January 2011:
  ➢ Draft Differences Report for FERC
  ➢ Develop Mitigation Plans

• February 2011:
  ➢ Review draft scope for the 2012 Reliability Assessment

• March 2011:
  ➢ Begin 2012 Reliability Assessment leading to the 2012 ICT Base Plan
Helping our members work together to keep the lights on... today and in the future
ICT SPC AFC Task Force Update

January 20, 2011

Jason Davis
jdavis@spp.org
Contents:

• Team Members
• Meetings/Discussion
• Open Action Items
• Close Action Items
# Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Davis</td>
<td>SPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Phillips</td>
<td>SPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Warren</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinit Gupta</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Turner</td>
<td>Stakeholder (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Messina</td>
<td>Stakeholder (Vice-Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chiles</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Thompson</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Paliza</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cheshire</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Henley</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lona</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings/Discussions

- Previous AFC Task Force Meeting Dates
  - October 12
  - December 2
  - December 16 Joint meeting with Reliability TF
  - January 12

- Next Scheduled meeting March 1
- Another Joint AFC Task Force and Reliability Task Force in the near future
Meetings/Discussions

• October 12 2010 Initial meeting
  – Reviewed the list of 18 items
    • Worked to see if the items could be consolidated
    • Reviewed the list to see if any items have been completed
      – Question if the Enforcement of Zonal Import Limits have been completed
    • Started prioritization of which item to work on first
      – Improve the coordination between the RC and TA group
      – Improve the notification for new transmission projects to be placed AFC/ATC process
  – Discussed the formation of the Task Force
Meetings/Discussions

• December 2 2010
  – Nomination of Becky Turner as Chair and Wayne Messina as Vice-Chair
  – Update on the Enforcement of Zonal Import Limits
  – Discussion on the notification of transmission projects being placed into the model.
    • Clarification of what type of projects/upgrades should be included
    • When and how should the notification be done
  – Coordination between RC and TA group
    • Needed a joint meeting with the Reliability Task Force
Meetings/Discussions

• December 16 2010 – Joint meeting with the Reliability Task Force
  – Differences in Next Day Analysis and the AFC Model
  – Benchmarking using the RC process vs. AFC Process
  – Comparison of the RC Flowgates and AFC Flowgates
Meetings/Discussions

• January 12 2011
  – Update on the notification of transmission projects being placed into the model
  – Coordination between RC and TA
    • Discussion on who is providing data for the AFC models and the RC group
## Open Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2010</td>
<td>Entergy to provide an annual review for the summer peak in the fall/November and the annual review would be provided to the SPC AFC Task Force upon completion</td>
<td>On Going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2010</td>
<td>Cameron’s group to provide a document that describes the new posting process. Vinit indicated to have the process document complete by end of year with implementation around mid January 2011.</td>
<td>Document provided. Implementation Scheduled February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2010</td>
<td>The AFC Task Force should identify, in the document, the specific parts that need RC Task force input.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2010</td>
<td>Could anyone confirm if Entergy is getting this data? What is the requirement for these generators. Vinit will check with the SOC to see what is currently being received for data from the Generator/Operator as required by a NERC standard. ICT/Entergy to determine which customers are providing AFC input data currently</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Action Items Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2010</td>
<td>Create process (Benchmarking) for comparing the real time environment with the day ahead AFC model for use as a benchmark by ICT. This process is intended to be used for the month of January, with the frequency to be determined based on the level of difficulty in capturing and analyzing this information.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/2011</td>
<td>Vinit to provide a list of the QF's that are providing data to Entergy</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/2011</td>
<td>Vinit to provide an update on the status of the addition of more slots for temporary flowgates</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/2011</td>
<td>Entergy to provide a list of who is providing data for the AFC process</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/2011</td>
<td>Cameron and Jason to talk about the issue with the outgate cancellation over the weekend of January 10 and provide a summary back to the group</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Closed Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
<td>Entergy will review enforcement of load pocket requirements during AFC/ATC calculations actions (issue #16) and report findings</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
<td>Entergy will also review issue #12, to improve the current, official notification timeline for new transmission projects to be placed in the AFC/ATC calculation process.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
<td>Roberto Paliza will define the scope of issues #3, 4, and 15 for the purpose of consolidating them into one issue.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
<td>The group to provide a recommendation to the SPC Coordination Committee for the membership of the AFC Task Force</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2010</td>
<td>Jennifer asked if Roberto was going to set up a subcommittee to address this issue.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2010</td>
<td>Schedule a joint call for the RC/ICT Task Forces to talk about benchmarking and differences in assumptions between the models</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12/2/2010  | The AFC TASK Force needs to get on the agenda of the 12/7/2010 9 -11 a.m. RC Task force conference to ask the following questions to be considered and schedule a formal joint meeting:  
  a. If the RC sees an issue in their next day analysis, what actions do they take  
  b. Is there any benchmarking being done with the RC next day analysis study and the AFCs on the day ahead  
  c. Which flowgates need to be added to the AFC model to include all known flowgates that are used by the RC  | Complete |
| 12/2/2010  | Becky will try to further combine and reduce the list of 18 items.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Complete |
| 1/12/2011  | Jason to provide Jennifer a paragraph describing the progress with the AFC Task Force for the ERSC update                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Complete |
Helping our members work together to keep the lights on... today and in the future
ICTE Reliability: Procedure Updates

January 20, 2011

Don Shipley
dshipley@spp.org 501.614.3581
Topics:

• Suspension of AFC during TLR
  – Analysis Summary
  – Monthly Information
  – TLR Hours and AFC Hours Summary
  – Actions from Prior Meetings
  – Action requested by Stakeholders

• Supplemental Curtailment Process during a TLR
  – Analysis Summary
  – Internal Non-Firm Curtailments
Section 1:

Suspension of AFC during TLR
Analysis Summary

• 189 TLRs issued during the 6 months
• 18 logging/communication errors
• 38 Flowgates that were not in AFC when requested
  – 1 added in July (16470 - Melbourne-Calico Rock 161kV ftlo ISES-Dell 500kV)
  – 1 added in October (Temp6/15974 - Grimes-Mt.Zion ftlo Grimes-Magnolia Anderson)
Data Analysis Performed: July 2010

- 71 - TLR’s issued by ICT RC
  - 60 - AFC’s were zero’d out according to the process
  - 11 - AFC’s were not zero’d out

Of the 11,
- 5 were due to communication issues,
- 6 were because the IDC Flowgate did not have an exact match in AFC.

The flowgates are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flowgate ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>Webre - Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16398</td>
<td>Jackson Rankin - Jackson Airport 115kv (ftlo) Rankin AT1 230/115kv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16470</td>
<td>Melbourne-Calico Rock 161kV ftlo ISES-Dell 500kV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16500</td>
<td>Sage-Melbourne 161kV FTLO Independence-Dell 500 kV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis Performed: August 2010

- 65 - TLR’s issued by ICT RC
  - 51 - AFC’s were zero’d out according to the process
  - 14 - AFC’s were not zero’d out

Of the 14,

- 1 was due to a notification failure between the desks, which also did not have an exact match in AFC.
- 13 were because the IDC Flowgate did not have an exact match in AFC.

The flowgates are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>Webre - Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Mayflower-Morgan 115 kV for the loss of Mayflower-Sylvan Hills 115 kV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5267</td>
<td>RUSDARANOFTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14804</td>
<td>Russellville E-Russellville S 161kv FTLO ANO Ft. Smith 500kv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15990</td>
<td>Morrilton East-Gleason 161kv FTLO Pleasant Hills-Greenbrier 161kv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16556</td>
<td>Russellville E-Russellville S 161kv FTLO ANO Ft. Smith 500kv (MKT COOR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis Performed: September 2010

• 25 - TLR’s issued by ICT RC
  – 22 - AFC’s were zero’d out according to the process
  – 3 - AFC’s were not zero’d out

Of the 3,

• 1 was due to a notification failure between the desks, which also did not have an exact match in AFC.
• 2 were because the IDC Flowgate did not have an exact match in AFC.

The flowgate is listed below:

| 16272  | Nelson AT1 500/230 (ftlo) Hartburg 500kv - Cypress |
Data Analysis Performed: October 2010

- 7 - TLR’s issued by ICT RC
  - 6 - AFC’s were zero’d out according to the process
  - 1 - AFC’s were not zero’d out

It was due to a notification failure between the desks, which also did not have an exact match in AFC.

The flowgate is listed below:

| 16670 | Addis-Tiger 230 kV flo Big Cajun-Webre 500 kV |
Data Analysis Performed: November 2010

• 3 - TLR’s issued by ICT RC
  – 2 - AFC’s were zero’d out according to the process
  – 1 - AFC’s were not zero’d out

  This was due to a notification failure between the desks, which also did not have an exact match in AFC.

The flowgate is listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16712</th>
<th>Moril - Duboin 138kv ftlo Hopkins - Patoutville(cleco) 138kv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Data Analysis Performed: December 2010

• 12 - TLR’s issued by ICT RC
  – 4 - AFC’s were zero’d out according to the process
  – 8 - AFC’s were not zero’d out
    
    All 8 were because the IDC Flowgate did not have an exact match in AFC.
    
    The flowgates are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flowgate ID</th>
<th>Location Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16793</td>
<td>Richard-Scott 138kv ftlo Wells-Pont de Mouton 230kv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16805</td>
<td>Sorrento-French Settlement 230kv ftlo McKnit-Franklin 500kv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16806</td>
<td>West Memphis XMFR 500/161kv ftlo Ises 2 - Keo 500kv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16807</td>
<td>Dell - San Souci 500kv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16816</td>
<td>Lakeover500/115 for loss of RayBraswell-Lakeover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16818</td>
<td>Keo - Ises 500 PTDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16819</td>
<td>Parkin - Gilmore 161 (ftlo) Choctaw - Westpoint 500 kv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total TLR Duration vs. Suspended AFC Activity

Suspension of AFCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Hours in TLR</th>
<th>AFC FG Hours</th>
<th>AFCs Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2010</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2010</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Points of Interest/Issues as reported in June:

1. The current procedure has the TA set the duration to 6 hours and either runs out or is adjusted by the TA based on a request by the RC.

   Problem stated in June: There were three (3) instances where the RC did not notify the TA that the TLR event was over.

   Resolution: The procedure was adjusted and RC’s notified to make TA notification when TLR level becomes 1 or 0, instead of just TLR 0. Also to be sure to perform the notification step.

   Updates: The changes were made and the reporting improved.

   The data analysis supports remaining at a 6 hour duration intervals.
Points of Interest/Issues as reported in June:

2. The procedure requires the RC to notify the TA. Both RC and TA procedures require the notification to be logged.

   Problem stated in June: The RC is not making the notification to the TA in a timely fashion and is not consistently updating the log.

   Resolution: The procedure was adjusted to include specifics about the Log entry and RC’s notified to make timely notifications.

   Update: There were instances where the RC or the TA did not log the notification. The number decreased considerably from July (5 instances) to a single instance for each month after July.
Points of Interest/Issues as reported in June:

3. The procedure requires the TA to update the log file upon notification, including the actions taken.

   Problem stated in June: The TA may not be updating the separate SNFS log if the flowgate does not exist in the AFC flowgate list.

   Resolution: The TA will be requested to add entries regardless of AFC flowgate existence for consistency.

   Update: The TA log has been used to document notifications even when the flowgate is not in the AFC process, and to document the engineering notification for the changes needed.
Points of Interest/Issues as reported in June:

- IDC Flowgates not in the AFC process
  - Several of the reported flowgates that do not appear in the AFC process remain outside of the process during this reporting period.
  - Update: Temporary flowgates continue to be primarily outside of the AFC Suspension process. Only 2 permanent flowgates were not included in the Suspension of AFCs, the remainder were temporary flowgates.
Action Items from prior meeting:

1. Determine if next day study information can be used to determine congested flowgates in order to build them in the AFC in advance.
   – Moved to the AFC Task Force as an action item.

2. Work with Cameron at Entergy to determine any efficiencies to reduce the amount of time needed to Add a temporary/permanent flowgate to the AFC process.
   – Moved to the AFC Task Force as an action item.
Section 2:

Supplemental Curtailment Process during a TLR
Supplemental Curtailment Process during a TLR

The ICT process for the Entergy Business Practice began on April 26, 2010 and was modified on May 18, 2010.

Evaluation/Analysis data July through December 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010</th>
<th>TLRs Issued by ICT</th>
<th>Internal NF Tags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Supplemental Curtailment Process during a TLR

## Internal Non-Firm Curtailments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>FG ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/21/10</td>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Keo-West Memphis 500 kV for the loss of Independence-Dell 500 kV</td>
<td>Contacted EES SS (Cox) to request curtailment of tag # 10247 6NN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/10</td>
<td>10:33</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Sheridan - Mabelvale 500kV ftlo White Bluff - Keo 500kV</td>
<td>Contacted EES SS (Cox) to curtail internal non-firm tag # 7569.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/10</td>
<td>10:58</td>
<td>15867</td>
<td>Webre-Willow Glen 500kV ftlo Big Cajun-Fancy 500kV</td>
<td>Emailed and 3 way confirmation of following message to SOC, Beckham &quot;The ICT RC has issued a TLR Level 5A on Flowgate 15687 Webre-Willow Glen 500kV ftlo Big Cajun-Fancy 500kV. At this time Entergy is instructed to curtail the non-firm portion of Schedule EES_TNSKDLAUG380A_EES. These curtailments should remain in place until the TLR level is reduced below a TLR 3&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/10</td>
<td>20:55</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Sheridan - Mabelvale 500kV ftlo White Bluff - Keo 500kV</td>
<td>The ICT RC has issued a TLR Level 3A on Flowgate 1966 Sheridan - Mabelvale 500kV ftlo White Bluff - Keo 500kV. At this time Entergy is instructed to curtail the non-firm portion of Schedule EES_MLCI01SD10809_EES, This curtailment should remain in place until the TLR level is reduced below a TLR 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/10</td>
<td>11:05</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Sheridan - Mabelvale 500kV ftlo White Bluff - Keo 500kV</td>
<td>The ICT RC has issued a TLR Level 3A on Flowgate 1966 Sheridan - Mabelvale 500kV ftlo White Bluff - Keo 500kV. At this time Entergy is instructed to curtail the non-firm portion of Schedule 0046621 and AUG1093. These curtailments should remain in place until the TLR level is reduced below a TLR 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 08/12/10 | 17:20| 1966  | Sheridan - Mabelvale 500kV ftlo White Bluff - Keo 500kV                     | The ICT RC has issued a TLR Level 5A on Flowgate 1966 Sheridan - Mabelvale 500kV ftlo White Bluff - Keo 500kV. At this time Entergy is instructed to curtail the non-firm portion of Schedule AUG1245. These curtailments should remain in place until the TLR level is reduced below a TLR 3."
| 08/21/10 | 17:48| 1316  | Scott-Semere 138kV FTLO Wells-Pont Des Mouton 230kV                        | Called Patrick to curtail internal Non-firm Tag # AG1959C on DOWCHEM.                                                                                                                                 |
| 08/21/10 | 21:49| 1966  | Sheridan - Mabelvale 500kV ftlo White Bluff - Keo 500kV                     | Contacted EES(Patrick) and informed him that the curtailed internal non-firm tag AUG1903 may be reloaded at 2200. Patrick stated that EES will reload the tag and release White Bluff.                                                 |
## Supplemental Curtailment Process during a TLR

