SPP Southwest Power Pool

Transmission Owner Selection Process Questions Log
Question/Answer Matrix for RFP# SPP-RFP-000001
North Liberal - Walkemeyer 115 kV Ckt 1

No.	Question/Comment Submitted	SPP Response	Date Q&A Posted
1	What does the $16.8M cost include in the Request for Proposal (RFP), because the 2015 ITP10 report states $36.6M?	The original project in the 2015 ITP10 that was pulled into the 2015 ITPNT was to tap the Hitchland to Finney 345 kV line at NewSub, new step down 345/115 kV transformer at NewSub, a new 1-mile 115 kV transmission line from NewSub to Walkemeyer, and then a new 21-mile 115 kV transmission line from Walkemeyer to North Liberal. This total project was the $36.6M. The SPP Board of Directors (BOD) had the 21-mile 115 kV transmission line from Walkemeyer to North Liberal upgrade removed from the 2015 ITPNT and put in the 2015 ITP10, and the RFP is issued for this project only as a Competitive Upgrade. The cost for this portion only is $16.8M.	6/8/2015
2	What happens if the cost of the project is outside of the +/-20% bandwidth, as described in SPP Business Practice 7060 (BP7060)? Is the RFP Respondent's cost estimate bound by that bandwidth?	Attachment Y, Section III.2.d.v, of the SPP Tariff, states [underline added]: *If the Transmission Provider does not receive any complete proposals in response to an RFP, the Transmission Provider shall inform the SPP Board of Directors and shall select the DTO in accordance with the process set forth in Section IV of this Attachment Y. <u>If all of the RFP proposals for a Competitive Upgrade include cost estimates that exceed the cost estimate determined by the Transmission Provider at the time the Competitive Upgrade was approved for construction by thirty (30) percent or more, the Transmission Provider shall inform the SPP Board of Directors, and the SPP Board of Directors shall decide whether to proceed with the IEP review of the RFP responses, or whether to withdraw the RFP and reevaluate the Competitive Upgrade.</u> If the SPP Board of Directors withdraws the RFP, each RFP Proposal shall be entitled to a partial refund of its Transmission Owner Selection Process deposit as set forth in Section III.2(e)(iv) of this Attachment Y.* During the study process, SPP staff makes assumptions regarding line length, and the focus is on determining what facilities need to be put in place to address the needs identified. In this instance, the decision was a transmission line from A to B, and SPP approximated 21-miles for the distance from A to B, and the cost estimate provided in the RFP is a conceptual estimate based on the estimated mileage between A and B. The actual line routing will be determined by the state commissions. RFP Respondents should make their own assumptions and describe those assumptions in the RFP Response. Once a final RFP Respondent is selected to be the Designated Transmission Owner (DTO) by the BOD, that final cost from the RFP Response selected will become the baseline cost for the Project Tracking process going forward.	6/8/2015

SPP Southwest Power Pool

Transmission Owner Selection Process Questions Log
Question/Answer Matrix for RFP# SPP-RFP-000001
North Liberal - Walkemeyer 115 kV Ckt 1

