

**Southwest Power Pool**  
**STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE TASK FORCE ON ORDER 1000 MEETING**  
**In-Person Meeting - AEP Office, Dallas, Texas**  
**November 10-11, 2014**

---

**• MINUTES •**

**Agenda Item 1 – Administrative Items**

SPP Chair Bill Grant called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. The SPCTF members attending in-person included: Terri Gallup (AEP), Jake Langthorn (OG&E), Dennis Reed (Westar), Bill Grant (SPS), Chuck Marshall (ITC), Todd Fridley (Transource Energy, LLC), and Paul Malone (NPPD). Tom Hesterman (Sunflower) participated via teleconference as proxy for Noman Williams. Also present in-person were Kip Fox (AEP), Mike Moffatt (Sunflower), Patrick Hayes (Ameren), Trent Carlson (MCN), Bruce Cude (SPS), Brian Gedrich (NextEra Energy Transmission), Bernie Liu (Xcel Energy), and Walt Shumate (Shumate & Associates). SPP staff in attendance included Michael Desselle, Ben Bright, Aaron Shipley, and Sherri Maxey. Matt Binette from Wright and Talisman was also present. Other guests and staff participated via phone (Attendance – Attachment 1).

The Chair solicited comments on the October 9, 2014 minutes. A task force member requested that the proxy for Transource Energy, LLC be identified and pending the revision the minutes were approved and accepted as submitted.

**Agenda Item 2 –Review FERC October 16 Order**

Matt Binette presented an overview of the October 16 FERC Order ruling on the SPP Order 1000 Regional Compliance Filing (October 16 Order on Compliance Presentation – Attachment 2). He noted that transmission service upgrades resulting from Aggregate Study would not be deemed as Competitive Upgrades. Mr. Binette noted that SPP would have until December 15, 2014 to file a response on any compliance issues identified in the Order. This included whether SPP would file an appeal related to FERC affirming its earlier ruling that the SPP Membership Agreement ROFR provisions are not entitled to the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption of justness and reasonableness. A motion by Todd Fridley seconded by Terri Gallup to not challenge the FERC's decision on the *Mobile-Sierra* issue failed with a split decision of 4 in favor and 4 against.

FERC ordered SPP to revise the definition of "rebuild" so that replacement of an entire existing facility does not qualify. Questions were raised as to the impact of this and how it should be interpreted when determining if projects would be issued as Competitive Upgrades or not. The task force opted to discuss this matter in more detail at the next meeting on December 11, 2014.

**Agenda Item 3 – Business Practice 059 ("BPR059")**

An overview of the topics that should be addressed in BPR059 was presented (Outline of BPR 059 Topics – Attachment 3). This Business Practice Revision will impact the RFP Process from the issuance of an RFP by SPP

through the receipt of RFP Responses submitted by RFP Respondents. The Task Force discussed the options an RFP Respondent has in relation to withdrawing an RFP Response and whether they would be entitled to any refund of the RFP deposit. It was determined that to help ensure an efficient evaluation process, an RFP Respondent should be allowed to withdraw an RFP Response. A motion was made by Terri Gallup and seconded by Todd Fridley that if a bidder pulls its RFP response prior to the closure of the window the refund of the deposit would be treated as if the proposal were a deficient proposal. This effectively allows a 90/10 percentage split refund of an RFP Deposit (10% of RFP Deposit to be refunded) if an RFP Response is withdrawn prior to the close of the RFP Response Window. The motion passed with two opposed (ITC, Westar) and 1 abstention (OGE) and will require Tariff changes that will be sent to the Regional Tariff Working Group ("RTWG") for review. It was noted that if an applicant withdraws an RFP Response after the close of the RFP Response Window, that would be allowed, however the RFP Respondent would still be liable for the RFP Deposit and any future collections or refunds associated with such deposit.

There was no opposition to the Business Practice.