### Internal Non-Firm Curtailments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>FG Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/19/10</td>
<td>19:57</td>
<td>16272</td>
<td>Nelson AT1 500/230 (ftlo) Hartburg 500kv - Cypress</td>
<td>Called Corley EES SOC supervisor to request curtailment of TAG #0047497 of DowChem generation unit per internal non-firm procedure for HE 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/19/10</td>
<td>20:43</td>
<td>16272</td>
<td>Nelson AT1 500/230 (ftlo) Hartburg 500kv - Cypress</td>
<td>Called Corley EES SOC supervisor to request curtailment of TAG #0047497 of DowChem generation unit per internal non-firm procedure for HE 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/25/10</td>
<td>11:35</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>Mt. Olive - Hartburg for the loss of Webre - Wells</td>
<td>Issued TLR 5a PC 98% REF 306153. AFC zeroed until 15:00. NNL: EES 38, CLEC .5, LAGn 4.3. One internal non firm identified. Entergy is instructed to curtail the non-firm portion of Schedules 0496800. These curtailments should remain in place until the TLR level is reduced below a TLR 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/10</td>
<td>06:19</td>
<td>15867</td>
<td>Webre-Willow Glen 500kv ftlo Big Cajun-Fancy 500kv</td>
<td>Issued TLR4, PC 110%, Ref 355475, AFCs held till 12:00, &quot;As provided in the email to the Shift Supervisor, the ICT RC has issued a TLR Level 4 on Flowgate 15867 Webre-Willow Glen 500kv ftlo Big Cajun-Fancy 500kv. At this time Entergy is instructed to curtail the non-firm portion of Schedule 0048406. These curtailments should remain in place until the TLR level is reduced below a TLR 3.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supplemental Curtailment Process during a TLR
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>SPP</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Becky Turner</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
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<td>Roberto Paliza</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
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Meetings/Discussions

• 11/9/2010 – Initial Team Meeting
  – Selected the Chair – Patrick Caufield
  – Discussed and made changes to the LAP Process
  – Initial discussion of Task Force Focus Items
    • Non-Sale of Non-Firm
    • Curtailment of Internal Non-Firm
    • TLR 5 Event Reports
    • RC TLR Analysis Recommendations
Meetings/Discussions

• 12/7/2010
  – Scope of Responsibility Discussion
  – Documentation of Recommendations discussion
  – Additional Suggestions (Cost associated with Congestion Management Practices and LAP reporting)
  – Request by AFC Task Force for a joint meeting
Meetings/Discussions

• 12/16/2010 – Joint meeting with the AFC Task Force
  – Differences in Next Day Analysis and the AFC Model
  – Benchmarking using the RC process vs. AFC Process
  – Comparison of the RC Flowgates and AFC Flowgates in the AFC Model
Action Items - Project Updates

• LAP Process Change
  – Entergy is providing the ICT RC with the LAP Step now on Local Area Procedures in effect.
  – The ICT is posting the LAP Step information to OASIS

• Benchmarking AFCs and Real Time Data
  – Operations Engineering (AFC Support and ICT Next Day Planning Engineers) determining method to do benchmarking
  – New tool expected soon that will streamline the data collection
## Open Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>Don will keep this group updated with progress for off-peak modeling for the Next Day process.</td>
<td>On Going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>RC to visit with Entergy’s TO and GO to discuss the framework for a process/procedure for review by this group at a high level of Generator outage approval/notifications</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>Don to write out discussion points for the next meeting for item 4 in Pat’s email, including the information from the 3 AFC Task Force questions.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>Pat to ask for clarification from ERSC on the specifics related to cost.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2010</td>
<td>Create process (Benchmarking) for comparing the real time environment with the day ahead AFC model for use as a benchmark by ICT. This process is intended to be used for the month of January, with the frequency to be determined based on the level of difficulty in capturing and analyzing this information.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2010</td>
<td>Larry and Don to search for the MOD standards or Orders that define the TOP, BA, and Generator data requirements.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Closed Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>Work on the NERC TLR 5 Investigation Report to provide more detail in question 4 of the report where the cause of the TLR event can be stated. Then determine where we need to go next.</td>
<td>Complete, starting with December TLR 5 Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>Investigate the OASIS postings for LAPs to allow a level/step designation with Entergy.</td>
<td>Complete, started on Dec 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>Melinda to review the ICT procedure and provide comments to Don with a goal to start LAP posting process of Dec 15.</td>
<td>Complete, started on Dec 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>Entergy provided the link information for the LAP postings. Sent to the Exploder.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>Pat will start the document that covers the recommendations pointed out in the TLR 5 Analysis Report. Others should send information to Pat to include in the document. Don will provide approval right information and precedence or other standards that may be related.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>Jennifer sent a request the SECC to determine what Don needs to provide in the future meeting.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>Don to create a list of data points/steps that are used by the RC when we find a situation where planning may need to become involved.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Meetings/Discussions

• 11/8/2010 – Initial Team Meeting
  – Selected the Chair – Jennifer Vosburg
  – Reviewed responses to stakeholder submitted questions

• 11/19/2010
  – Finalized Task Force Guiding Document
  – Discussed FFR examples

• 1/13/11
  – Discussed competitive solicitation
  – Reviewed Draft Attachment T Guiding document
Action Items - Project Updates

• Issues deemed resolved or significant progress made:
  – Reporting of Negative AFC
  – Failure to Show TDF Values
  – Lack of complete cost estimates ("TBD")

• Issues actively under discussion:
  – FFR procedures (Attachment T Guidance Document)
  – Competitive solicitation (Multiple sources to single sinks)
  – Modeling of Base Plan and Construction Plan upgrades in the SIS and FS
# Open Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Develop FFR process document that. ICT will report on status and timeframe.</td>
<td>Draft document provided to SISTF on 12/30/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>ICT will need to request getting access to Entergy’s configuration management database.</td>
<td>Entergy working on providing access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Does competitive solicitation allow multiple sources to a single sink? What would be the procedure?</td>
<td>Stakeholders to draft procedure for solicitation and present to group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Email will need to be sent to SPC exploder when posting to Special Notices on major changes.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Clarify 3-year window in the “After-the-Fact” test response</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Clarify term “estimated nature” in reference to FFR</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Open Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Compare how BP, CP, and SU upgrades are used between the SIS and FS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Edit TDF to read OTDF in response and future reports</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Explanation of why MW would be used over MVA for FFR calculation.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Insert note of load growth provision in November follow-up responses</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Process for calculation SU for new facilities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Proposal for availability to study multiple sources for one sink</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Recommended draft Attachment T Guidance Document edits</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Research option to opt out of TSA with large cost discrepancy</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Summary of Order 717 and study opportunities for LSEs</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Closed Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>ICT and Entergy will get together to provide a response on the Daniel-McKnight phase shifter.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>ICT to determine a timeline for review and posting for a business practice for FFRs.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>ICT will examine the possibility of adding negative ATCs and OTDFs to SISR.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>ICT will prepare a draft guiding document for the task force.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>Roberto will send an email describing specific FFR examples they would like to have detailed. The ICT will provide a response on providing those examples.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>Roberto will send an e-mail describing what items are included in the models for the SIS. ICT will follow up with a response.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>After the Entergy/ICT December 2nd face-to-face meeting, a status update will be sent to the SISTF.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Develop process document defining “after-the-fact” test</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Closed Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Legal interpretation of Attachment D concerning inclusion of all of ICT Base Plan upgrades in model</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Roberto will send ICT another FFR example of loop flows and system changes. Roberto will work with ICT on the example. How is capacity fixed if loop flow grows?</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Where in the process is the determination made of what causes the BCCOs, and how is it conveyed to the customer?</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Email word version of draft Attachment T Guidance Document to SISTF participants</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>ICT will examine adding descriptions to the SISR that will note what supplemental upgrade costs are fixed, and which may vary.</td>
<td>Complete – SISRs after 12/1/10 comply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SIS Task Force issues:

• Reporting of Negative AFC in SIS Reports – The current SIS report shows a zero for any AFC value that is negative due to a Base Case Contingency Overload. At a minimum, Entergy/ICT need to show the actual AFC/ATC values.

• Failure to Show TDF Values – The SIS report would be more valuable to the Transmission Customer if the TDF values on impacted elements were given. I recognize could be issues of confidentiality, but a redacted version of the study could be posted on OASIS, and a non-redacted version could be made available to the Transmission Customer upon request.

• More Accurate Cost Estimates for Potential Solutions – Currently, there is a wide disparity between what is shown for SIS upgrade costs and FS upgrades costs, even if the list of overloaded elements is unchanged between the studies. Entergy should provide a “weak link” database to ICT for use in developing cost estimates. If the Entergy Facility Rating Methodology requires the listing of each transmission element then such list could be made available to determine the items that need to be upgraded in order to provide the necessary ampacity to alleviate the overload. For example, a transmission line with a conductor rating of 350 MVA may have a significantly lower rating due to the rating of wave traps, switches, fuses, etc on the circuit.

• Model Coordination with ICT – There have been documented instances whereby model data for a specific transaction has not been handled correctly due to not coordinating with the Transmission Customer on Network Customer assumptions for generating resources and dispatch. This needs to be part of the SIS process to avoid multiple studies.

• Cluster Study Process for Load – Currently, the ICT has the ability to study multiple requests from the same generator to different load points as a single cluster study. The OATT has provisions for studying requests as part of “a competitive solicitation.” A Transmission Customer participating in a competitive power supply solicitation should have the ability to have multiple requests from varying sources to the same sink studied as a cluster.

• Treatment of Third Party Impacts in SIS Process – Coordination between the Entergy/ICT TSR queue and the SPP TSR queue needs to take place to make sure that third-party transactions are properly identified, queued and treated.
SIS Task Force Issues – cont.

- The dispatch should be the same in both SIS and FS. Modification of the dispatch to account for transactions, loading, etc. needs to be coordinated so the results are the same in both cases.
- Network topology should be consistent in both studies.
- Unless there can be improvements to bring the SIS and FS results into a much more consistent pattern, we would be better off to drop the SIS step and go directly to FS with a shorter time window for results.
- How are prior required transmission upgrades for previous transmission service requests incorporated in an SIS? If this process was changed, when was it changed and why?
- In the SIS process, what is the internal process within the ICT and Entergy that tracks common transmission upgrades associated with different transmission service requests? How is this commonality conveyed to the market participants associated with these SIS?
- Due to load variations, transmission topology changes and generation dispatch variations, has the ICT and/or Entergy ever performed an updated study for any FIS previously studied?
SIS Task Force Issues – cont.

- Please reference SIS OASIS #74305336 as an example.
- What is the process and procedure that will be used to calculate the FFR capacity and financial compensation?
- Does the process and procedure take into account impact of BBCOs and loop flows on FFRs capacity and financial compensation?
- Where is this process and procedure documented?
- What is the time frame for providing the FFR information to requesting customer? Will this information be included in SIS? If not, please explain. Does the ICT and Entergy consider a SIS issued without the FFR amount or total cost to be a completed SIS? If so, what is your justification? What is the plan to be able to perform these costs as part of the SIS?
- Who will calculate the FFR?
- If the FFR is not calculated as part of the SIS, will the queue be frozen until the FFR is calculated?
- Please reference OASIS #s 74412181, 7426230_7426230[1], 74262367
- Was service confirmed for these requests (and others) for Cargill under a “higher of” pricing?
- How was that determination made if FFRs needed to be calculated?
- How can a requesting party timely confirm service without knowing the price impact of the FFR?
- Can a party withdraw its confirmation without penalty if the FFR cost makes the request uneconomical to the requesting party?
- How is that a SIS report that does not provide a total cost, FFRs, meet the tariff obligations?
- If service is granted using the higher-of methodology, how is it determined as to how much of the PTP revenues go to the funding customer and how much go to offset the network revenue requirement? Is there a minimum offset to the network revenue requirement considered in granting service? For example, if PTP service is going to bring in $1mm of revenues but the FFR would be 950k, is there only going to be 50k allocated to the network revenues requirement even though the vast majority of the atc being used by this transaction is being supported by the general rate base?
- Describe the impact of Base Case Overloads, loop flows or changes in network resource dispatch on the FFR calculation. For example, if a funded supplemental upgrades originally creates 100 MW of AFC, of which 30 is needed for the funding customer, and 50 mw of the remaining 70 mw of AFC is taken up by the next resync of the model due to load and dispatch changes, how is the cost of the FFR allocated to the next customer who request service under this flowgate?
SIS Task Force Issues – cont.

- How are FFR’s allocated among different customers with different lengths of transmission service request? For example, if Customer A needs 100 MW from 2015 through 2045 on a given flowgate, and Customer B needs 100 mw on the same flowgate from 2015 to 2016, how would their FFRs be calculated.

- In example above, assuming Customer B pays same as customer A, then how would Entergy/ICT allocate FFR beyond 2016 once Customer Bs transmission is over but there may/may not still be FFR rights.

- If a customer gets an FFR because of upgrades needed for his TSR, and later redirects or annuls the TSR such that ATC is created due to his upgrades, is the customer compensated for releasing his upgrade capacity? How?

- All ICT Base Plan upgrades should be included in the SIS models used to evaluate long-term TSRs. The ICT does not include the upgrades in the models rather it uses an "after-the-fact check" to determine whether a Base Plan upgrade mitigates an overload or not. This is an inaccurate method to evaluate the benefits of Base Plan upgrades.

  - The report should also list upgrades included in the models. This could be done using the ICT Base Plan as a reference so only additions/deletions need to be identified.

- Some network resources are not properly dispatched in SIS studies. The ICT uses a default dispatch for network resources. But a network customer can provide a specific dispatch order or methodology for its network resources. If the network customer provides this information, the ICT should use this dispatch in all SIS studies. This issue needs a thorough discussion which should lead to the development of guidelines for submitting dispatch data, type of resources to be dispatched (owned vs. contracted), frequency of dispatch changes, and events triggering changes in network customer's dispatch.

- Evaluation of network resources re派遣 of a network customer in SIS studies. Typically, the ICT does not include an evaluation of network resources re-dispatch to mitigate overloads identified in SIS studies. But this evaluation is performed if requested by the network customer after the initial study is completed. Network customers should be given an option up front to request the use of re-dispatch and/or delisting of their network resources as mitigation in SIS studies.
SIS Task Force Issues – cont.