No.	Question/Comment Submitted	SPP Response	Date Q&A Posted
3	What was the reasoning for the short duration for regulatory approvals? The RFP states regulatory approvals must be complete by June 1, 2016. In order for a new entrant to obtain utility status within a new state, a project must first be awarded and then it takes about 12 months. By keeping this date for regulatory approvals to be complete, only members in Kansas with blanket status will be able to submit an RFP Response. A suggestion was made that the RFP timeline be reviewed to allow time for the regulatory process. An additional suggestion was made that potentially an operating guide could be used to allow the timeframe to accommodate new entrants getting status within a state. A request for a description of the expected financial expenditure date was also requested.	The regulatory approval completion date and the expected financial expenditure date were discussed extensively at the SPC Task Force on Order 1000 (SPCTF), now the Competitive Transmission Process Task Force (CTPTF). SPCTF determined that this date would be the RTO Determined Need Date minus lead time, and that the primary approval required would be to do business in that state; obtain utility status. In order to change this requirement, a Revision Request (RR) would have to be submitted and the change taken back through the stakeholder process. (Link: http://www.spp.org/section.asp?pageID=201). The expected financial expenditure date is also the RTO Determined Need Date minus lead time. SPP Legal stated this is a FERC Order 1000 requirement, and in discussions, SPCTF determined that the most permissive regulatory approval date to accommodate as many competitors as possible was to only require obtaining utility status in the state where the Competitive Upgrade is located. Since it is a FERC Order 1000 requirement, there may not be much leeway in getting rid of the date altogether. This does not include siting or any other regulatory requirement. SPP staff added that this item will be a topic at an upcoming CTPTF meeting on June 10, 2015, adding that on a state by state basis, what is required to do business as an electric utility varies by state. With regard to changing the RFP Response Window or existing RFP timeline, the SPP Tariff and Business Practices are specific about the timeline for the RFP, and any change to account for regulatory approvals would require changes through the stakeholder process, as described above.	6/8/2015
4	Why would RFP bidders need to provide in their RFP response any details about where they exceeded the Minimum Transmission Design Standards (MTDS)?	One of the Acknowledgements in Section 4 of the RFP requires RFP Respondent to acknowledge that all MTDS have been met. The RFP Response Form provides the opportunity to detail information if the MTDS are exceeded to support and differentiate an RFP response. **Action Item:** SPP Staff did agree to review the wording for future RFPs to ensure the intent is clear going forward.	6/8/2015
5	What are the clearance requirements for Pivot Irrigation Systems? They are not in the MTDS or RFP.	**Action Item:** Jeff Stebbins, Chairman of the Minimum Design Standards Task Force (MDSTF) mentioned NESC, but would take an action item to follow-up with specifics. SPP staff mentioned a possible IEEE standard (IEEE 1542-2007), and follow-up review is required.	6/8/2015
6	Once a project is awarded, requirement is that 2% of the cost is to be made as a deposit, that will be refundable when half the project is complete. Who determines when 50% of the project is complete?	The 50% completion date would be decided after the award of the bid, between the bidder and SPP. SPP through the stakeholder process will continue to evaluate the best way to determine this percentage for the future.	6/8/2015
7	Is the SPP Board of Directors obligated to award the bid at the first meeting?	The SPP Tariff only requires the BOD to receive the Industry Expert Panel (IEP) report and recommendation and make a decision. There are no details regarding re-evaluations and further BOD action.	6/8/2015
8	RFP timetable show last day to ask questions (which is a Saturday), does that mean questions will be cut off on Friday	RFP questions will be accepted via the SPP Request Management System (RMS) until the end of the next business day, Monday, October 19, 2015. (RMS link: https://spprms.issuetrak.com/login.asp)	6/8/2015
9	In Section 4, Acknowledgements, A-7 and A-8, is N/A acceptable for these boxes?	Yes, N/A is acceptable for A-7 and A-8 in Section 4, Acknowledgments, of the RFP. **Action Item:** SPP Staff will update the RFP Instruction document to clarify.	6/8/2015

Transmission Owner Selection Process Questions Log
Question/Answer Matrix for RFP# SPP-RFP-000001
North Liberal - Walkemeyer 115 kV Ckt 1