Trent Carlson (South Central MCN) described their comments for how to "level the playing field" regarding RFP issuance and the new BPR (SCMCN Comments regarding BPR – RFP Issuance – Attachment 4). Trent reported that the comments were intended to provide value to the RFP processes under development. Discussions revolved around how competition impacts the transparency of interconnection standards. Bill Grant first conducted a straw poll of the Task Force regarding the intent to develop high-level operating/maintenance guidelines for interconnection agreements associated with competitive transmission projects. Following a mostly favorable straw poll and discussion of what Working Group might develop such agreement Chuck Marshall moved and Paul Malone seconded that the TWG should create the "high level operations guidelines". The motion passed with two opposed (Transource and AEP) and 1 abstention (Sunflower).

Finally, the Task Force recommended including a definition of how the 50% completion milestone would be identified in the construction portion of the project. Attachment Y allows for a refund of the initial 2% cash deposit by the DTO once the 50% completion milestone is reached, but does not provide clarity on how that milestone could be determined. Language addressing this issue will be added to BPR059.

#### **Agenda Item 4 – Deposit Refund of Withdrawn Projects**

*See discussion in Agenda Item 3.* This topic was addressed during review of BPR059 and referenced in that section for the purpose of these minutes.

#### **Agenda Item 5 – Minimum Design Standards Task Force ("MDSTF") Update**

Jeff Stebbins (Chair of MDSTF) presented an update on the MDSTF. He noted that the Task Force is working with an increased urgency and reported that they will be meeting at least bi-weekly if not weekly going forward until the Minimum Transmission Design Standards ("MTDS") are finished. He referenced a phone call held with SPP Staff that provided direction on whether or not to use emergency versus normal ratings for line amperage guidelines and if the minimum should be lowered from the current 3000 amps to 2000 amps. This has been a point of much debate among the MDSTF and cause of delay. The SPCTF directed the MDSTF to

consider all ratings to be issued at emergency ratings and to use the current 3000 amps. An engineering study would be required to properly determine if the 3000 amps should be lowered. This study could not be completed by the deadline for the start of the SPP TOSP in January 2015, but may be addressed in the future. The update was concluded by notifying the SPCTF of the next meeting on November 14, 2014.

#### **Agenda Item 6 – RFP Response Form Review**

SPP Staff presented the RFP Response Form (RFP Response Form – Attachment 5) for feedback from the SPCTF. Discussion was held on the amount of detail that should be expected in an RFP Response and specifically related to Tabs 1A and 1B. These tabs are the location for much of the technical aspects of a response, thus are very important in the scoring and evaluation process. After discussion around needed level of detail and whether too much was being asked for, the SPCTF determined that providing the option for answers was acceptable and noting in the instructions (and on the RFP Response Form), it is acceptable to provide a “N/A” response if deemed necessary by an RFP Respondent. It was determined when responding to “Reliability Metrics” questions, responses should rely on history and past building practices/experience of the RFP Respondent. It was suggested that to account for Losses, RFP Respondents could calculate their projected losses at 70% of the emergency rating given a base assumption for load provided by SPP Staff. For BIL ratings, the SPCTF determined that an acknowledgment should be signed as part of the RFP Response that all MTDS have been met. If the RFP Respondent exceeds the MTDS, such as BIL Ratings, then it is the responsibility of the RFP Respondent to detail and support the reason it exceeded the MTDS.

Staff was given an action item to research what items should be held confidential as a standard practice and which items are subject to public reports/knowledge. The confidentiality should include both pre- and post-NTC awards. Several other minor suggestions were made to edit the RFP Response Form in other areas and noted for inclusion by SPP Staff.

#### **Agenda Item 7 – ATRR Template**

SPP Staff presented a proposal on how to address the ATRR requirements in an RFP Response. This was a tiered approach that accounts for RFP Respondents that have accepted FERC Formula Rates (“FR”) in the SPP Region, RFP Respondents that have filed but not received a ruling on their FR from FERC, RFP Respondents that are creating a FR in conjunction with SPP, and RFP Respondents that do not have a FR and are not currently creating a FR. The staff proposal is summarized below:

- If a Respondent has an accepted FR in SPP, the bidder must use that FR for the ATRR requirement in their Response;
- If a Respondent has a FR that has been filed but has not received an Order, they must use the FR in the filing at FERC;
- If a Respondent has developed a FR in conjunction with SPP but has not yet filed the FR at FERC, they may use that FR, as long as SPP Staff reviews and determines it meets the requirements of the ATRR for the purpose of an RFP Response;

- If an RFP Respondent does not meet any of the previous options, it must use the SPP Template and provide all supporting documentation to detail the assumptions used in creation of their NPCC for the purpose of the ATRR requirement.