• Lack of complete cost estimates ("tbd") for upgrades and financial compensation for FFRs in the SIS reports. An SIS study is not useful if it does not include a complete estimate of the total cost of upgrades and financial compensation for FFRs. Unfortunately, this is the case with most of the SIS studies conducted by the ICT.

• Lack of detail in the presentation of SIS results. SIS reports only present the ATC for each limiting equipment identified in the study. When an ATC is negative, the ATC value is set to zero masking the real value which could be significantly negative, i.e. Base Case Overload. To improve the usefulness and transparency of SIS reports, the following should be presented for each limiting equipment identified in the report:
  – ✔ Actual ATC value
  – Pre-transfer flow
  – Post-transfer flow
  – Rating of limiting element
  – ✔ OTDF (Outage Transfer Distribution Factor) value

• Improve planning re-dispatch methodology and presentation. Discuss and clarify this issue. It is not clear whether this is a real option for customers in Entergy.
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Section 1

Assessment and Findings
Assessment

- Performed on 11/17/2010 for the period 08/10 through 10/10
- Examined AFC and WPP data retention:
  - Sampled evidence of the full and incremental backup processes
  - Sampled evidence of the test restoration process
  - Sampled AFC data storage on EMS and online file server
  - Verified evidence of tape storage maintenance
  - Discussed AFC/HDR data and end of life issues
  - Reviewed FERC Filings
Findings

- Backup and Restoration Processes
  - Issues from previous assessment:
    - The B&R process are still being revised to include the additional steps that are required to shorten B&R run times.
    - ICT will continue to follow up to ensure the process documentation is updated with the additional steps.
    - Weekly Full backup did not run on July 17, 2010. ICT confirmed that the daily differential data backups ran successfully until the next weekly full backup ran on July 29. Entergy staff failed to document the backup issue as required by the documentation. Entergy is researching the cause and will report back to the ICT.
  - Issue Updates/New Issues:
    - Revised backup process documentation has not yet be completed.
Findings

• AFC and WPP Data Archive:
  – Issues from previous assessment:
    • Entergy remains current will data backup processes.
  – Issues Update:
    • No current data archive issues.
Section 2

FERC Filings
FERC Filings

Summary of Docket No. ER05-1065-000 Filings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Issues Filed</th>
<th>AFC Related</th>
<th>ICT</th>
<th>Entergy</th>
<th>Customer</th>
<th>OATI Software Issue</th>
<th>AREVA Software Issue</th>
<th>Human Error</th>
<th>Issues Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/10 - 10/10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10 - 07/10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/10 - 04/10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/09 - 01/10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09 - 10/09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09 - 07/09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09 - 04/09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Work is ongoing to verify the data to produce this same chart dating back to 11/06.
FERC Filings

- August 13, 2010: EMS Network Model
  - On July 30, 2010, the ICT contacted Entergy and requested review of certain line outages.
  - Entergy identified twelve breakers that were incorrectly modeled as Normaly Open in the network model used in the Operating andPlanning Horizons, which resulted in RFCALC incorrectly modeling them as outages.
  - May have impacted the base flow and response factors; however, the impact, if any, would be minimal because only four of these resulted in a loss of a total of 25 MW.
  - The others resulted in topology changes but no loss of load.
  - Entergy is programmatically reviewing normally open breakers to determine if they are being correctly modeled.
  - The review is extensive and may result in identifying additional breakers that are modeled incorrectly.
  - The results and status of the review will be provided to the ICT and the Users Group.
  - Upon completion of the effort, a baseline will be established and an annual review performed consistent with the process used in the Study Horizon. Entergy will submit additional information to the Commission regarding this error upon completion of the review and implementation of corrective actions.
Questions?
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### WPP Weekly Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th># Offers Submitted</th>
<th>Total MWs Offered</th>
<th># of Offers Accepted</th>
<th>Total MWs Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WPP Task Force

• The first WPPTF meeting was held via teleconference on December 14, 2010.

• A chair and vice chair for the WPPTF have not yet been elected.

• The next WPPTF meeting is scheduled for February 1, 2011.

• Issues currently being addressed in the WPPTF;
  – WPP Offer Period Extension Proposal
  – WPP Transparency Proposal
WPP Offer Period Extension Proposal

- Entergy endorsed the WPP Offer Period Extension Proposal.
- Entergy will make a tariff filing with FERC to amend section 3.3.1.4 of Attachment V to facilitate implementation of the proposal.
- The WPP Offer Period Extension Proposal should be implemented approximately 60 days after this filing is made.
WPP Transparency Proposal

• At the November 2010 ERSC WG meeting, the ICT discussed its proposal to increase the transparency of the WPP.

• Under this proposal, the ICT suggested the following WPP information be provided to Third Party Suppliers;
  – List of congested flowgates in the final iteration of Run 1.
  – Weekly posting of the operating reserves requirement.
  – Indication (Y/N) of products (i.e., energy, reserves, agc) provided by the generator. (*provided only to individual suppliers*)
  – Indication (Y/N) whether the generator was selected as part of the PNC flexibility requirement. (*provided only to individual suppliers*)
WPP Transparency Proposal

• Entergy did not support the ICT WPP Transparency Proposal but stated that it will disclose additional WPP information if its retail regulators believe such information should be disclosed.

• Entergy believes that disclosure of the information proposed by the ICT may be a risk to network customer savings.
Transparency Proposal

- Entergy ranked the information from least risk to most risk to network customer savings as follows;

1. Indication (Y/N) whether the generator was selected as part of a PNC’s flexibility requirement.

2. Indication (Y/N) what products (energy, reserves, AGC) were provided by the generator.

3. Posting weekly operating reserves requirement.

4. List of congested flowgates in Run 1.

- The WPPTF will evaluate this proposal further and consider other options to expand the transparency of the WPP.
Questions ?
Agenda Item 1- Introductions and Roll Call
Antoine Lucas, SPP, called the meeting to order at approximately 9:02 a.m. There were sixteen (16) people in attendance.

Agenda Item 2- Review and approve WPP transparency recommendation
Antoine Lucas opened the floor for discussion of the WPP transparency recommendation to address any questions or concerns with the recommendation prior to holding a vote. Stakeholder questioned whether the WPP transparency recommendation would accrue additional costs. Mr. Lucas stated that no additional costs would be accrued to implement the WPP transparency recommendation. Jennifer Vosburg, NRG Energy, questioned if a quorum was required to hold a vote on the recommendation. Bruce Rew, SPP, confirmed a quorum is not required and that a vote from those present on the teleconference was sufficient. Ms. Vosburg, moved to accept the WPP transparency recommendation with John Chiles, GDS Associates, seconding the motion. A unanimous vote in favor of the WPP transparency recommendation followed. Mr. Lucas suggested Entergy provide a formal position on the WPP transparency recommendation within two weeks. Mr. Lucas stated further the ICT would have two weeks from the date of receipt of Entergy’s position to formally state its position on the recommendation.

Agenda Item 3- Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:14 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce Rew
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Wright &amp; Talisman</td>
<td>Shaffer</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>attorney</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shaffer@wrightlaw.com">shaffer@wrightlaw.com</a></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Antoine</td>
<td>Manager, Inter-Regional Planning &amp; Procurement</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alucas@spp.org">alucas@spp.org</a></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Paliza Consulting, LLC.</td>
<td>Paliza</td>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:roberto@palizaconsulting.com">roberto@palizaconsulting.com</a></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Conway Corporation</td>
<td>Heintzen</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Director, Power Supply &amp; Major Accts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 KGen Power</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tlee@kgenpower.com">tlee@kgenpower.com</a></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Rew</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Vice President, Engineering</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brew@spp.org">brew@spp.org</a></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 American Electric Power</td>
<td>Gallup</td>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>Manager, Southwest Transmission Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ExxonMobil</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Energy Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:David.A.Cheshire@exxonmobil.com">David.A.Cheshire@exxonmobil.com</a></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Arkansas Public Service Commission</td>
<td>Loudenslager</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sam_loudenslager@psc.state.ar.us">sam_loudenslager@psc.state.ar.us</a></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Entergy Services</td>
<td>Ralston</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:aralsto@entergy.com">aralsto@entergy.com</a></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Murphy</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Counsel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emurph1@entergy.com">emurph1@entergy.com</a></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 NRG Louisiana Generating, LLC</td>
<td>Vosburg</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Dir. Reg. and Govt. Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jennifer.vosburg@nrgenergy.com">jennifer.vosburg@nrgenergy.com</a></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Harris</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Director Power</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brenda_harris@oxy.com">brenda_harris@oxy.com</a></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Bernstein</td>
<td>Glen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:gbernstein@sidley.com">gbernstein@sidley.com</a></td>
<td>Net Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Jones Ryan</td>
<td>Engineer II</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rjones@spp.org">rjones@spp.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>GDS Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>Chiles John</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.chiles@gdsassociates.com">john.chiles@gdsassociates.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Southwest Power Pool</td>
<td>Joe Byers</td>
<td>Engineer II</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbyers@spp.org">jbyers@spp.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2010 ICT Annual Stakeholder Survey

March 17, 2011
ICT Stakeholder Survey

- Questions were adapted from previous surveys to reflect operational changes
- Question review and survey administration via third-party research firm
- Survey administration completely online, with multiple communications:
  - Launched 12/16/2010
  - Began with 138 email addresses
  - 5 email announcements/reminders
- Closed 1/26/2011 with 17 completed surveys
Areas of Concentration

• Overall Performance
  – Non Discriminatory Treatment of Customers
  – Transparency

• Business Process Performance
  – Reliability
    ▪ Congestion Management, Short-term Planning, Communication
  – Transmission Planning and Studies
    ▪ TSR Planning, Generation Interconnect, Base Plan, Model Building
  – Weekly Procurement Process
Areas of Concentration

• ICT Department Staff Customer Satisfaction
  – Responsive to Stakeholder Needs
  – Provide Accurate Information
  – Resolve Issues
  – Improve Customer Service

• Stakeholder Processes
  – Working Group and Task Force Effectiveness
  – Service and Support of Meetings

• Stakeholder Policy Committee Revisions
Measurement Criteria

• Range of Answers on a 5 Point scale
  – Poor to Excellent
  – Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree
  – Not at all Effective to Very Effective

• Customer Service Improvement on a 4 Point Scale
  – Not at all Improved to Much Improved
2010 ICT Stakeholder Survey Summary
Survey Results Comparison

• Average scores in most areas showed steady improvement from 2009
  – Transparency up 15% (3.59 in 2010, 3.12 in 2009)
  – Reliability Communication up 14% (3.35 from 2.93)

• Customer Service improved across all departments
  – Reliability Coordination Customer Service Improvement up 26% (2.77 in 2010, 2.19 in 2009)
Survey Results Comparison

- Scores declined in some areas involving processes
  - Generation Interconnect down 12% (3.33 in 2010, 3.78 in 2009)
  - Model Building down 13% (2.94 from 3.38)

- Working Group Effectiveness scores declined with the exception of WPP and User’s Group
  - LTIIWG down 6% (2.94 from 3.13)
  - NTIIWG down 8% (3.00 from 3.27)
Survey Results Comparison

• Overall survey showed almost same scores as 2009
  – 2010 overall score 84.73, 2009 overall score 83.73
• Higher satisfaction with ICT staff activity and customer service
• Improvement needed with processes and resolution of issues
• Comments support trend of survey
  – Excellent remarks for SPP staff members
  – Flawed processes need to be improved
2010 ICT Stakeholder Survey Results
Overall Performance

Please rate the ICT’s performance in transparency in the transmission business process.

- Poor: 1 (6%)
- 2: 2 (12%)
- Neutral: 2 (12%)
- 4: 10 (59%)
- Excellent: 2 (12%)

Please rate the ICT’s performance in treating customers in a non-discriminatory manner.

- Poor: 1 (6%)
- 2: 8 (47%)
- Neutral: 6 (35%)
- 4: 2 (12%)
- Excellent: 2 (12%)
Business Process Performance

Please rate the ICT's provision of the Reliability service of Congestion Management.

Please rate the ICT's provision of the Reliability service of Short-term Planning.
Business Process Performance

Please rate the ICT’s provision of the Reliability service of Communication.

- Poor: 3 (18%)
- 2
- Neutral: 6 (35%)
- 4
- Excellent: 7 (41%)
- 1 (8%)

What is your level of satisfaction with the ICT’s Weekly Procurement Process (WPP) implementation and operation?

- Not at all satisfied: 2 (12%)
- Neutral: 4 (24%)
- Very satisfied: 1 (6%)
- 2
- 4
Business Process Performance

Please rate the ICT's provision of the Transmission Planning & Studies service of Transmission Service Request (TSR) Planning.

Please rate the ICT's provision of the Transmission Planning & Studies service of Generation Interconnection Process.
Business Process Performance

Please rate the ICT's provision of the Transmission Planning & Studies service of Base Plan Process.

1. 7 (41%)
2. 9 (53%)
3. 1 (6%)

Please rate the ICT's provision of the Transmission Planning & Studies service of the Model Building Process.

1. 5 (31%)
2. 8 (50%)
3. 2 (12%)
4. 1 (6%)
ICT Staff Performance-Responsiveness

Rate the ICT Tariff Administration staff in being responsive to my needs.

- 3 (19%) Poor
- 5 (31%) Neutral
- 6 (38%) Excellent
- 2 (12%) Excellent

Rate the ICT Reliability Coordination staff in being responsive to my needs.

- 11 (85%) Neutral
- 3 (18%) Poor
- 3 (18%) Neutral
ICT Staff Performance-Responsiveness

Rate the ICT WPP staff in being responsive to my needs.

- Poor: 1 (6%)
- 2: 1 (6%)
- Neutral: 7 (44%)
- 4: 5 (31%)
- Excellent: 2 (12%)

Rate the ICT Transmission Planning & Studies staff in being responsive to my needs.

- Poor: 7 (50%)
- 2: 5 (38%)
- Neutral: 2 (14%)
- 4: 2 (14%)
- Excellent: 5 (38%)
ICT Staff Performance - Accurate Information

Rate the ICT Tariff Administration staff in providing accurate information.

- Poor: 1 (7%)
- 2: 1 (7%)
- Neutral: 7 (47%)
- 4: 6 (40%)
- Excellent: 1 (7%)

Rate the ICT Reliability Coordination staff in providing accurate information.

- Poor: 1 (6%)
- 2: 5 (29%)
- Neutral: 11 (85%)
- 4: 1 (6%)
- Excellent: 1 (6%)
ICT Staff Performance - Resolving Issues

Rate the ICT Tariff Administration staff in resolving issues to my satisfaction.

- Poor: 3 (20%)
- Neutral: 7 (47%)
- Good: 3 (20%)
- Excellent: 1 (7%)

Rate the ICT Reliability Coordination staff in resolving issues to my satisfaction.