No.	Question/Comment Submitted	SPP Response	Date Q&A Posted
10	When bids are submitted, what information is redacted for the IEP Report, and what information is redacted for the public report?	Tariff requires the IEP to provide an internal recommendation report to SPP staff. SPP staff takes the IEP recommendation report and creates two reports -- one for the BOD with redacted information that would identify the bidder, including name, addresses or any other identifying information; and another report to be publicly posted, with all confidential information redacted. The Oversight Committee specifically asked that any identifying information be removed for the BOD report. Only the BOD sees the BOD report and the public report is posted publicly. Also, Attachment Y, Section III.2.c.v.7 requires that the RFP Response provide the following: *(7) identification of information in the RFP Proposal that the RFP Respondent considers to be confidential.*	6/8/2015
11	Will the BOD report have all bids or just selected and alternate?	This topic is currently being discussed at CTPTF. The current discussion is that all bids will be identified on the report to the BOD, listing the bidders and points received, in order, so that the top bidder would be the recommended bidder, but no identifying information (*i.e.* , just Bidder1, Bidder2, etc.). In addition, a request has been made to the CTPTF that once an RFP has been awarded, that the individual bidders will be told how they scored and their final bid ranking.	6/8/2015
12	Without having all the details/requirements, should RFP Respondents make assumptions in their cost estimate and response?	Yes, just provide justification and explanation in the RFP Response form.	6/8/2015
13	Do Sunflower and Mid-Kansas use the same Interconnection Requirements?	Yes, SPP has a letter confirming the Interconnection Requirements are for both parties.	6/8/2015
14	What are the points of demarcation for the transmission line and associated equipment or transmission line structure required? Will RFP Respondents know where they need to enter the existing substation, deadends, or what the existing configuration is inside the substation? Will the RFP bidder have any say related to what protective equipment is required?	SPP staff provided that any information not in the Interconnection Requirements would have to be facilitated with the facility owner if it is required in order to provide an RFP Response. An action item was taken to further address items not provided for in the Interconnection Requirements, since this type of detailed information will need to be provided by the incumbent utility. *Examples* : Fiber box inside or outside the fence, points of demarcation, protection scheme (needed prior to bid award?), communication, future coordination for operation and maintenance. SPP staff has allowed QRPs until 6/9/2015 to provide questions related to the current facilities and will be coordinating the responses with the incumbent and publicly posting responses to spp.org. SPP staff provided that this type of coordination of information and interconnection goes on today and the Project Cost Working Group (PCWG) is adding language to BP 7060 to require the incumbent TO to work with the awarded DTO.	6/8/2015
15	From a process standpoint, incumbent TOs need to be protected from having multiple contacts from potential bidders.	**Action Item:** SPP staff agreed and stated that this has also been discussed at CTPTF. SPP staff has taken an action item to determine a process for compiling information needed from incumbent TO and obtaining that information to provide to QRPs for use with their RFP Response. For the purpose of this RFP, SPP staff has allowed QRPs until 6/9/2015 to provide questions related to the current facilities for the incumbent and will be publicly posting responses to spp.org. **Update:** Questions were sent to the incumbent TO and the responses were posted to TrueShare on 7/14/2015. See Response to Question #27 for further information on obtaining this information.	6/8/2015 Updated: 8/6/2015
16	Should the RFP Response estimate submitted be in 2014 or 2015 dollars?	It should be in 2015 dollars. **Action Item:** SPP staff will review documents to ensure that is clear going forward.	6/8/2015

SPP Southwest Power Pool

Transmission Owner Selection Process Questions Log
Question/Answer Matrix for RFP# SPP-RFP-000001
North Liberal - Walkemeyer 115 kV Ckt 1