The Staff proposal was well received by the SPCTF. They directed Staff to continue developing the template as proposed and detail the assumptions which should be used by any RFP Respondent required to use the SPP ATRR template.

#### **Agenda Item 8 – Summary of Action Items**

- SPP Staff to amend October 9 minutes to reflect the proxy for Transource Energy, LLC;
- RTWG to develop tariff changes allowing for a 90/10% refund if an RFP Respondent withdraws their response prior to the close of the RFP Response Window;
  - Staff to make changes to the New RFP BPR059 to BP7700 items and include the following changes: The ability of an RFP Respondent to amend their response prior to close of RFP Response window. The RFP Response cannot be amended after the close of the RFP Response window and there is no RFP cure period.
  - Define the 50% completion milestone.
- Recommend that the TWG create a “high level operations guideline” related to the pro-forma interconnection agreement discussion; Approved.
- Staff to research what items should be considered confidential as a standard practice and what items are subject to public reports/knowledge. This applies to time period prior to the award of a NTC and post award of a NTC;
- Staff to evaluate the release of the award of point and the point’s structure once an RFP is selected. For example, Company A received “x” number of points, Company B received “x” number of points, etc.;
- Task Force to determine how much impact it can have on scoring (i.e., giving the IEP specifics on scoring);
- Follow-up on the “controls for the competitive process” strategic initiative;
- Awarding DPP incentive points from the Interregional vs. ITP processes should be discussed at the next SPCTF meeting; and,
- Staff to begin discussions regarding the long-term role of this Task Force.

#### **Agenda Item 9 – Discussion of Future Meetings**

The next meeting of the Task Force will be a Net-Conference on Thursday, December 11 from 2:30 - 4:30.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Desselle  
Secretary

SPCTF ORDER 1000

11-10-14

AEP - DALLAS

Company	Last Name	First Name	Middle Initial	Attending	Comments
Southwestern Power Administration	Bagnall	Jan	Andrew	Net Conference	✓
Xcel Energy	Bredenbeck	Cheryl		Net Conference	
Southwest Power Pool	Bright	Ben		In Person	✓
	Carlson	Trent	A	In Person	✓
Oklahoma Corporation Commission	Chaplin	Jason	Colt	Net Conference	
Public Utility Commission of Texas	Claiborn-Pinto	Shawnee		Net Conference	✓
Southwestern Public Service Company	Cude	Bruce		In Person	✓
Southwest Power Pool	Desselle	Michael		In Person	✓
South Central MCN, LLC	Emery	N. Beth		Net Conference	✓
Quanta Technology	Estes	Evan		In Person <del>Net Conf</del>	✓
American Electric Power	Fox	Kip		In Person	✓
Westar Energy, Inc.	Franklin	Clifford		Net Conference	
American Electric Power	Gallup	Terri	A.	In Person	✓
NextEra Energy Transmission, LLC	Gedrich	Brian		In Person	✓
	Ghoms	Noumvi		Net Conference	✓
Xcel Energy	Grant	Bill (William)	A	In Person	✓
Ameren Services Company	Hayes	Patrick		In Person	✓
Sunflower Electric Power Corporation	Hestermann	Thomas		Net Conference	✓
Burns & McDonnell	Jennings	Philip		Net Conference	
Southwest Power Pool	Kentner	Tessie		Net Conference	✓
Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company	Langthorn, IV	Jacob	S	In Person	✓
Noble Great Plains Windpark LLC	Lewis	James		Net Conference	✓
Xcel Energy	Liu	Bernard		In Person	✓
Nebraska Public Power District	Malone	Paul	J.	In Person	✓
ITC Great Plains, LLC	Marshall	Chuck		In Person	✓
Southwest Power Pool	Maxey	Sherri		In Person	✓
Sunflower Electric Power Corporation	Moffet	Michael	Charles	In Person	✓
American Electric Power	Parrish	David		Net Conference	✓
Quanta Technology	pfeiffer	Ed		Net Conference	✓
Westar Energy, Inc.	Reed	Dennis	L.	In Person	✓
Customized Energy Solutions, LTD	Safuto	Robert		Net Conference	✓
Hunt Transmission Services, LLC	Schwarz	Brad		In Person	✓
Southwest Power Pool	Scott	Shaun		In Person, Net Conference	
LS Power	Segner	Sharon	K	In Person	✓
Southwest Power Pool	Shiple	Aaron		In Person	✓
	Shumate	Walt		Net Conference In Person	✓
Midwest ISO	Solano	Elizabeth		Net Conference	
Missouri Joint Municipal EUC	Starnes	Heather		Net Conference	✓
East Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc.	Tynes	Keith		Net Conference	
Boston Energy Trading and Marketing, LLC	Wagner	Marguerite		Net Conference	
The Empire District Electric Company	Warren	Bary	K	In Person	
Wright + Talisman	Binette	Matt		In Person	✓
KCP&L Transwice	Fridley	Todd		In Person	✓
SPP	Frizzel	Cory		Teleconference	✓
LS Power	Baidwan	Sandeep		Teleconference	✓