- Poor: 2 (12%)
- Neutral: 10 (62%)
- Good: 3 (19%)
- Excellent: 1 (6%)
ICT Staff Performance - Resolving Issues

Rate the ICT WPP staff in resolving issues to my satisfaction.

- Poor: 2 (12%)
- Neutral: 11 (65%)
- Excellent: 2 (12%)

Rate the ICT Transmission Planning & Studies staff in resolving issues to my satisfaction.

- Poor: 1 (7%)
- Neutral: 10 (67%)
- Excellent: 3 (20%)
ICT Staff Performance - Customer Service

Have the ICT Tariff Administration staff members improved their customer service during the past year?

- Not at all improved: 1 (7%)
- Somewhat improved: 7 (47%)
- Improved: 5 (33%)
- Much improved: 2 (13%)

Have the ICT Reliability Coordination staff members improved their customer service during the past year?

- Not at all improved: 1 (8%)
- Somewhat improved: 5 (38%)
- Improved: 3 (23%)
- Much improved: 4 (31%)
ICT Staff Performance - Customer Service

Have the ICT WPP staff members improved their customer service during the past year?

- Not at all improved: 2 (12%)
- Somewhat improved: 6 (38%)
- Improved: 7 (44%)
- Much improved: 1 (8%)

Have the ICT Transmission Planning & Studies staff members improved their customer service during the past year?

- Not at all improved: 1 (7%)
- Somewhat improved: 6 (43%)
- Improved: 6 (43%)
- Much improved: 1 (7%)
ICT Working Groups- Effectiveness

Please rate the overall effectiveness of the ICT stakeholder group: Long-term Transmission Issues Working Group.

- Not at all effective: 2 (12%)
- Neutral: 4 (25%)
- Very effective: 7 (44%)

Please rate the overall effectiveness of the ICT stakeholder group: Near-term Transmission Issues Working Group.

- Not at all effective: 2 (12%)
- Neutral: 6 (38%)
- Very effective: 6 (38%)
ICT Working Groups - Effectiveness


Please rate the overall effectiveness of the ICT stakeholder group: Users' Group.
ICT SPC Task Forces- Effectiveness

Please rate the overall effectiveness of the ICT stakeholder group: Operating Efficiency Task Force

- Not at all effective: 1 (7%)
- 2 (13%)
- Neutral: 10 (67%)
- 4 (13%)
- Very effective: 2 (13%)

Please rate the overall effectiveness of the ICT stakeholder group (formed after the Stakeholder Policy Committee restructure): ACF Task Force.

- Not at all effective: 3 (21%)
- 2 (13%)
- Neutral: 7 (50%)
- 4 (29%)
- Very effective: 4 (29%)
ICT SPC Task Forces- Effectiveness

Please rate the overall effectiveness of the ICT stakeholder group (formed after the Stakeholder Policy Committee restructure): Reliability Task Force.

Please rate the overall effectiveness of the ICT stakeholder group (formed after the Stakeholder Policy Committee restructure): SIS Task Force.
ICT SPC Task Forces - Effectiveness

Please rate the overall effectiveness of the ICT stakeholder group (formed after the Stakeholder Policy Committee restructure): Reliability Task Force.

- Not at all effective: 1 (7%)
- Neutral: 8 (57%)
- Very effective: 4 (28%)

Please rate the overall effectiveness of the ICT stakeholder group (formed after the Stakeholder Policy Committee restructure): SIS Task Force.

- Not at all effective: 1 (8%)
- Neutral: 2 (15%)
- Very effective: 4 (31%)
Stakeholder Policy Committee – Effectiveness

Please rate the overall effectiveness of the ICT stakeholder group:
Stakeholder Policy Committee.

- 2 (12%) Not at all effective
- 3 (19%) Neutral
- 6 (38%)
- 5 (31%) Very effective

SPP
Stakeholder Policy Committee - Overall

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement, regarding revisions in the Stakeholder Policy Committee: "Structure changes are communicated clearly."

- 7 (47%) Neutral
- 6 (40%) Agree
- 2 (13%) Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Stakeholder Policy Committee- Overall

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement, regarding revisions in the Stakeholder Policy Committee: "Stakeholder concerns have been addressed."

- Strongly disagree: 2 (13%)
- Disagree: 4 (27%)
- Neutral: 5 (33%)
- Agree: 4 (27%)
- Strongly agree: 0

Total responses: 13
Stakeholder Policy Committee- Overall

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement, regarding revisions in the Stakeholder Policy Committee: "Task force structure and participation are appropriate."

- **Neutral**: 9 (60%)
- **Agree**: 4 (27%)
- **Disagree**: 2 (13%)
- **Strongly disagree**: None
ICT Meeting Support

Please rate the SPP ICT’s service and support of committees, working groups, and task forces for ensuring meeting schedules and logistics are communicated in a timely, clear manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate the SPP ICT’s service and support of committees, working groups, and task forces for ensuring meeting facilities are planned appropriately and meet the needs of the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICT Meeting Support

Please rate the SPP ICT's service and support of committees, working groups, and task forces for ensuring meeting materials are well prepared and distributed in a timely manner.

- Poor: 2 (13%)
- Neutral: 6 (40%)
- Excellent: 7 (47%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Total respondents</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 Treatment of customers in a non-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.529411765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discriminatory manner</td>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency in the transmission business</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.588235294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process</td>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELIABILITY SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.176470588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.352941176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSMISSION PLANNING AND STUDIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSR Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Interconnection Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.333333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Plan Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.647058824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Building Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.9375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEKLY PROCUREMENT PROCESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.647058824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TARIFF ADMINISTRATION CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT Tariff Administration staff members are responsive to my needs</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Total respondents</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.4375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Tariff Administration staff members provide accurate information</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>Average Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Tariff Administration staff members resolve issues to my satisfaction</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>Average Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.866666667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Have ICT Tariff Administration staff members improved their customer service over the past year? | Number of Responses | Not Improved | Somewhat Improved | Improved | Much Improved | N/A | Total respondents | Average Score |
| Gross Score | 1 | 7 | 5 | 2 | | | 15 | 2.533333333 |
| | 1 | 14 | 15 | 8 | | | 38 |  |

### RELIABILITY COORDINATION CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

| ICT Reliability Coordination staff members are responsive to my needs | Number of Responses | Poor | 2 | 3 | 4 | Excellent | N/A | Total respondents | Average Score |
| Gross Score | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 3 | | 17 | 3.529411765 |
| | 0 | 0 | 33 | 12 | 15 | | 60 |  |
| ICT Reliability Coordination staff members provide accurate information | Number of Responses | Poor | 2 | 3 | 4 | Excellent | N/A | Total respondents | Average Score |
| Gross Score | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 3.411764706 |
| | 0 | 0 | 33 | 20 | 5 | | 58 |  |
| ICT Reliability Coordination staff members resolve issues to my satisfaction | Number of Responses | Poor | 2 | 3 | 4 | Excellent | N/A | Total respondents | Average Score |
| Gross Score | 0 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 1 | | 16 | 3.1875 |
| | 0 | 4 | 30 | 12 | 5 | | 51 |  |

| Have ICT Reliability Coordination staff members improved their customer service over the past year? | Number of Responses | Not Improved | Somewhat Improved | Improved | Much Improved | N/A | Total respondents | Average Score |
| Gross Score | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | | | 13 | 2.769230769 |
| | 1 | 10 | 9 | 16 | | | 36 |  |

### WPP CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

| ICT WPP staff members are responsive to my needs | Number of Responses | Poor | 2 | 3 | 4 | Excellent | N/A | Total respondents | Average Score |
| Gross Score | 1 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 2 | | 16 | 3.375 |
| | 1 | 2 | 21 | 20 | 10 | | 54 |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Total respondents</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Somewhat Improved</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>Much Improved</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICT WPP staff members provide accurate information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICT WPP staff members resolve issues to my satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have ICT WPP staff members improved their customer service over the past year?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSMISSION PLANNING AN STUDIES CUSTOMER SATISFACTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICT Transmission Planning and Studies staff members are responsive to my needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICT Transmission Planning and Studies staff members provide accurate information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICT Transmission Planning and Studies staff members resolve issues to my satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have ICT Transmission Planning and Studies staff members improved their customer service over the past year?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAKEHOLDER PROCESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Policy Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Term Transmission Issues Working Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Near Term Transmission Issues Working Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Gross Score</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Procurement Process Issues Working Group</td>
<td>1 2 10 2 0 N/A</td>
<td>1 4 30 8 0 8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.866666667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User's Group</td>
<td>1 1 10 3 0 N/A</td>
<td>1 2 30 12 0 8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Efficiency Task Force</td>
<td>1 2 10 2 0 N/A</td>
<td>1 4 30 8 0 8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.866666667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFC Task Force</td>
<td>3 0 21 16 0 N/A</td>
<td>3 0 21 16 0 8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.857142857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability Task Force</td>
<td>1 0 8 4 1 N/A</td>
<td>1 0 24 16 5 0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.285714286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS Task Force</td>
<td>1 2 6 4 0 N/A</td>
<td>1 4 18 16 0 8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting schedules and logistics are</td>
<td>0 2 5 8 0 N/A</td>
<td>0 4 15 32 0 8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting facilities are planned</td>
<td>0 4 4 6 0 N/A</td>
<td>0 8 12 24 0 8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.142857143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting materials are well-prepared and</td>
<td>0 2 6 7 0 N/A</td>
<td>0 4 18 28 0 8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.333333333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 1

Assessment and Preliminary Findings
Assessment

• Attempted on 02/22/2011 for the period 11/10 through 01/11
• Assess data retention processes to provide reasonable assurance that the processes will prevent data loss.
• Assessment Methodology:
  • Sample evidence of the full and incremental backup processes
  • Sample evidence of the test restoration process
  • Sample AFC data storage on EMS and online file server
  • Verify evidence of tape storage maintenance
  • Discuss AFC/HDR data and end of life issues
  • Review FERC Filings
Preliminary Findings

• **Backup and Restoration Processes**
  
  – **Issues from previous assessments:**
    • The B&R process are still being revised to include the additional steps that are required to shorten B&R run times.
    • Revised backup process documentation has not yet be completed.
  
  – **Issue Updates/New Issues:**
    • On 2/22, Entergy could not produce all of the required data to perform the assessment.
    • A working session with the SPP Internal Audit staff and Entergy’s IT staff was scheduled and held on 3/1 to help Entergy’s IT staff better understand the audit scope and testing procedures.
    • Another assessment was scheduled and held on 3/7/2011 at which time Entergy was able to provide some assessment data and provided a chart detailing the gaps in performance of the regular AFC and WPP data retention processes.
Preliminary Findings

- EMS full backup and restoration processes could not be determined to be successful for 3 of the 6 sampled dates due to lack of sufficient supporting evidence.
- EMS incremental backup and restoration processes could not be determined to be successful for 3 of the 6 sampled dates due to lack of sufficient supporting evidence.
- Entergy is working to provide evidence to validate that tapes created for full and incremental backups were sent offsite in a timely manner.
- Entergy was unable to provide information on tapes that were removed from the rotation due to errors during the period at the time of the assessment. Entergy is working to provide this information to SPP Internal Audit.
- AFC and WPP Data Archive Backup and Deletion processes were determined to be successful with minor process improvement recommendations.
Preliminary Findings

• Online data storage process was determined to be successful for current + 3 months AFC data storage on TSEMS systems.
• Online data storage process was determined to be behind schedule for the current + 12 months AFC data storage on TSDSEMS systems. Entergy is currently working to store December.
• Online data storage process was determined to be successful for WPP data from 11/1/2010 to 1/31/2011.
• Entergy does not have documented procedures that are current and up to date.
• Entergy has not addressed the issue of AFC data reaching end of life (5 year retention) but collocated on backup archive tapes with Historical Data Retention (HDR) data that has 25 year retention. Issue ongoing since November, 2008.
• A number of process issues/inefficiencies exist in Entergy’s current regular AFC and WPP AFC data retention processes.
• Recommendations will be made in the formal report to address these issues and Entergy will have the opportunity to respond and communicate and remediation plans that have been developed.
Section 2

FERC Filings
FERC Filings

Summary of Docket No. ER05-1065-000 Filings:

- Work is ongoing to verify the data to produce this same chart dating back to 11/06.
FERC Filings

• November 18, 2010: Transmission Outage Data
  – On 11/4/10 Entergy, during routine temporary flowgate testing, identified that an outage on certain 500/161kV auto-transformers was not modeled in Op. and Pl. Horizons
  – Entergy determined the outage was not included in the list of outages provided by Transmission Automated Outage Request System (TAORS). The outage was found to be on a Limiting Element of a flowgate definition. Entergy has identified additional auto-transformer outages not in EMS and is continuing to review and correct once errors are identified. The date on which the error was introduced has not yet been determined.
  – The error occurred because the field for ‘EMS Equipment ID’ in Substation Work Management System (SWMS) database was left blank. EMS does not recognize the information from TAORs as an outage without the EMS Equipment ID information in SWMS. Therefore, the information was not included in TAORS and, as a result, the outages were not included as outages in EMS for modeling in the AFC process.
  – Subsequently, Entergy initiated a process to review the SWMS database to identify all auto transformers with a blank EMS Equipment ID field.
  – Entergy continues to review all auto-transformer entries in SWMS to identify and correct any blank EMS Equipment ID.
  – Not modeling these outages may have resulted in an increase in AFC values; however, it is not technically feasible to determine the exact impact on AFCs. Transmission Service Requests (TSRs) processed during the time the error existed could have resulted in granting more service than was actually available.
  – Individual customers affected during this time frame could not be determined but could have potentially affected customers requesting service in the Operating and Planning Horizons. Entergy manually made the necessary corrections to include the outages in the EMS once identified.
FERC Filings

• November 18, 2010: Net Schedule File
  – On 11/5/2010, Entergy discovered that the Net Schedule File had hours shifted for the days November 7, 2010 until November 8, 2010.
  – The Net Schedule File is only used in the AFC process during the Operating Horizon. The Net Schedule File contains 72 hours of data and is used as an input to RFCALC for the AFC process. The incorrect schedule data was for November 7, 2010 and was to be included in the model starting at noon on November 6, 2010. An immediate change was made to the software on November 5, 2010; therefore, it did not impact the AFC calculations during 2010 Fall DST.
  – The potential error was caused because of the incorrect software logic for handling schedules during Fall DST.
  – The error was introduced on October 31, 2008 when the Net Schedule File logic was modified. The error potentially impacted the non-firm AFC calculations in the Operating Horizon on November 2, 2008 for the 02:00 hour until November 3, 2008 00:00 hour. In 2009, the software logic that created the Net Schedule File also had an additional issue causing it to incorrectly use November 8 as the Fall DST date. Thus, in 2009 the additional issue could have affected the non-firm AFC calculations in Operating Horizon for November 8, 2009 02:00 until November 9, 2009 00:00. The non-firm AFCs in the Operating Horizon for November 1, 2009 to November 2, 2009 00:00 may have been impacted as well because of the incorrect DST date.
December 3, 2010: Rating of Proxy Flowgates

- On 11/14/2010, during the implementation of the West Memphis name change to WMU in models, Entergy discovered that the rating of the proxy flowgate representing the maximum import limit for the West Memphis sink (TIECAP for West Memphis) for the Study Horizon was different than the Operating and Planning Horizons.