No.	Question/Comment Submitted	SPP Response	Date Q&A Posted
17	Is there a procedure in place that would allow bidders to determine the identities of the IEP panelists evaluating the bids? A recommendation was made to review the IEP process for asking questions to clarify the procedures.	SPP staff stated that in October 2014, the BOD approved a recommendation from the Oversight Committee approving a pool of industry experts. For each RFP, a panel of industry experts will be selected to form the IEP. There is no requirement to identify which panelists will be involved, and SPP does not have an expectation this information will be made available. **Action Item:** IEP will be allowed to ask clarifying questions through SPP staff. SPP staff took an action item to review the process for how these questions will be handled, whether through direct contact or via SPP staff.	6/8/2015
18	Does SPP staff envision that the RFP responses will come in and SPP staff will have a list of some that they will have clarifying calls or further discussion with regarding their RFP responses?	SPP staff is required to do a completeness check of incoming RFP responses. In BP 7700, SPP staff is allowed 10 days in order to accomplish this task. There is no cure period for an RFP response, and the sooner RFP responses are received, the earlier SPP staff can respond if submittals are incomplete to allow RFP Respondent time to further comply before the close of the RFP Response Window.	6/8/2015
19	Is the 1200A rating emergency or normal?	It is an emergency rating. Notifications to Construct (NTCs) are issued at emergency rating, and the MTDS specifies emergency rating.	6/8/2015
20	What was the reasoning for the RFP Response form being in an Excel format instead of a Word document?	During the stakeholder review process, this was the way the RFP Response form was presented and developed. No request was made for any other format. The Excel format also allows for an easier way to divide up the RFP information to the IEP, and also mirrors the RFP scoring criteria found in Attachment Y of the SPP Tariff.	6/8/2015
21	How was it decided to use a 40-year ATRR?	SPP staff stated this is a Tariff requirement.	6/8/2015
22	Would substation layouts for line termination points from the incumbent TOs be available?	SPP staff clarified that the identification of deadends at each substation on either end of the line would be required, and referenced back to Question #14 above. SPP staff will need to work with the incumbent TO for that information.	6/8/2015
23	Please provide clarification around Tab 1A.12 "Estimated Life of Construction" for the transmission line assumption in the RFP Response Form, because life expectancy is not something usually determined in transmission line design.	SPP staff stated this is a Tariff requirement.	6/8/2015
24	Please provide clarification around Tab 1A.15 "Losses (Design Efficiency)" assumption in the RFP Response Form.	This item is required by the SPP Tariff and was discussed in CTPTF and it was determined this should be calculated as 70% of rating based on line design, and this information is found in the RFP Instruction document posted here: http://www.spp.org/publications/RFP%20Response%20Form%20Instructions.pdf.	6/8/2015
25	Please provide clarification around Tab 1A.22 "Reliability/Quality Metrics" in the RFP Response Form.	This item is required by the SPP Tariff and was discussed in CTPTF and it was determined that for this item, the RFP Respondent should provide any metrics they used to justify and/or support their bid.	6/8/2015
26	In the SPP RFP - Response Form Instructions dated 5/5/15, on page 30 under the Steps to complete this RFP Requirement Step 2, item 8 it wants the respondent to include the revenue credits for Point-to-Point to be factored into the Revenue Requirement calculation. Since SPP is the Tariff administrator, shouldn't SPP, for a given defined project like the current Walkemeyer project, provide an estimate of this expected Point-to-Point revenue to all potential respondents so that all the bidders revenue requirements have a consistent credit in them? Please advise	You may provide your best estimate of what to anticipate for the Point-to-Point revenue credits or elect to not provide such estimates. SPP will not be providing a standard estimate for this project at this time and for future projects will re-evaluate how this credit is addressed for RFP Responses. As with all parts of a RFP Response, a respondent can provide or choose not to provide, what information they feel best completes their RFP Proposal.	7/13/2015
27	How will a QRP gain access to specific Q&A interconnection requirements from incumbent TO?	The responses and information related to the Q&A interconnection requirements for RFP 000001 has been posted to Trueshare. To gain access to the document, you will be required to complete a NDA, if not already done, and an addendum to the NDA specific to this RFP. Once these agreements are signed and returned to SPP you will be granted access to the information. Contact Mitch Jackson in SPP Modeling to obtain and process the agreements needed to gain access to the Trueshare document: mjackson@spp.org / 501-614-3542	7/16/2015

