



Southwest Power Pool, Inc. – Entergy

ENTERGY SPP RTO REGIONAL PLANNING PROCESS MEETING

March 4, 2010

NET CONFERENCE

• Summary of Action Items •

- 1.) The three planning departments (Entergy Planning, SPP ICT Planning, and SPP RTO Planning), that are part of ESRPP, committed to following up with additional information that the stakeholders requested during the net conference. This information has been integrated to these minutes.
 - a. Post PSS/MUST subsystems used during analysis
 - b. Attach PSS/MUST output spreadsheets to the Final Report
 - c. Review Tariff language on how many studies “High Level” and “Detailed “ are to be performed in a study cycle.



Southwest Power Pool, Inc. – Entergy
ENTERGY SPP RTO REGIONAL PLANNING PROCESS MEETING
March 4, 2010
NET CONFERENCE
• Minutes •

Agenda Item 1 – Administrative

Jody Holland called the meeting to order at 9:35p.m. A list of attendees is attached at the end of these Minutes. Jody reviewed the agenda and anti-trust guidelines.

Agenda Item 2 – 2009 ESRPP Step 1 High Level Analysis Results

Paul Simoneaux presented the study results from the 2009 ESRPP Step 1 High Level Analysis. During the presentation, a dialog occurred among the stakeholders and the representatives from each of the planning departments (Entergy Planning, SPP ICT Planning, and SPP RTO Planning). The questions and comments helped to provide additional details about the information presented and recommendations on how to build upon the first year of the ESRPP. Here is a summary of this feedback:

Bary Warren asked for clarification on how benefit was determined. Jody Holland responded that to show a benefit, there had to be more than a 100 MW increase in First Contingency Incremental Transfer Capability (FCITC). The cells highlighted green in the FCITC results tables indicate the Point of Receipt/Point of Delivery (POR/POD) pairs that showed benefit. Paul Simoneaux went on to explain that the top number in these cells reflects the increase in FCITC (MW) while the bottom number indicates the final FCITC (MW) that was possible after the upgrade was added to the model.

Matt McGee suggested that negative FCITC values should be shaded differently. This could be an enhancement to future FCITC tables and, also, Jody pointed out that many of the negative FCITC values might have been increased by adding the upgrades from Entergy's 2010-2012 Construction Plan Update 1. Also, Tim McGinnis pointed out that even with an improved negative FCITC there may be a real benefit because it may possibly allow an upgrade project to be replaced by a less expensive project.

Sam Loudenslager asked why the FCITC results for the Messick 500/230 kV Autotransformer were different in the presentation than they had previously appeared in the report. Paul explained that the limit of the Beaver Creek-Jena was taken out.

Sam Loudenslager asked if new projects that might affect the limiting constraints could be provided. Paul said these projects could be listed in the final report. Jody added that the approved projects from the latest expansion plans would be included in the 2010 ESRPP Cycle now that these projects have been approved. Also, the MUST subsystem and FCITC results files will be posted. Ronnie Frizzell added that he would like to see the top three FCITC limits shown as is done at the TWG. Eric Burkey said that they will format the results like a Transmission Service Request report.

It was asked what recently-planned upgrades were in the Base Case for the 2009 ESRPP. Tim McGinnis said that the 2009 ESRPP Step 1 High-Level Analysis included the upgrades from the Entergy 2009-2010 Construction Plan and the board-approved upgrades from the SPP Transmission Expansion Plan 2008.

Sam Loudenslager asked how the cost estimates for each of the five projects were determined. For purposes of the high-level planning cost estimates, the per-mile cost of the lines is dependent only upon the voltage level and does not take into account design choices such as line type, structure type, etc. For example, the cost of a new 345 kV line is estimated to be \$1.35 million per mile. More detailed cost estimates can be developed in an ESRPP Step 2 Detailed Analysis. Eric Burkey mentioned that the 345 kV idevs used in the ESRPP Step 1 High-Level Analysis were based on 3-bundled 954 ACSR 345 kV single circuit construction that resulted in a 1959 MVA Rate B.

Matt McGee asked who recommended the change of the new line from ANO – Ft. Smith be configured at the 500 kV level instead of 345 kV as studied. Jody said that all three planning groups were recommending the change since Entergy's nuclear substation at ANO does not contain any 345 kV bus work. He did say that it would be possible to build a new 500/345 kV station some distance from the ANO substation.

Agenda Item 3 – 2010 ESRPP Cycle

Tim McGinnis gave a presentation about the next cycle of ESRPP. He said the meeting to start the 2010 ESRPP Cycle should occur mid-April. At this net-conference, the scopes for the 2010 Cycle studies will be presented and the stakeholders will provide study nominations. Jody Holland added that the scope for the 2010 ESRPP Cycle will be distributed ahead of this time and that improvement suggestions were invited.

The meeting to select the five studies will be in Little Rock on May 27th, 2010. Ronnie Frizzell asked if all the ESRPP Step 1 projects would be studied in ESRPP Step 2 in 2010. Jody answered that there would be a total of five studies completed during each

ESRPP cycle. The plan is to have a stakeholder vote to determine how many of the five would be Step 1 studies and how many of the five would be Step 2 studies. He said this was consistent with similar ICT planning processes but there would be a check of the tariff. Here is the Section of the Entergy OATT Attachment K that confirms that there will be a total of five studies during each ESRPP cycle:

13.1.5.2. Performing Regional Studies

- 13.1.5.2.1. The Regional Planning Process shall include performing up to a total of five Step 1 and Step 2 Regional Studies annually.

The initial study results will be presented at a meeting in New Orleans in August. Tim said feedback from this meeting will help guide the planning team during the remainder of the 2010 ESRPP Cycle.

ESRPP Report and Meeting Material

The ESRPP Report and meeting background information is posted on Entergy's OASIS and TWG meeting materials folder.

Entergy's OASIS

<http://www.oatioasis.com/EES/EESDocs/Entergy%20SPP%20RTO%20Regional%20Planning%20Process.htm>

TWG Meeting Materials Folder

<http://www.spp.org/section.asp?group=131&pageID=27>

Attendance List

Company	Last Name	First Name
Southern Company	Ansley	Matthew
Kelson Energy	Atwood	Jason
Entergy Services, Inc.	Burke	Oliver
Southwest Power Pool	Burkey	Eric
GDS Associates, Inc.	Cadar	Claudiu
City Utilities of Springfield	Chamberlin	John
GDS Associates, Inc.	Chiles	John
Entergy	Daspit	Laurence
Lincoln Electric System	Fortik	Jason
Arkansas Electric Coop. Corp.	Frizzell	Ronnie
American Electric Power	Gallup	Terri
Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc.	Gott	Tony
OXY	Harris	Brenda
Southwest Power Pool	Holland	Jody
Tenaska	Lane	Sarah
KGen Power	Lee	Tina
Entergy Services, Inc.	Long	Charles
Arkansas Public Service Commission	Loudenslager	Sam
SMEPA	McElhaney	Steve
AEP	McGee	Matthew
Southwest Power Pool	McGinnis	Tim
FERC	Morris	Susan
American Electric Power	Pasternack	Bernie
Entergy Services, Inc.	Powell	Doug
Southwest Power Pool	Purdy	Steve
Entergy Services	Ralston	Alan
Entergy	Simoneaux	Paul
City of Lafayette, LA	Stewart	Jeffrey
Southwest Power Pool	Tynes	Keith
The Empire District Electric Company	Warren	Bary
OG+E Electric Services	Wilson	William