- The error in the Operating and Planning Horizons existed since July 27, 2006 and was corrected on December 2, 2010. This error was caused by a manual input error. The error resulted in an increase in AFCs and the potential for oversell of service; however, the incorrect value was only a difference of 3 MVA.

- Individual customers potentially affected during this time frame could not be specially determined. This error had no impact on AFCs as the total reservation for the West Memphis sink did not exceed the limit during this timeframe for the Operating Horizon. Evaluation of the impact to the Planning Horizon has not been completed; however, it is expected to be minimal, if any, for customers requesting service sinking into the West Memphis sink.

- Entergy implemented new criteria in determining the ratings of proxy flowgates (TIECAP flowgates) used to represent control area interface limit for embedded control areas within the system.

- New TIECAP ratings were established for CNWY, WMU, BUBA, NLR, DERS and OMLP. On November 30, 2010, during the process to update the Operating and Planning Horizons models with the new values, a value for WMU of 235MVA was incorrectly entered instead of 245MVA. This error existed from November 30, 2010 at 2:30 PM until corrected on December 1, 2010 at 8:30 AM. This error had no impact on AFCs as the total reservations for West Memphis sink during this time period did not exceed 235 MVA during this timeframe. Thus, even though the rating of TIECAP Flowgate was low by 10 MW but it did not cause denial to any TSR.
FERC Filings

- December 15, 2010: Study Horizon Model
  - 11/30/2010, in preparation for implementing new definitions for Conway (CWAY) and West Memphis (WMU), the override function in webTrans was used to change transmission service requests (TSRs) beginning January 1, 2011, to reflect the new definitions.
  - On 12/1/2010, Entergy discovered that the Study Horizon model uploaded with the new proxy flowgate definitions at approximately 7:39 PM 11/30/2010, reflected incorrect baseflow values for CWAY and WMU. The incorrect values resulted from the changes to TSRs being made after the data for the model was extracted from webTrans but before the development of the Study Horizon model was completed.
  - Entergy corrected the model to include the actual baseflow values and uploaded it on December 2, 2010. This potentially could have affected new reservations received from November 30, 2010 until December 2, 2010 that involved CWAY and WMU.
  - The review of the service requests processed during this time showed that two reservations for service for NRG from Big Cajun 2 to WMU were confirmed when they should have been denied.
**FERC Filings**

- **December 21, 2010: Operating and Planning Horizon AFC Values**
  - On 12/8/2010 at 2:00 PM, the ICT notified Entergy that the AFC values for 12/9/2010 were duplicated. Upon further investigation, it appeared that both the Planning and Operating Horizons were active simultaneously which resulted in the next day reservations included in both horizons from 12:11PM until 2:38 PM.
  - Entergy performed an initialization of the Planning Horizon in webTrans that eliminated the duplicate values and corrected the AFCs. This error appears to have been a result of a manual resync of the Planning Horizon that did not complete prior to noon, which is the time the initializations were scheduled to begin for both the operating and planning horizons. Thus, webTrans did not function as expected and the noon initialization of the Planning Horizon had to be manually triggered.
  - This potentially could have affected non firm reservations processed from 12/8/2010 at 12:11 PM until 2:38 PM. The review of the service requests processed during this time showed that five reservations for service from WRGS and CRGL were counter offered or denied. However, it is not possible to determine if this was a result of the above issue.
FERC Filings

• January 12, 2011: Incorrect Response Factors
  – On 12/29 2010 at 2:00 PM, the ICT notified Entergy that the Livonia to Wilbert line was showing AFC available on the WILLVB_WEBWL flowgate even though there was an outage on the line. Upon further investigation, it was determined that RFCALC incorrectly included the flowgate in the list of top 15 monitored flowgates for some transfer paths in the Operating and Planning Horizons.
  – When a flowgate has an associated line outage, then RFCALC is expected to compute a response factor of zero. Instead, RFCALC is using a previously calculated non-zero response factor, potentially resulting in the flowgate being incorrectly included in the top 15 monitored flowgates. This software error has existed since the implementation of RFCALC in April 2004, and could have occurred for any line outage associated with a flowgate limiting element.
  – RFCALC was correctly computing a zero flow on these flowgates, thus the AFCs on an affected flowgate should not have restricted any transmission service requests. There is a low probability that including these flowgates would have resulted in incorrectly granting transmission service. However, it is not technically feasible to determine the exact impact on AFC calculations or on customers.
  – There is no manual workaround to correct this until the permanent fix is in place. AREVA provided a software patch on January 11, 2011 which Entergy is testing prior to placing in production.
FERC Filings

• January 24, 2011: Incorrect Response Factors (RFCALC Generation Dispatch)
  – On January 7, 2011 at 2:00 PM, the ICT contacted Entergy questioning the dispatch of Union Power generators in the PSSE files posted on OASIS.
  – Upon further investigation, Entergy discovered that the RFCALC models included the generators being dispatched at 30 MW each. Further analysis revealed that there were no reservations or schedules for the Union Power generation. The Generator Only control area (PUPP) was incorrectly set off interchange control in the model.
  – This resulted from the required generation field in RFCALC being set at NULL in lieu of ZERO. This software error in RFCALC potentially impacted Union, BUBA and Plum Point since June 2005, April 2007 and March 2010 respectively. The permanent software fix provided by Alstom (formerly AREVA) was put in production by Entergy on January 17, 2011.
  – Potential impact to the customers should have been minimal due to the small amount of generation included in the model. Only customers requesting service on these flowgates could have been affected due to some granting of transmission service when AFCs were not actually available.
Questions?
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## Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Shipley</td>
<td>SPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Caulfield</td>
<td>Chair - Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Warren</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Long</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Powell</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Thomas</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Montgomery</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Turner</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Harris</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Heintzen</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Thompson</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mueller</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Henley</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Paliza</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tal Walker</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Pedersen</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings/Discussions

• 3/8/2011
  – AFC Flowgate Creation for Real Time Congestion
  – Generator Outage Approval Process Framework
  – Off-Peak modeling for Next Day Analysis
  – Joint AFC TF and RTF Meeting topics
  – AFC Benchmarking
Project Updates

- Benchmarking AFCs and Real Time Data
  - Operations Engineering (AFC Support and ICT Next Day Planning Engineers) determining method to do benchmarking
  - New tool expected soon that will streamline the data collection
Meetings/Discussions

- 3/16/2011 – Joint Meeting with the AFC Task Force
## Open Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>Don will keep this group updated with progress for off-peak modeling for the Next Day process.</td>
<td>On Going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>RC to visit with Entergy’s TO and GO to discuss the framework for a process/procedure for review by this group at a high level of Generator outage approval/notifications</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>Pat to ask for clarification from ERSC on the specifics related to cost.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2010</td>
<td>Create process (Benchmarking) for comparing the real time environment with the day ahead AFC model for use as a benchmark by ICT. This process is intended to be used for the month of January, with the frequency to be determined based on the level of difficulty in capturing and analyzing this information.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Closed Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>Work on the NERC TLR 5 Investigation Report to provide more detail in question 4 of the report where the cause of the TLR event can be stated. Then determine where we need to go next.</td>
<td>Complete, starting with December TLR 5 Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>Investigate the OASIS postings for LAPs to allow a level/step designation with Entergy.</td>
<td>Complete, started on Dec 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>Entergy provided the link information for the LAP postings. Sent to the Exploder.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>Pat will start the document that covers the recommendations pointed out in the TLR 5 Analysis Report. Others should send information to Pat to include in the document. Don will provide approval right information and precedence or other standards that may be related.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2010</td>
<td>Jennifer sent a request the SECCC to determine what Don needs to provide in the future meeting.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>Don to create a list of data points/steps that are used by the RC when we find a situation where planning may need to become involved.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>Don to write out discussion points for the next meeting for item 4 in Pat’s email, including the information from the 3 AFC Task Force questions.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/2010</td>
<td>Melinda to review the ICT procedure and provide comments to Don with a goal to start LAP posting process of Dec 15.</td>
<td>Complete, started on Dec 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2010</td>
<td>Larry and Don to search for the MOD standards or Orders that define the TOP, BA, and Generator data requirements.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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March 3 Meeting Recap

- Data Input into AFC Process
  - Presentation of operating and planning horizons
  - Presentation of study horizon

- AFC Flowgate Analysis
  - Presentation on requirements used for adding flowgates
  - Reviewed list of new flowgates
  - Discussion around these flowgates and the construction plan
March Meeting Recap (cont.)

- RC/TA Coordination
  - Benchmarking real time data
  - Speed up the time to get flowgates in the model for NSNF
    - Addition of 50 temp flowgates
  - Discussion around RC approving outages that resulted in AFC flowgates being overloaded in the model
March Meeting Recap (cont.)

- Review of Consolidated List of Issues
  - Closed some of the items that had been completed

- Open Discussion
  - Agenda items for upcoming meetings
  - Entergy’s proposal for changes to meet 729/676E
## Open Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2010</td>
<td>Entergy to provide an annual review for the summer peak in the fall/November and the annual review would be provided to the SPC AFC Task Force upon completion</td>
<td>On Going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2010</td>
<td>The AFC Task Force should identify the specific parts that need RC Task force input.</td>
<td>On Going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2010</td>
<td>Create process (Benchmarking) for comparing the real time environment with the day ahead AFC model for use as a benchmark by ICT. <code>ICT RC/TA group has developed a process</code></td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/2011</td>
<td>Entergy to provide a list of who is providing data. Entergy is researching to confirm there are no confidentiality issues.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2011</td>
<td>Complete a formal write up of the outage cancellation event explaining the issue and mitigation plan. Assigned to Vinit.</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2011</td>
<td>Check on the process that will improve the mapping correction time so that is less manual mapping and outages would come out automatically if cancelled. Vinit to check on a process that will automatically check the translation table for accuracy.</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2011</td>
<td>Compare the list of flowgates with the construction plan to identify which upgrades may impact the flowgates on the master list. Assigned to Cameron.</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2011</td>
<td>Determine a way to reflect the status of each item on the Consolidated list of AFC items. Draft sent out for review</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2011</td>
<td>Determine if Don Shipley can present a resolution at the various TF meetings which covers RC approving outages that resulted in AFC flowgates being overload</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Closed Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/12/2011</td>
<td>Vinit to provide an update on the status of the addition of more slots for temporary flowgates.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/2011</td>
<td>Improve the timeliness of adding new flowgates to AFC models so that if the RC identifies real-time congestion on a flowgate not in the AFC models it can be added quickly to prevent overselling transmission service.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/2011</td>
<td>Develop a process to inform stakeholders of new transmission project additions to the AFC models.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/2011</td>
<td>Cameron and Jason to talk about the issue with the outage cancellation over the weekend of January 10 and provide a summary back to the group</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2010</td>
<td>Cameron’s group to provide a document that describes the new posting process. Vinit indicated to have the process document complete by end of year with implementation around mid January 2011.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2011</td>
<td>Post presentation that Cameron Warren gave concerning flowgate additions to the task force website.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Meeting(s)

- Face to Face Meeting
  - New Orleans – April 8, 2011 – 9 am to 12 pm
Helping our members work together to keep the lights on... today and in the future
SPC System Impact Study
Task Force Update

March 17, 2011

Ben Roubique
Jennifer Vosburg
Contents:

• Team Members
• Meetings/Discussion
• Projects Update
• Open Action Items
• Close Action Items
## Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Roubique</td>
<td>SPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Vosburg</td>
<td>Chair - Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chiles</td>
<td>Vice-chair - Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Turner</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Thompson</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Paliza</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lona</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mueller</td>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Powell</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Broussard</td>
<td>Entergy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings/Discussions

- **11/8/2010** – Initial Team Meeting
  - Selected the Chair – Jennifer Vosburg
  - Reviewed responses to stakeholder submitted questions

- **11/19/2010**
  - Finalized Task Force Guiding Document
  - Discussed FFR examples

- **1/13/11**
  - Discussed competitive solicitation
  - Reviewed Draft Attachment T Guiding document

- **2/28/11**
  - Meeting cancelled due to low participation
Action Items - Project Updates

- **Issues deemed resolved or significant progress made:**
  - Reporting of Negative AFC
  - Failure to Show TDF Values
  - Lack of complete cost estimates ("TBD")

- **Issues actively under discussion:**
  - FFR procedures (Attachment T Guidance Document)
  - Competitive solicitation (Multiple sources to single sinks)
  - Modeling of Base Plan and Construction Plan upgrades in the SIS and FS
## Open Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Develop FFR process document that. ICT will report on status and timeframe.</td>
<td>Draft document provided to SISTF on 12/30/10, updated on 2/28/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>ICT will need to request getting access to Entergy’s configuration management database.</td>
<td>Entergy working on providing access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Does competitive solicitation allow multiple sources to a single sink? What would be the procedure?</td>
<td>Stakeholders to draft procedure for solicitation and present to group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Email will need to be sent to SPC exploder when posting to Special Notices on major changes.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Closed Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Compare how BP, CP, and SU upgrades are used between the SIS and FS</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Edit TDF to read OTDF in response and future reports</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Explanation of why MW would be used over MVA for FFR calculation.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Insert note of load growth provision in November follow-up responses</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Process for calculation SU for new facilities</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Proposal for availability to study multiple sources for one sink</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Recommended draft Attachment T Guidance Document edits</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Research option to opt out of TSA with large cost discrepancy</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Summary of Order 717 and study opportunities for LSEs</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Clarify 3-year window in the “After-the-Fact” test response</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Clarify term “estimated nature” in reference to FFR</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Closed Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>ICT and Entergy will get together to provide a response on the Daniel-McKnight phase shifter.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>ICT to determine a timeline for review and posting for a business practice for FFRs.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>ICT will examine the possibility of adding negative ATCs and OTDFs to SISR.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>ICT will prepare a draft guiding document for the task force.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>Roberto will send an email describing specific FFR examples they would like to have detailed. The ICT will provide a response on providing those examples.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>Roberto will send an e-mail describing what items are included in the models for the SIS. ICT will follow up with a response.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>After the Entergy/ICT December 2nd face-to-face meeting, a status update will be sent to the SISTF.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Develop process document defining “after-the-fact” test</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Closed Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg Date</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Legal interpretation of Attachment D concerning inclusion of all of ICT Base Plan upgrades in model</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Roberto will send ICT another FFR example of loop flows and system changes. Roberto will work with ICT on the example. How is capacity fixed if loop flow grows?</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2010</td>
<td>Where in the process is the determination made of what causes the BCCOs, and how is it conveyed to the customer?</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/2011</td>
<td>Email word version of draft Attachment T Guidance Document to SISTF participants</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2010</td>
<td>ICT will examine adding descriptions to the SISR that will note what supplemental upgrade costs are fixed, and which may vary.</td>
<td>Complete – SISRs after 12/1/10 comply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SIS Task Force issues:

- Reporting of Negative AFC in SIS Reports – The current SIS report shows a zero for any AFC value that is negative due to a Base Case Contingency Overload. At a minimum, Entergy/ICT need to show the actual AFC/ATC values.
- Failure to Show TDF Values – The SIS report would be more valuable to the Transmission Customer if the TDF values on impacted elements were given. I recognize could be issues of confidentiality, but a redacted version of the study could be posted on OASIS, and a non-redacted version could be made available to the Transmission Customer upon request.
- More Accurate Cost Estimates for Potential Solutions – Currently, there is a wide disparity between what is shown for SIS upgrade costs and FS upgrades costs, even if the list of overloaded elements is unchanged between the studies. Entergy should provide a “weak link” database to ICT for use in developing cost estimates. If the Entergy Facility Rating Methodology requires the listing of each transmission element then such list could be made available to determine the items that need to be upgraded in order to provide the necessary ampacity to alleviate the overload. For example, a transmission line with a conductor rating of 350 MVA may have a significantly lower rating due to the rating of wave traps, switches, fuses, etc on the circuit.
- Model Coordination with ICT – There have been documented instances whereby model data for a specific transaction has not been handled correctly due to not coordinating with the Transmission Customer on Network Customer assumptions for generating resources and dispatch. This needs to be part of the SIS process to avoid multiple studies.
- Cluster Study Process for Load – Currently, the ICT has the ability to study multiple requests from the same generator to different load points as a single cluster study. The OATT has provisions for studying requests as part of “a competitive solicitation.” A Transmission Customer participating in a competitive power supply solicitation should have the ability to have multiple requests from varying sources to the same sink studied as a cluster.
- Treatment of Third Party Impacts in SIS Process – Coordination between the Entergy/ICT TSR queue and the SPP TSR queue needs to take place to make sure that third-party transactions are properly identified, queued and treated.
The dispatch should be the same in both SIS and FS. Modification of the dispatch to account for transactions, loading, etc. needs to be coordinated so the results are the same in both cases.

Network topology should be consistent in both studies.

Unless there can be improvements to bring the SIS and FS results into a much more consistent pattern, we would be better off to drop the SIS step and go directly to FS with a shorter time window for results.

How are prior required transmission upgrades for previous transmission service requests incorporated in an SIS? If this process was changed, when was it changed and why?

In the SIS process, what is the internal process within the ICT and Entergy that tracks common transmission upgrades associated with different transmission service requests? How is this commonality conveyed to the market participants associated with these SIS?

Due to load variations, transmission topology changes and generation dispatch variations, has the ICT and/or Entergy ever performed an updated study for any FIS previously studied?
SIS Task Force Issues – cont.

- Please reference SIS OASIS #74305336 as an example.
- What is the process and procedure that will be used to calculate the FFR capacity and financial compensation?
- Does the process and procedure take into account impact of BBCOs and loop flows on FFRs capacity and financial compensation?
- Where is this process and procedure documented?
- What is the time frame for providing the FFR information to requesting customer? Will this information be included in SIS? If not, please explain. Does the ICT and Entergy consider a SIS issued without the FFR amount or total cost to be a completed SIS? If so, what is your justification? What is the plan to be able to perform these costs as part of the SIS?
- Who will calculate the FFR?
- If the FFR is not calculated as part of the SIS, will the queue be frozen until the FFR is calculated?
- Please reference OASIS #s 74412181, 7426230_7426230[1], 74262367
- Was service confirmed for these requests (and others) for Cargill under a “higher of” pricing?
- How was that determination made if FFRs needed to be calculated?
- How can a requesting party timely confirm service without knowing the price impact of the FFR?
- Can a party withdraw its confirmation without penalty if the FFR cost makes the request uneconomical to the requesting party?
- How is that a SIS report that does not provide a total cost, FFRs, meet the tariff obligations?
- If service is granted using the higher-of methodology, how is it determined as to how much of the PTP revenues go to the funding customer and how much go to offset the network revenue requirement? Is there a minimum offset to the network revenue requirement considered in granting service? For example, if PTP service is going to bring in $1mm of revenues but the FFR would be 950k, is there only going to be 50k allocated to the network revenues requirement even though the vast majority of the atc being used by this transaction is being supported by the general rate base?
- Describe the impact of Base Case Overloads, loop flows or changes in network resource dispatch on the FFR calculation. For example, if a funded supplemental upgrades originally creates 100 MW of AFC, of which 30 is needed for the funding customer, and 50 mw of the remaining 70 mw of AFC is taken up by the next resync of the model due to load and dispatch changes, how is the cost of the FFR allocated to the next customer who request service under this flowgate?
How are FFR’s allocated among different customers with different lengths of transmission service request? For example, if Customer A needs 100 MW from 2015 through 2045 on a given flowgate, and Customer B needs 100 mw on the same flowgate from 2015 to 2016, how would their FFRs be calculated.

In example above, assuming Customer B pays same as customer A, then how would Entergy/ICT allocate FFR beyond 2016 once Customer Bs transmission is over but there may/may not still be FFR rights.

If a customer gets an FFR because of upgrades needed for his TSR, and later redirects or annuls the TSR such that ATC is created due to his upgrades, is the customer compensated for releasing his upgrade capacity? How?

All ICT Base Plan upgrades should be included in the SIS models used to evaluate long-term TSRs. The ICT does not include the upgrades in the models rather it uses an "after-the-fact check" to determine whether a Base Plan upgrade mitigates an overload or not. This is an inaccurate method to evaluate the benefits of Base Plan upgrades.

The report should also list upgrades included in the models. This could be done using the ICT Base Plan as a reference so only additions/deletions need to be identified.

Some network resources are not properly dispatched in SIS studies. The ICT uses a default dispatch for network resources. But a network customer can provide a specific dispatch order or methodology for its network resources. If the network customer provides this information, the ICT should use this dispatch in all SIS studies. This issue needs a thorough discussion which should lead to the development of guidelines for submitting dispatch data, type of resources to be dispatched (owned vs. contracted), frequency of dispatch changes, and events triggering changes in network customer's dispatch.

Evaluation of network resources re-dispatch of a network customer in SIS studies. Typically, the ICT does not include an evaluation of network resources re-dispatch to mitigate overloads identified in SIS studies. But this evaluation is performed if requested by the network customer after the initial study is completed. Network customers should be given an option up front to request the use of re-dispatch and/or delisting of their network resources as mitigation in SIS studies.
SIS Task Force Issues – cont.

- Lack of complete cost estimates ("tbd") for upgrades and financial compensation for FFRs in the SIS reports. An SIS study is not useful if it does not include a complete estimate of the total cost of upgrades and financial compensation for FFRs. Unfortunately, this is the case with most of the SIS studies conducted by the ICT.

- Lack of detail in the presentation of SIS results. SIS reports only present the ATC for each limiting equipment identified in the study. When an ATC is negative, the ATC value is set to zero masking the real value which could be significantly negative, i.e. Base Case Overload. To improve the usefulness and transparency of SIS reports, the following should be presented for each limiting equipment identified in the report:
  - ✓ Actual ATC value
  - Pre-transfer flow
  - Post-transfer flow
  - Rating of limiting element
  - ✓ OTDF (Outage Transfer Distribution Factor) value

- Improve planning re-dispatch methodology and presentation. Discuss and clarify this issue. It is not clear whether this is a real option for customers in Entergy.
ICT 2011 Base Plan and 2012 RA Update
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Overview

• Final 2011 BP U1 – (February 24)
• 2011 BP/CP Differences Report (February 28)
• 2011 BP Overview (February 28)
• 2012 RA Scope
**Final 2011 BP Update 1**

### Completed Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT Project Name</th>
<th>ICT Project Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkin to Twist 161 kV - Replace line trap at Parkin</td>
<td>Ray Braswell to Clinton 115 kV line: Upgrade switch at Clinton and riser at Ray Braswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(increase rating of line segment)</td>
<td>Clinton to Jackson NW 115 kV line: Upgrade switch at Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couch to McNeil 115kV Line: Upgrade jumpers at Couch</td>
<td>Upgrade Terminal Equipment on Vicksburg - Waterway 115kV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Catherine 4 to Arkahoma 115 kV line: Upgrade risers at Arkahoma</td>
<td>Sabine to Linde 138 kV line: Upgrade bus and risers at Sabine and Linde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russellville North to Russellville East 161 kV line: Replace jumpers at</td>
<td>Sabine to Mid County 230 kV line: Upgrade bus and jumpers at Mid County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russellville East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan to Mayflower 115 kV line: Replace jumpers and bus at Mayflower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russellville East to Russellville South 161 kV line: Replace jumpers and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risers at Russellville East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis to Cajun 230 kV line - Upgrade Limiting Section With Double-Bundled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649.5 ACAR (654 MVA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbert to Livonia 138 kV line: Upgrade risers at Wilbert and Livonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Glen to Geismer 138 kV line: Upgrade risers at Willow Glen and Geismer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Hudson to Fancy Point 230 kV line: Upgrade bus at Fancy Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard to Scott 1 138kV segment: Replace/change CT ratio at Richard and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upgrade bus at Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final 2011 BP Update 1 (Cont)

- **Moved to Potential Future BP Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT Project Name</th>
<th>ICT Need-by Date</th>
<th>ICT Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grimes Substation - Add 3rd 345-138 kV Auto</td>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
<td>revised need-by date from 10W to 19S after further evaluation of the latest power flow models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Grimes to Mt. Zion 138 kV line</td>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
<td>revised need-by date from 10W to 19S after further evaluation of the latest power flow models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Projects added to the BP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT Project Name</th>
<th>ICT Need-by Date</th>
<th>ICT Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hot Springs Hamilton (Albright) - Bismarck: Construct new 115 kV Line and convert Bismarck and Mountain Pine South to ring bus stations. Add capacitor bank at Milton</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>load projections have increased in the Hot Springs area accelerating the need for this project from 19S to 14S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Olive: Add Shunt Reactor</td>
<td>Winter 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermitage 10.8 MVAR Capacitor Bank</td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuttgart Ricuskey 115 kV Substation: Expand Capacitor Bank to 40.8 MVAR</td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>Address voltage in Stuttgart area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Braswell to West Jackson 115 kV line: Reconductor line</td>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>Replaces BP-11-007 Braswell to Forest Hill 115 kV Line - Reconductor line (Per line impedance update)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangburn 161 kV Substation: Relocate Rutherford 115 kV Cap Bank to Pangburn</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>Cap bank is too big to switch on at Rutherford 115kV.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final 2011 BP Update 1 (Cont)

- TE Upgrades added to the BP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT Project Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leach to Newton Bulk 138 kV line: Upgrade terminal equipment at Newton Bulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlyss to Nelson 230 kV: Upgrade station equipment at Carlyss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireco to Copol 69 kV line: Upgrade line and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis 69 kV substation: Upgrade 69 kV switches and line trap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker to Waterford 230 kV line - Upgrade station equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford to Union Carbide 230 kV line - Upgrade station equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Carbide to Hooker 230 kV line - Upgrade station equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation to Conroe 138 kV line: Upgrade station equipment at Plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Neches to Linde: Upgrade station equipment at Port Neches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final 2011 BP Update 1 (Cont)

- Mitigation Plans
  - Added for projects with an ICT need-by date that is before Entergy’s projected in-service date
    - Generation Adjustments
    - Operation Guides
    - Consequential load loss
2012 RA Scope

• Powerflow Models – 2010 Series U1

• Reliability Assessment Contingency Scans
  ➢ Near Term (Including 2011-2013 Approved CP projects)
    – Summer and Winter Peak 2013 and 2017
  ➢ Long Term (Including 2011-2013 Approved CP projects)
    – Summer Peak 2020

• 2012-2014 Construction Plan Evaluation Contingency Scans
  ➢ Near Term (Including Draft 2012-2014 APP/Prop CP projects)
    – Summer and Winter Peak 2013 and 2017
  ➢ Long Term (Including Draft 2012-2014 APP/Prop CP projects)
    – Summer Peak 2020
2012 RA Scope (Cont)

• Low Hydro Analysis
  – Bull Shoals – off
  – Greers Ferry – off
  – Sam Rayburn – off
  – Bull Shoals, Greers Ferry, Norfork, and Table Rock at 50% capacity

• Load Pocket Analysis (N-1,G-1)
  – Summer 2017
  – Western Region
  – Amite South
  – DSG
2011 BP/CP Differences Report

- February 28, 2011 - Filed at FERC and posted on OASIS
- Three differences in 2011 Final BP and 2011-13 CP
  - 3rd Auto at Grimes
  - Upgrade Grimes – Zion 138kV
  - Upgrade terminal equipment on Toledo Bend - Leach 138kV
- Currently no differences in the Final BP and CP Update 1
2011 BP Overview

- February 28, 2011 - posted on OASIS
- Provides information and data inputs used in the development of the 2011 BP
Attachment T Guidance Document

March 10, 2011
Attachment T Guidance Document
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1 Overview of the Supplemental Upgrade and Flowgate Financial Rights Process

1.1 Introduction and Purpose

Entergy’s\(^1\) pricing and cost allocation policy for new transmission investments, commonly referred to as participant funding, is codified in Attachment T (Recovery of New Facilities Costs and Planning Redispatch Costs for Long-Term Services) to the Entergy Operating Companies’ Open Access Transmission Tariff (“OATT” or “Tariff”). Attachment T underwent a rigorous stakeholder review and comment process and was approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) in April 2007, in Docket No. ER05-1065. Under Attachment T, transmission customers who fund Supplemental Upgrades are ensured firm transmission rights on the facilities that are upgraded. Also, because of the “lumpiness” of transmission upgrades, Supplemental Upgrades can create excess capacity. The customer initially funding the Supplemental Upgrades thus will be entitled to financial compensation for any third party’s use of the portion of the upgrade that the funding customer does not use for its own firm service. FERC has held that Attachment T is consistent with the principle of native load protection underlying the Commission’s “higher of” pricing policy in FERC’s Order No. 2003-A, which ensures “that other transmission customers, including a Transmission Provider’s native load, will not subsidize Network Upgrades required to interconnect merchant generation.” Order No. 2003-A at P 580. Further, FERC has also agreed that the pricing methodology set forth in Attachment T sends more efficient price signals to interconnection and transmission customers. As FERC and Entergy’s retail regulators have held, cost allocation under Attachment T appropriately aligns the costs of transmission investment with those entities that cause the cost to be incurred.