No.	Question/Comment Submitted	SPP Response	Date Q&A Posted
28	RFP Response Form Section Identifier 1A.15: It is our understanding that we are to provide the losses at 70% of emergency rating. How many hours per year do we use in the calculation? How are losses evaluated, will SPP convert the kWh to a cost and then NPV the costs over the life of the project?	The assumption is that the average loading is 70% of Rate B or emergency rating based on RFP Respondent's line design. For example, this can be answered by providing a response based on instantaneous loss calculations (*i.e.* , line design impedance times flow) or based on an estimate of losses on an annual basis (roughly instantaneous loss number times hours at 70% loading), but RFP Respondent will need to provide their number for losses and provide what assumptions were used. At a minimum, provide the instantaneous loss calculation number either as the answer or as the assumption for the annualized response. RFP Respondent may provide an accompanying narrative to further explain or support their assumptions. Evaluation of losses, along with the other elements of the RFP Response, will be part of the Industry Expert Panel (IEP) evaluation.	8/6/2015
29	The bid template includes a tax of 9%. So is it permissible to change the tax rate in the bid response template?	Yes, please use whatever tax rate is appropriate to your RFP Response.	8/6/2015
30	Section Identifier B.7 is the same as B.6. However, on the Response Form Instructions it has a different discussion for B.7 which we assume is the correct one to use.	Correct. In looking at a previous form, the correct B.7 should say, “Describe any right of first refusal (ROFR) granted to RFP Respondent under relevant law for the Competitive Upgrade.” This looks like a cut and paste or Excel cell “drag” error. **Action Item:** SPP will update form accordingly going forward.	8/6/2015
31	Response Form Instructions, page 17, Section Identifier 1A.9 Design Criteria: states " . . . load conditions are discussed on page 5 of SEDG." What are you referring by SEDG?	SEDG is the Study Estimate Design Guide, and page 5 does contain information related to this section. **Action Item:** SPP staff will update the RFP instruction document going forward to refer to the MTDS “Structural Design Loads” section.	8/6/2015
32	Response Form Instructions, page 18, Section Identifier 1A.21 Describe any communication requirements with existing Transmission Owner: states we are to provide evidence of communication requirements with existing TO named in the RFP. Are you asking if we have had discussions with the existing TO? We don't understand what you are asking us to provide? It is our understanding that we are not supposed to contact the existing TO.	The incumbent TO interconnection requirements document was posted on OASIS here: http://www.oasis.oati.com/SWPP/SWPPdocs/SPP-RFP-00001_SUNC-MKEC_Interconnection_Requirements_05MAY2015.pdf. In addition, SPP staff allowed QRPs until 6/9/2015 to provide questions related to the current facilities for the incumbent TO. Those responses were posted to TrueShare on 7/14/2015. See Response to Question #27 for further information on obtaining this information. For item 1A.21, RFP Respondent may specifically itemize any communication requirements not already addressed.	8/6/2015
33	RFP Response Form: By current dollars we assume you mean 2015$.	Yes.	8/6/2015
34	Response Form Instructions, page 27, Section Identifier 4D.4 Detail Revenue Requirements and any relevant documentation: has different requirements for whether or not the RFP Respondent has a FERC-accepted Formula Rate. We have filed our Formula Rate with FERC but don't have final approval. Are allowed to use the Formula Rate that we have on file?	Yes. Per BP7700, a RFP Respondent is allowed to use a Formula Rate Template that has been filed with FERC but not yet ruled on with the stipulation it is provided to SPP prior final RFP Response submission for review. SPP Business Practices can be found here: http://www.spp.org/section.asp?group=3627&pageID=27.	8/6/2015
35	RFP Response Form Section Identifier 4C.14 Security Measures: Please expand on what this cost is to cover. Is this the cost to comply with NERC Requirements or are you looking for something else?	RFP Response Form Section Identifier 4C.14 is for a RFP Respondent to provide any individual itemized cost for Section Identifier 1A.14 (Describe security measures and protection schemes) not already addressed elsewhere in the RFP Response Form. Security refers to the protection of construction materials and equipment during the construction process. Any costs specifically related to security measures in this context would be what is entered in 4C.14. **Action Item:** SPP staff will review documents to ensure that is clear going forward.	8/6/2015

No.	Question/Comment Submitted	SPP Response	Date Q&A Posted
36	Describe "security measures and protection schemes" with this short description: "Describe security measures and protection schemes related to line construction." It is unclear what "security measures" or "protection schemes" are to be addressed Item 1A.14 by RFP Respondents. Could SPP provide examples of "security measures" related to line construction; or, alternatively, confirm that Item 1A.14 "security measures" refers to things such as locks on gates, security personnel at material staging yards, and the like? Could SPP provide examples of "protection schemes" related to line construction; or, alternatively, confirm that Item 1A.14 "protection schemes" refers to things such as road-crossing guard structures, work construction signage, traffic barriers, and the like? Please define, or clarify the meaning of, "security measures" and "protection schemes" related to line construction in Item 1A.14.	See response to Question #35. The examples in Question #36 of "security measures" follow the intent of item 1A.14. Also, the RFP Response Form was developed as a standard form for RFP Responses. All fields are available for RFP Respondents to provide a response, if needed. However, all fields may not be applicable for all RFPs. In general, all items on tab 1A relate to line assumptions, while tab 1B are for substation assumptions. In this RFP, any work that would pertain to the substation terminal upgrades would be handled by the incumbent TO. Security measures and protection schemes are closely related since they are applicable to the security of the public, material and equipment during the construction process. **Action Item:** SPP staff will review documents to ensure that is clear going forward.	8/6/2015
37	Item 1A.21 of the RFP Response Form is titled "Describe any communication requirements with existing Transmission Owner" with this short description: "Provide evidence of communication requirements with existing TO named in the RFP." Since SPP-RFP-00001 is for a transmission line (without any substation work), it's not clear what "evidence" is being requested in Item 1A.21. Further, the "Incumbent TO Interconnection Information" that SPP posted to Trueshare indicates that the Incumbent TO does not expect to coordinate communication requirements (including possible CIP considerations) until after the bidder is awarded the construction of the transmission line (see, e.g., Trueshare Incumbent TO responses ITO-11 and ITO-12). Please confirm that the only "evidence of communication requirements with existing TO named in the RFP" that can be provided in an RFP Respondent's Response Form is strictly limited to that information contained in the TOs' Interconnection Requirements and in the "Incumbent TO Interconnection Information" that SPP posted to Trueshare (e.g., ITO-8).	See Response to Question #32.	8/6/2015
38	Provide the anticipated fault currents generated at both North Liberal and Walkemeyer Substations	RFP Respondents may perform any additional study or analysis to support their RFP Response (*i.e.* , short circuit or stability study) and may provide that information when they submit their RFP Response.	8/6/2015
39	Does 'first year' mean the remaining portion of the first calendar year of the project or the first 12 months after project award, and then subsequent years adjustments are made on the following 12 month anniversary?	In current year dollars give us the "first year" of the project, so if the current year is 2015 and project goes in 2018, provide what the cost for 2018 will be in 2015 dollars and then subsequent years adjustments on a 12 month anniversary.	9/1/2015
40	4C.18 requires an "internal escalation rate" is this intended to be a predictive annual percentage to be applied or, a proposed escalation/inflation index to be applied based on calculation of the actual index performance on the yearly anniversary?	This requirement is intended to be a predictive annual percentage to be applied.	9/1/2015
41	Is escalation calculated on a compounding basis such that, for example, third and fourth year adjustments are calculated using a remaining costs which include escalation previously calculated for year two?	Yes escalation is calculated on a compounding basis as described, assuming that when referring to third and fourth year adjustments that is referring to project investments made in the third and fourth year.	9/1/2015
42	Is the value of escalation included within the +/-20% cost accuracy range or is the cost accuracy range always evaluated using current year dollars?	All cost estimates provided should be in current year dollars. Escalation is accounted for in the +/-20% bandwidth, if the baseline estimate was established in a previous calendar year. For example, if we received the baseline estimate in 2013, and we have an updated estimate in 2015, we will escalate the baseline estimate for two years at the rate that was assumed in the planning study that originated the project.	9/1/2015
43	In docket ER15-1918 SPP proposed a change to the financial contingencies requirements.	SPP proposed to modify the financial contingencies that bidders are required to demonstrate when they bid on a Competitive Upgrade from 30% to 20%. FERC found that this request was just and reasonable and accepted the Tariff revisions as proposed in this docket. The modification to a 20% financial contingency requirement will be in effect for SPP-RFP-000001.	9/1/2015

Transmission Owner Selection Process Questions Log
Question/Answer Matrix for RFP# SPP-RFP-000001
North Liberal - Walkemeyer 115 kV Ckt 1