The purpose of this document is to provide Entergy’s stakeholders with more detailed information regarding how Attachment T is implemented by Entergy and the ICT including the coordination between the two parties, the delineation of responsibilities, and other specific information regarding the calculation of financial rights associated with Supplemental Upgrades.

Note: Unless otherwise noted, the referenced sections or provisions relate to Attachment T to the Entergy OATT, the primary source for and subject of this document. Capitalized terms are as defined by the Tariff and its related attachments or applicable industry standards. This document is provided as a reference document only; in the event of conflict between information provided in this document and the OATT, the OATT shall control.

\(^1\) Entergy refers to Entergy Services, Inc. (“ESI”), the service company for the six Entergy Operating Companies: Entergy Arkansas, Inc., Entergy Gulf Sates Louisiana, L.L.C., Entergy Louisiana, LLC, Entergy Mississippi, Inc., Entergy New Orleans, Inc., and Entergy Texas, Inc. The Energy Delivery function within ESI, in coordination with the ICT in certain areas, is responsible for the planning, operation, maintenance management, and construction management of the electric transmission systems of Entergy’s Operating Companies.
1.2 References
The cited references below are not intended to be an exhaustive list of applicable Tariff provisions relating to the application and calculation of Supplemental Upgrades.

1.2.1 Entergy OATT
Refer to this document and attachments below for more details and specific provisions referenced in this document.

1.2.2 Attachment K to the Entergy OATT
This attachment, among other things, describes the ICT’s development of the Base Plan.

1.2.3 Attachment S to the Entergy OATT
Section 3.1 of this attachment states that one of the ICT functions, among a number of responsibilities, is to “implement Attachment T, Recovery of New Facilities Costs.”

1.2.4 Attachment T to the Entergy OATT
This attachment provides the framework for transmission cost allocation between Transmission Customers and Entergy.

1.2.5 Attachment D to the Entergy OATT
This attachment describes the methodology for conducting System Impact Studies and Facilities Studies and determining the impact on previously funded Supplemental Upgrades for the purpose of calculating financial compensation payments under Attachment T.

1.2.6 FERC Order

1.3 Definitions

1.3.1 Base Plan Upgrade
For purposes of cost allocation, Base Plan Upgrades are those defined in accordance with Section 1.2 of Attachment T.

They generally refer to those upgrades necessary to maintain system reliability and firm transmission service commitments. Per section 2.1 of Attachment T, the cost of such upgrades will be recoverable through the Transmission Provider’s transmission rates, including Point-to-Point (“PTP”) and Network Integration Transmission Service (“NITS”) rates under the Tariff, bundled retail rates, and rates charged to grandfathered customers. Section 3.2 of Attachment T further goes on to state: “The ICT will assess whether a proposed upgrade should be considered a Base Plan Upgrade or Supplemental Upgrade. For purposes of this Section 3.2, the ICT will consider only upgrades in the then-current Base Plan for which construction is to be initiated within the next 3 years.”
1.3.2 Flowgate Financial Rights
While this term is not officially defined in the referenced documents, flowgate financial rights ("FFRs") refer to rights associated with Supplemental Upgrades, including financial compensation rights, as described in Section 4 of Attachment T.

1.3.3 Supplemental Upgrade
For purposes of cost allocation, Supplemental Upgrades ("SUs") will consist of a number of categories of investment as defined in Section 1.3 of Attachment T. As referenced in the definition of Base Plan Upgrade above, a transmission upgrade is classified by the ICT as either a Base Plan Upgrade or Supplemental Upgrade.

1.3.4 FFR Holder
Although this term is not officially defined in the referenced documents, FFR Holder refers to a customer who has funded capacity on a Supplemental Upgrade, either through funding the upgrade, or purchasing rights from another customer.

2 Processes for Transmission Customer

2.1 System Impact Study Process

2.1.1 System Impact Study
Per Attachment D to the OATT, a System Impact Study ("SIS") is “an in-depth analysis of whether a request for Transmission Service can be reliably accommodated.” An SIS is a DC analysis conducted by the ICT to determine if there is sufficient Available Transfer Capability ("ATC") to grant a transmission service request ("TSR"). If there is insufficient ATC, limitations to the specified transfer are identified. If it is determined that less than the full amount requested is available, the elements that are limiting the transfer will be identified, and upgrades will be proposed for those limiting elements.

During the performance of an SIS, a test will be performed to determine if the specified request impacts a previously-funded Supplemental Upgrade ("SU"). The details of this test are presented in further detail in Section 5.3 below.

2.1.2 System Impact Study Report
The System Impact Study Report ("SISR") will specify whether ATC is available for the full transmission service request amount, ATC is only available for part of the transmission service request amount or ATC is not available. If ATC is not available, the SISR will indicate (i) that ATC is not available, (ii) cost estimates for upgrades to the constrained elements, and (iii) the need to conduct a Facilities Study ("FS") for more definitive details of capacity and upgrade costs. If it is determined that a TSR will depend upon any Base Plan projects, it will also be noted in the SISR.
If service is available only for part of the requested amount, the customer will have the option of either accepting the partial service as offered (counter-offer), or proceeding to a Facilities Study to evaluate the scope of the upgrades need to provide the full amount requested in more detail.

If it is determined that the request depends upon prior committed SUs, the SISR will identify the SU(s) that are impacted by the requesting service, the supplemental capacity necessary, unit rate, estimates of FFR impact, and any potential counter offers. The SISR will note if the cost for the SU has been finalized or if it is still an estimate.

2.2 Facilities Study Process

2.2.1 Facilities Study
The FS will re-examine the specified transfer, identify constraints to granting the requested service and will determine which upgrades will best resolve the limitations and provide the scope of those facilities. The FS also provides a more detailed cost estimate. If SUs are impacted, the FS will also examine whether supplemental capacity is available to grant the service.

Entergy performs a full AC analysis during the FS, and the ICT verifies the solution set and determines the cost allocation for the upgrades. The ICT will determine the amount of capacity created and what portion of the capacity created will be used by the requesting customer. The ICT will also examine if the request is dependent upon any previously-funded SUs.

If it is determined that the request is dependent upon Base Plan upgrades, those upgrades will also be examined through the FS process to determine if they have enough capacity as currently scoped to accommodate the request.

2.2.2 Facilities Study Report
The Facilities Study Report (“FSR”) will indicate an estimate of costs, in-service date of upgrades, any necessary counter offers (MW or service start time), and conditions of service. Through the FSR, the ICT will also classify upgrades as either Base Plan or Supplemental, the amount of capacity created on any Supplemental Upgrades, and the customer’s use of any capacity created. For requests that require construction of new facilities or upgrades to existing facilities, the original facility rating, required rating to grant service, and estimated proposed rating once facilities are complete will be included.

For requests that impact previously-funded SUs, the FSR will indicate the capacity required for the TSR, an estimate of the unit rate, in-service date, conditions relating to project completion, cross references to previous FS(s) of impacted SU, and any changes to required upgrades that may be necessary to grant service.

If the final scoping and design have not been completed for the prior SU under the Project Execution Plan (PEP) process, the available FFR capacity and the estimated unit rate stated in the FSR will be noted as estimated pending completion of the PEP.
2.3 Transmission Service Agreement Process

Entergy’s Transmission Services group will tender the Transmission Customer a Transmission Service Agreement ("TSA") which will include information related to the SU provided in FSR, including the capacity required for the requested transaction, estimates of the post-upgrade capacity and cost of the upgrade(s). If the final scoping and design have not been completed under the PEP process, the available FFR capacity and the estimated unit rate stated in the FSR will be estimated, pending completion of the PEP. The TSA also will state that the available FFR capacity and the estimated rate for Point-to-Point Transmission Service based on the results of a “higher of” analysis are estimates, pending completion of the project. If the final scoping and design under the PEP process result in the subsequent impacting customer having to fund the SU, the subsequent impacting customer will be notified and the TSA will be revised and re-filed with FERC. Until the project is closed, the TSA will indicate that transmission service pricing is subject to a true-up.

If the original customer ultimately declines to fund the SU and the subsequent impacting customer is required to fund the SU, the customer will be notified and the TSA will be revised and re-filed.

2.4 Follow-up Process

Once the TSA has been executed, the ICT will reflect the committed status of the upgrade information in the ICT’s SU tracking database. Additional details of the tracking process are provided in Section 4. At the next model update, the ICT will include the SU in the base case transmission models. The rating of the facility will be the estimated rating that is provided in the FSR. Entergy’s Transmission Services group will also input the SU information into its internal tracking database.

After the TSA is executed, Entergy will perform a more detailed scoping process for the transmission projects. This process is known as the PEP. During the PEP, the scope of the upgrade, including the capacity created and cost, may change. Entergy will provide the best available estimates at the time for input into subsequent SIS or FS impacting the SU.

Once the SU is in-service, Entergy will file an amended TSA or Interconnection Agreement ("IA") for the customer funding the SU and any subsequent agreements with impacts on that SU reflecting any updated details on the final capacity and unit rate, along with any update on project conditions. The revised agreements also will reflect final determination of the transmission service rate based on the “higher of” analysis.

For SUs that are impacted by the request, the SU funding customer (or FFR Holder), will be notified when new transmission service requests impact its existing SU. The FFR Holder will be notified via the Notice provisions in the agreement.
3 Processes for Evaluating Load Growth Impact

As indicated in Section 1.2.2.1 of Attachment T, Base Plan Upgrades include “investments necessary to serve forecasted load growth reliably within the Entergy Transmission System, including new Points of Delivery.” The framework for evaluating load growth impact by the ICT is provided in Section 4.3.2 of Attachment T. The detailed evaluation process is under development and will be provided to stakeholders for review and comments.

4 Tracking of Supplemental Upgrades

4.1 ICT Supplemental Upgrade Tracking Database

The ICT will track and provide the following information to Entergy’s Transmission Services group for incorporation into TSAs or IAs, including Large Generator Interconnection Agreements (“LGIAs”) and Small Generator Interconnection Agreements (“SGIAs”), and internal tracking and provisioning to the Transmission Services Billing (“TSB”) system:

   a. The upgrade element
   b. The effective date (typically the start of service date)
   c. Pre-upgrade rating
   d. Post-upgrade rating
   e. Upgraded capacity (capacity created by the upgrade)
   f. Capacity used by the funding party
   g. Subsequent impacting requests
   h. Capacity remaining (available FFRs)

4.2 Tracking Transmission Service Impact on Supplemental Upgrades

Entergy’s Transmission Services group will input the information received from the ICT, in 4.1 above, into its internal tracking database. Information from this database will be used to track available FFRs and any transfer to subsequent Transmission Service or Interconnection customers who are identified by the ICT as impacting the SU. Load growth impacts will be tracked against the available FFRs.

In addition to the information provided by the ICT, Entergy will track the latest approved estimate of the upgrade cost for calculation of the estimated Unit Rate. The Unit Rate will be an estimated value until the upgrade is placed in-service and the final cost and post upgrade rating are confirmed. The inflation rate to be applied to the Unit Rate for each of the first five years after the upgrade is placed in service will also be tracked in the database.
Information from the database will be used as input for the “higher of” rate calculation for subsequent transmission service requests requiring available capacity on the SU. The Transmission Services group will provide data from the database to Transmission Billing and Settlement for input into TSB to facilitate compensation payments for long-term transmission service impacts on the SU.

The information in Entergy’s internal tracking database will be added for new SUs following execution of an agreement (TSA or IA) to fund the upgrade. Updates to the database to reflect subsequent impacts from transmission or interconnection service will be made following execution of an agreement. Impacts resulting from load growth will be input as the Transmission Services group is notified of such impacts by the ICT.

4.3 Customer Notifications
The party funding the SU or owning FFRs on an upgrade will be notified of subsequent Transmission Service or Interconnection Customers impacting its available FFRs following execution of an agreement. Similarly, notification will also be made upon confirmation by the ICT that forecasted load growth will require the use of available FFRs. Notification will be made via or formal Notice provisions under the applicable agreement.

4.4 Factors Affecting Supplemental Upgrade Capacity
Supplemental Upgrade capacity (MW Capacity Created) is initially determined upon completion of the Facilities Study that identifies the need for a SU. Details on the calculation of MW Capacity Created are below in section 5.2. The MW Capacity Created may change from the value provided in the FSR dependent upon the outcome of the PEP process, or the final capacity of the facility once it is placed in-service. These changes could result in either an increase or decrease from the MW Capacity Created provided in the FSR.

In addition to changes in the MW Capacity Created, the amount of Supplemental Capacity available for other users of the transmission system may vary based on several factors as well. Subsequent TSRs that impact the SU and satisfy the Three-Factor Test, described in more detail below, will decrement the amount of available capacity by that request’s impact on the SU. As the term of requests expire, or TSRs are withdrawn, that SU capacity will be released, and added back to the available capacity. Load growth impacts that have greater than a 3% TDF impact will also be decremented from the available capacity.

There are factors that are not explicitly accounted for that may affect SU available capacity as well. Among those are: TSR impacts that have less than a 3% OTDF, load growth impacts that have less than a 3% OTDF, loop flows, and changes in system topology. Note that these impacts may have either a positive or negative effect on available capacity. Customers funding a SU are not compensated for impacts due to the above factors.
5 Calculation Details

5.1 Unit Rate
Unit Rate = Cost of Project ($) / MW Capacity Created (MW)

For this calculation, best estimates of cost for the projects will be used until the project is in-service and all costs have been finalized. Per Section 4.3.5.1 of Attachment T, the Unit Rate will escalate at the rate of inflation for each of the first five years after the SU project is placed in service. MW Capacity Created is detailed in the next section.

5.2 Megawatt Capacity Created
MW Capacity Created will be calculated as follows for upgrades that create capacity on the Entergy system:

MW Capacity Created = Proposed Rating – Current Rating

The above equation is used for existing facilities that are upgraded to a higher rating. For new facilities, it is assumed that the Current Rating is equal to zero, and thus, the MW Capacity Created is equal to the proposed rating.

Example:
For the upgrade of an existing facility, if the Proposed (or post-upgrade) rating of a facility is 150 MVA, and the Current (or pre-upgrade rating) is 115 MVA, then the MW Capacity Created would be equal to 35 MVA.

\[
150 \text{ MVA} - 115 \text{ MVA} = 35 \text{ MVA} = 35 \text{ MW}
\]

For the purpose of this calculation, unity power factor is assumed. Thus, the MW Capacity Created will be equal to the incremental MVA capacity created.