No.	Question/Comment Submitted	SPP Response	Date Q&A Posted
44	5.2 – We do not intend to obtain financing prior to this project being awarded. What evidence is required in this response?	Per Attachment Y Section III.2(f)(5) an RFP Respondent must show the ability to obtain financing for the Competitive Upgrade. It is up to the RFP Respondent to propose how it would intend to finance a project and show it has the ability to obtain this financing. Whether it is credit based, balanced sheet liquidity, a mix etc. is up to the RFP Respondent but should be demonstrated in a response. Per Attachment Y Section III.2 (c)(v), each RFP response must demonstrate that each RFP Respondent possess the necessary financial strength to finance the Competitive Upgrade plus reasonable contingency. In Section III.2(c)(vi) details 3 options for demonstrating this financial strength with "conclusive evidence". This section also provides a definition of conclusive evidence. That definition states "conclusive evidence" shall mean "a letter from a bonding agent or bank indicating approval of or willingness to provide the required performance bond or letter of credit to the RFP Respondent."	9/9/2015
45	5.3 - We do not intend to obtain financing prior to this project being awarded. What support for material conditions is required? See previous question response.	Any specific conditions associated with how the RFP Respondent proposes to finance the project should be detailed. Depending on the condition, supporting material for the condition may be in documents associated with the definition of conclusive evidence. If not, provide at a minimal what the conditions are.	9/9/2015
46	5.4 – What is meant by a financial business plan? Is this a description of how we intend to finance the project company, or something different?	This should include how the "project company" would be financed and the overall business plan for that company.	9/9/2015
47	5.7 - We do not intend to obtain financing prior to this project being awarded. What support for debt covenants is required?	SPP wants to ensure that after taking on the project the company won't be in violation of its debt covenants. If the company has no debt covenants and isn't taking on new debt that would have covenants, then the response is N/A. If there are existing debt covenants or will be new debt covenants, the company should document a pro forma covenant compliance worksheet indicating compliance before taking on the project and after taking on the project.	9/9/2015
48	5.10 – Is this requesting something beyond the broader "financial statements" request in 5.5?	If a cash flow analysis statement was included with the financial statements then this requirement may reference the location of that cash flow analysis.	9/9/2015
49	Questions on tab 6: BP 7700 says if we are in the process of seeking a formula rate, we are to use that formula rate in lieu tab 6. In the absence of using tab 6, what support for the formula rate or resulting ATRR is required? What discount rate is used for the NPV calculation? If everyone is using their own formula rate, how does SPP confirm a respondent's formula is being applied correctly in the ATRR tab?	Per the RFP Instruction Document and BP7700, Tab 6 is only to be completed if a RFP Respondent does not have or is not seeking approval of a FERC formula rate template. BP7700 also instructs any RFP Respondent in the process of obtaining a FERC approved formula rate template to provide that template to SPP prior to final RFP Proposal submission so that SPP Staff may review the template and confirm it meets all requirements. For RFP Respondents using this method to meet the requirement, a completed formula rate template with all factors included should be part of a final RFP Proposal.	9/9/2015
50	Is there a public forum where we can view the questions and responses of other respondents on this project?	Yes. All Q&A related to this RFP have been posted under the Order 1000 Documents folder. To date, an updated version with new Q&A has been posted twice. A notification was sent to the CTPTF and Order 1000 exploders each time.	9/9/2015
51	In reading the Walkemeyer response form, tab 4D indicates we should put an "N/A" in fields not applicable to this RFP response. Can you provide guidance as to which fields are required for this project?	RFP Respondents should complete all fields it feels are necessary to provide all relevant information pertaining to its RFP Response. For example if the answer to 4.d.3 is none, then it would be applicable to answer with N/A. However, if yes, then an answer should be provided and supported. The N/A is an option afforded to the RFP Respondent if needed, but the necessity of the N/A is determined by the RFP Respondent not SPP.	9/9/2015
52	Can you give a sense for what is meant by "any relevant documentation" as it relates to all 9 items on this tab?	This should include any documentation providing proof or answers to the questions.	9/9/2015
53	Item 4D.5 asks us to detail the "Lifetime cost of the project to customers", but does not indicate how that is to be calculated or detailed. Can you provide more information on this calculation?	All ATRRs (40 year life) summed up by year through the life of the Facility/or when it is depreciated to $0. That information would provide the customer with an estimate of the costs they would be responsible for over the life of the facility. With the understanding that the ATRR will be higher in beginning years and trending down to $0 in the future.	9/9/2015
54	The proposal requests estimated costs in 2015 dollars ($) but we also have to develop a cash flow for ATRR purposes. Please advise as to what inflation and discount factors we should apply to our costs to achieve the future cash flows.	The factors are to be determined and provided by the RFP Respondent. ****Updated on 9/15/2015 The discount rate should be 8%. All other factors are still to be determined by the RFP Respondent	9/9/2015
55	Please clarify the nature of the Losses inquiry in tab 1A.15. Specifically: Is the inquiry directed to real power losses only or reactive losses as well? Also: is 70% of emergency related to the specified 1200 Amp line rating or 70% of our selected conductor choice?	See answers to questions 24 and 28 above.	9/11/2015

Transmission Owner Selection Process Questions Log
Question/Answer Matrix for RFP# SPP-RFP-000001
North Liberal - Walkemeyer 115 kV Ckt 1

No.	Question/Comment Submitted	SPP Response	Date Q&A Posted
56	If an RFP respondent submits a complete proposal prior to the deadline, can the respondent submit revised information prior to the final submission date at either or both of the following times: 1) after initial submission but prior to a completeness check; or 2) after a completeness check is completed?	Question 1) Yes Question 2) Yes, however if this submission happens within 10 business days of the close of RFP Response Window, the new completeness check may not be completed. See Business Practice 7700 section "RFP Receipt and Response" for more detail. Any updates to RFP Responses require a complete submission of the entire RFP Response within RMS on the original ticket number. See same section of business practice 7700 referenced above for more detail.	9/11/2015
57	Updates to RFP Response Form:		9/11/2015
	- Date Regulatory Approval Complete Updated (Tab B, 2A, & 2B)	This date was changed and approved per the SPP Board to 1/1/2017 or a period of 8 months from the issuance of this NTC	9/11/2015
	- Tab B, Section Identifier B.7	This item was updated per the copy/paste error with the original RFP Response Form. Per the RFP Instruction document this cell should have said, “Describe any right of first refusal (ROFR) granted to RFP Respondent under relevant law for the Competitive Upgrade.” Previously it copied section Identifier B.6.	9/11/2015
	- Tab 5, Cell C5	The financial contingency requirements were recently approved by FERC to be reduced from 30% to 20%. This cell has been updated to reflect the change.	9/11/2015
	- Update Discount Rate (Tab 6)	SPP determined to prescribe the Discount Rate used on Tab 6 to be 8% and be left up to RFP Responders to determine. All responses should use this discount rate.	9/11/2015
	- NPCC Cell C6 (Tab 6)	Retitled to "NPCC Excluding Depreciation" The formula in column B for rows 13 – 52 accounts for the straight-line depreciation over a 40 year period. SPP realizes this treatment of depreciation could potentially account for minor differences as compared to 40 years’ worth of formula rate templates for a project but for the purpose of this evaluation, this method is sufficient. If a RFP Respondent would prefer to account for the depreciation as prescribe in their formula rate templates over a 40 year period, they may in lieu of completing Tab 6, supply 40 years’ worth of formula rate templates.	9/11/2015
	- Tab 6 Required	Tab 6 is now required to be completed for ALL RFP Responses regardless of whether a formula rate templet is provided. This will provide a 40 year NPV for all RFP Responses.	9/11/2015
	- Using FERC formula rate for RFP Responses	Only the first 12 months of the project in service are required in the template. Forty years of formula rate templates for the project are NOT required	9/11/2015
58	In regards to the TOSP deposit and the use of Electronic Funds Transfer banking, is SPP intending to provide all the pertinent banking information to the QRP''s?	Yes, similar to how this was handled for QRP application deposits we can provide EFT information once requested one on one. SPP will not publicly post or mass email this information. A completed W-9 will need to be provided as well. SPP will send this to QRPs.	9/23/2015
59	In regards to the completion of the Section IV - Acknowledgements in the Request for Proposal, does a fully initialed and signed PDF document satisfy the requirements specified in the Request for Proposal?	Yes, pdf is fine as long as all items have been initialed and signature provided accordingly.	9/23/2015