5.3 Customer Impact on Supplemental Upgrade(s)

5.3.1 Three-Factor Test
Attachment T describes the test to determine whether a particular transmission service request impacts an existing SU. A request will be deemed to be dependent on a prior SU if the load flow modeling of the request demonstrates that:

1. Pre- or post-contingent flows associated with the request have at least a 3% Outage Transfer Distribution Factor (“OTDF”) on the SU facility, and
2. The capacity created by the SU is not fully utilized prior to consideration of the requested service, and
3. The increase in flows associated with the request could not be accommodated reliably (in whole or part), without the previously funded SU.
Note that step 2 of the above check, is performed in two parts. First, the load flow model is examined to determine if the request will result in less than 100% post-contingent loading on the SU. Second, the SU Tracking Database is examined to determine if the SU capacity is fully subscribed. The capacity must be available both through the load flow study, as well as the SU Tracking Database. The process to check if a request meets the three conditions described above is presented in detail in the following section.

5.3.2 Calculation of Impact on Supplemental Upgrades

5.3.2.1 System Impact Study

Section 3.3.1 of Attachment D requires that the System Impact Study ("SIS") be performed using a DC contingency analysis. In order to track whether SUs are impacted during the SIS, the previously funded SUs are monitored in the SIS process specifically at the original or pre-upgrade rating of the facility. However, the element is included at the SU (or post-upgrade) rating in the transmission model. The study transfers must have a minimum of 3% OTDF on the identified limiting elements in these reports.

- **EXISTING FACILITY UPGRADE** – The Baxter Wilson – Ray Braswell 500kV transmission line was upgraded from 1732 MW to 2598 MW. It is modeled at 2598 MW in the power flow models, and will have a SU interface designated in the transfer capability study at 1732 MW (1645.4 MW, considering the 5% TRM used in the SIS) in the Monitor file. An example of the entry in the monitor file is below:

  Monitor Interface RayBax500 Rating 1645.4 MW
  Monitor Branch from bus 336830 to bus 336839 ckt 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATC</th>
<th>FCITC</th>
<th>OTDF</th>
<th>Limiting Constraint</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Preshift</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2590</td>
<td>-2589.5</td>
<td>0.0837</td>
<td>Interface RayBax500</td>
<td>Franklin – Grand Gulf 500</td>
<td>1862.0</td>
<td>1645.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 - SU Limiting Interface Example*

If, during the transfer capability analysis, the SU interface is a limiting element, then two of the three factors have been satisfied. In the Table 1 above, the transfer simulation has an 8.37% OTDF, so the SU interface should only appear as it is greater than 3% OTDF. Also, if the SU interface appears as a limiting element, then it indicates that the request under study requires that SU to be in place.

SU impact is calculated as the greatest OTDF impact during the reservation time multiplied by the requested transfer MW amount (*i.e.*, if the analysis shows an 8.37% OTDF impact for a 100 MW request, then the SU impact will be 100 MW X 0.0837 ~ 8 MW). All supplemental impacts are rounded to a whole value, as consistent with the thermal overload reporting in the SIS.

- **NEW FACILITY** – The Baxter Wilson 2nd 500/115 kV 600MVA Transformer was added in parallel with the existing 500/115 kV transformer. Since the facility was not in service, the full capacity of the transformer will be available for FFR. The facility will be monitored at 0 MW to identify if the facility is impacted by the request. An example of an entry in the monitor file is below:
For new facilities that are installed parallel to an existing facility, a special test will be applied. This test is composed of two parts: the Need Test, and the Impact Test. These tests determine if the request could be accommodated without the parallel facility.

The Need Test is simply stated as “if this supplemental upgrade was not built, would this transaction have a need for this upgrade.” The identified double contingencies take the supplemental upgrade out of service along with the original contingency that caused the supplemental upgrade to be built. To perform the Need Test, the original contingency element and the new facility are taken out of service simultaneously. If any element(s) are identified with a 3% OTDF under N-1 contingency and greater than 95% loading (factoring in 5% TRM), then it passes the Need Test.

![Figure 1 - Contingency of Parallel elements for the Need Test](image)

An example of an entry in the contingency file of the double contingencies is below:

```
Contingency ‘BW 500 AUTOS’
Open Branch from bus 336830 to bus 336800 ckt 2
Open Branch from bus 336830 to bus 336800 ckt 1
End
```

The Impact Test is the new facility (interface) being identified as a limiting constraint. To perform the Impact Test, the original and new facilities are put back into the model. If the new facility is identified with a 3% impact under N-1 contingency and greater than 95% loading (factoring in 5% TRM), then it passes the Impact Test.
For the customer to be charged for a supplemental impact, the analysis must pass both the Need and Impact Tests. In the example above, it shows that the Baxter Wilson – Tallulah 138kV overloads for the loss of the original and new autos, which satisfies the Need Test. The Baxter Wilson 500/115kV interface overloads for the loss of the Franklin – Ray Braswell 500kV, which satisfies the Impact Test. If a customer passes only one of the tests, then the customer will not be charged for a supplemental impact. The amount of impact is the greatest OTDF amount multiplied by the transaction amount.

Additional assumptions used in the examination in the SIS are:

- 5% Transmission Reliability Margin (“TRM”) is applied to facility ratings in seasonal peak models
- No TRM is applied to facility ratings in monthly models
- DC power flow analysis
- Bus-to-bus contingency analysis

### Facilities Study

The conditions in the FS are similar to the above, but the following additional assumptions are used:

- No TRM is applied to facility ratings in either seasonal peak or monthly models
- AC power flow analysis
- Breaker-to-breaker contingency analysis

The SU impact for the FS is calculated by a DC power flow analysis (MUST) to keep all FFR calculations (MW) compliant with Sections 4.3.5.1, 4.3.5.2, and 4.3.5.3 of Attachment T and consistently used between the SIS and FS processes. A main difference between MUST and PSSE when looking at the SU impact (MW), is that MUST uses a unity power factor; whereas, PSSE has a power factor that fluctuates due to system constraints. The SU impact calculations will be the same as the process described in Section 5.3.2.1 System Impact Study.

### Impact of Base Case Contingency Overloads

If a facility is loaded past 100% of its applicable thermal rating (under contingency) prior to the customer’s service request, that overload amount will not be counted as capacity used against that SU. For example, if a customer upgrades an existing line by 100MW, the customer’s impact is 25MW, and the existing overload is 30 MW, the amount of capacity used on the Supplemental Upgrade will be recorded as 25 MW, leaving 75 MW available for use by other customers.

Table 2, below, provides an example of the various parameters for a SU of an existing facility whose rating is increased by 100 MW, with an existing BCCO.
Table 2 - BCCO Impact on SU Example

### 6 Examples

This section will be developed further based on stakeholder input.
Appendix 1: Process Flowcharts

System Impact Study / Facilities Study Process
February 23, 2011

Customer
- Customer submits long-term OASIS request
- Customer produces SISA and sends to ICT

ICT Planning
- ICT prepares and sends Customer SISA
- ICT updates TSR Study Queue
- ICT determines if model inputs have been sent from Entergy
- ICT proceeds to updating existing models
- ICT reviews and validates inputs received from Entergy

Entergy
- Entergy provides ICT with update to models

 Were Previously funded Supplemental Upgrades identified as impacted?
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- SU YES

No
- SU NO

Yes
- SU YES

No
- SU NO
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System Impact Study / Facilities Study Process
February 23, 2011

Customer

ICT Planning

Entropy

SU NO

SU YES

ICT calculates MIV impact

Has Entergy updated SU cost and rating estimates?

ICT calculates the SU impact cost

Requested service available with existing facilities?

YES

ICT prepares SIS Report with SU impacts, if any. Forwards report to Entergy

NO

ICT prepares SIS Report with limitations, SU impacts, & mitigation. Forwards report to Entergy

Entergy reviews SIS Report and comments back to ICT

Entergy provides ICT updated info
System Impact Study / Facilities Study Process
February 23, 2011

Customer
- Customer is notified of SISR posting and provided link to final report.
- Customer reviews and executes TSA, after confirming service on OASIS.
- Customer decides if they want counteroffer from SIG.

ICT Planning
- ICT will incorporate Entergy’s comments into the SISR, if any.
- ICT will post the Final SISR on Entergy’s OASIS and send notification to Customer.
- ICT updates TSR study queue.
- Partial service available with existing facilities.
- ICT asks Customer if they want counteroffer.

Entergy
- Entergy is copied on customer notification of SISR posting.
- Entergy will draft TSA for Customer.

Request remains in TSR study queue.
- Requested service not available with existing facilities.
- FSA.
System Impact Study / Facilities Study Process
February 23, 2011

Customer
- Customer executes FSA and sends back to ICT

ICT Planning
- ICT prepares and sends Customer FSA
- ICT receives executed FSA, updates TSR study queue, and forwards to Entergy
- ICT reviews and validates solution set
- ICT calculates MW impact amount for previously funded SU
- ICT calculates capacity created amount for newly identified SU
- FSR

Entergy
- Copy of signed FSA forwarded to Entergy
- Entergy updates Basecase models provided by ICT
- Entergy develops solution set for request
- Entergy scopes project upgrades and cost estimates
- Were Supplemental Upgrades identified as impacted?
  - YES
  - NO: Entergy prepares FS Report with SU impacts, if any. Forwards report to ICT
2012 Reliability Assessment Scope

March 2011
Interregional Planning

Southwest Power Pool
2012 ICT Reliability Assessment Scope

Objective
The objective of the Reliability Assessment is to assess the ability of the Entergy transmission system to perform according to Entergy’s Planning Criteria and the ICT’s planning criteria enhancements in both near-term and long-term horizons.

Models
- RA Models
  - Base Case 2010-Series Update 1 with Approved 2011-2013 CP projects
  - Summer and Winter Peak 2013 and 2017 for near-term.
  - Summer Peak 2020 for longer-term.

- CPE Models
  - Base Case 2010-Series Update 1 with Approved and Proposed 2012-2014 CP projects
  - Summer and Winter Peak 2013 and 2017 for near-term.
  - Summer Peak 2020 for longer-term.

- Low Hydro Analysis Models
  - Base Case 2010-Series Update 1 with 2011-2013 Approved CP projects
  - Summers 2013, 2017 and 2020
    - Bull Shoals – off
    - Greers Ferry – off
    - Sam Rayburn – off
    - Bull Shoals, Greers Ferry, Norfork, and Table Rock at 50% capacity

- Load Pocket Analysis Models (N-1, G-1 evaluation)
  - Base Case 2010-Series Update 1 with 2011-2013 Approved CP projects
  - Summer 2017
    - Western Region
      - Lewis Creek U1 – off
    - Amite South
      - Waterford U3 – off
    - DSG
      - Nine Mile U5 – off
      - Michoud U3 – off

Model Preparation
The Base Case Model will be updated to reflect:
1. The latest confirmed transmission service reservations.
2. Updated topology: equipment which has been newly placed in-service.
3. Approved and Proposed projects from the 2012-2014 DRAFT Construction Plan projects in the season in which the facilities are expected to be complete and for all seasons thereafter.
Software
- PSSE v30
- MUST 9.1

Contingency Scans (BP, Low Hydro, RA, CPE)
- Category A
  - The Base Case Model will be evaluated under normal, system-intact conditions.
  - Monitored elements must remain within the thermal and voltage limits specified in Entergy’s Transmission Local Planning Criteria for Category A, currently flows less than 100% of RATEA; voltages between 0.95 and 1.05 per unit.
  - Identify all elements that do not meet the Category A limits.
- Category B
  - N-1 contingency scans were run on the Base Case Models.
  - Monitored elements must remain within the thermal and voltage limits specified in Entergy’s Transmission Local Planning Criteria for Category B, currently flows less than 100% of RATEA; voltages between 0.92 and 1.05 per unit.
  - For each monitored element that does not remain within these limits, the breaker-to-breaker circuit for the contingency was identified and an analysis was done with the entire circuit out of service, if the breaker-to-breaker outage differs from the simulated outage.
  - (ICT 100MW rule) If there is more than 100MW of consequential load between breakers then the bus to bus contingency was used to identify overloads and voltage issues.
- Monitored Elements
  - Entergy Internal:
    - Transmission elements within Entergy’s footprint (including embedded Areas) with nominal voltage 69 kV and higher.
    - Ties to outside Areas at 69 kV and higher.
  - CLECO & LUS: Transmission elements with nominal voltage 69 kV and higher.
  - All other first-tier Areas (AECI, SOCO, TVA, SMEPA, SWPA, AEPW, OKGE, EMDE): Transmission elements with nominal voltage 345 kV and higher.
- Contingencies
  - Same as Monitored Elements

Load Pocket Contingencies
The contingencies below will be applied to each corresponding scenario of the Load Pocket Analysis models that can be found in the models section above. This creates the appropriate N1G1 scenarios for each load pocket defined in Entergy’s Local Planning Criteria Section 7.6.

Western Contingencies
- China – Jacinto 230kV
- China – Porter 230kV
- Crockett – Grimes 230kV
- Doucette – Corrigan Bulk 230kV
- Cypress – Poco 138kV
- Cypress – Hightower 138kV
- Dayton Bulk – New Caney 138kV
- Dayton Bulk – New Long John 138kV

- Amite South Contingencies
  - Waterford – Willow Glen 500kV

- DSG Contingencies
  - Michoud – Front Street 230kV
  - Nine Mile – Waterford 230kV
  - Gypsy – Wesco 230kV
  - Gypsy – University City 230kV
  - Gypsy – Ponchartrain 230kV
Helping our members work together to keep the lights on... today and in the future
WPP Update
SPC Meeting

March 17, 2011

Antoine Lucas
alucas@spp.org: 501.614.3382
## WPP Weekly Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th># Offers Submitted</th>
<th>Total MWs Offered</th>
<th># of Offers Accepted</th>
<th>Total MWs Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/22/11 – 1/28/11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/11 – 2/4/11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/11 – 2/11/11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/11 – 2/18/11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19/11 – 2/25/11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26/11 – 3/4/11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,690</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5/11 – 3/11/11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/12/11 – 3/18/11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WPP Task Force

• 2/1/11
  – Selected Chair: John Heisey, Entegra Power Group.
  – Discussed information desired to expand the transparency of the WPP.
  – Stakeholders committed to develop a transparency recommendation to present to the SPC.

• 2/14/11
  – Discussed the WPPTF Transparency Recommendation submitted by stakeholders. *(Recommendation approved by the SPC on 2/22/11).*
  – Entergy committed to provide its position on the SPC approved WPPTF Transparency Recommendation within two weeks. *(Received Entergy’s position on 3/9/11).*
WPP Task Force (continued)

• 2/14/11
  – The ICT committed to develop its independent position on the SPC approved WPP Transparency Recommendation within two weeks after receiving Entergy’s response (approx. 3/22/11).
  – Received an update on Entergy’s commitment to file amendments to Attachment V in order to implement the WPP Offer Period Extension Proposal.
  – ICT notified the WPPTF that the ICT’s second round of testing of the WPP QF Put proposal was underway and includes the WPP Offer Period Extension as an active modeling assumption.
  – ICT committed to present the results of this testing when completed.
Questions ?