Day Two

Proxy for Norman Williams

Teleconference  
 Geoffrey Rush - OCC  
 Joe Richardson  
 Jordan Schmick  
 Sandeep Baidwan - LS Power  
 Tony Green - SPP  
 Jeff Stebbins - Tri County



Day 2

- ✓ Michael Desselte SPP
- ✓ Ben Bright SPP
- ✓ Bill Grant XCEL/SPP
- ✓ Aaron Shipley SPP
- ✓ Sherri Makey SPP
- ✓ Matt Binette Wright + Talamon
- ✓ Walt Swumate STUMATE & Assoc.
- ✓ Pat Hayes Ameren
- ✓ TRENT CARLSON South Central MGN
- ✓ BRIAN GEDRICH NEXTERA ENERGY TRANS.
- ✓ Michael C. Moffet Sunflower Elec.
- ✓ Paul Malone NPPD
- ✓ Chuck Marsaacc ITC
- ✓ Jake Langham O&E
- ✓ Dennis Reed Westar Energy
- by phone ✓ Bruce Cude XCEL ENERGY / SPS
- ✓ Bernice Liu XCEL ENERGY
- ✓ Todd Fradley MCPIL / TRANSOURCE
- ✓ Terri Gallup AEP
- ← Kip Fox AEP - TRANSOURCE

Day 2 only

Jon Hesterman by phone  
proxy for Norman Williams

# **SPP Order 1000 Compliance Order**

Issued October 16, 2014

Matt Binette  
Shareholder, Wright & Talisman, P.C.  
SPCTF Meeting  
November 10-11, 2014

- **FERC issued an order on October 16, 2014 accepting in part SPP's November 2013 Order 1000 Regional Compliance Filing**
  - **FERC largely accepted SPP's filing, but directed a few additional compliance revisions**
  - **Granted in part and denied in part rehearing**
- **Compliance filing due December 15, 2014**



- **FERC granted rehearing on:**
  - **Considering state/local laws and regulations when determining whether to designate a project as a Competitive Upgrade**
    - **SPP must “restore” language from previous compliance filing**
  - **Treatment of Service Upgrades (i.e. Aggregate Study) as Competitive Upgrades**
    - **SPP must remove language proposed in its August 15, 2014 compliance filing to address Aggregate Study**

- **FERC denied rehearing on:**
  - **Treatment of Byway facilities as Competitive Upgrades**
    - **SPP's Transmission Owner Selection Process will apply to Byway facilities**
  - ***Mobile-Sierra***
    - **FERC affirmed its earlier ruling that the Membership Agreement ROFR provisions are not entitled to the *Mobile-Sierra* presumption of justness and reasonableness**

- **FERC denied rehearing on:**
  - **Effective Date (March 30, 2014) and Commencement of Transmission Owner Selection Process (January 1, 2015)**
  - **Request for additional compliance revisions to address ITP transparency**
  - **Request to exclude projects in ROFR states from regional cost allocation**

- **Dissent:**
  - **Commissioner Clark dissented from the majority on the issue of Competitive Upgrade treatment for Byway facilities**
    - **FERC previously found Byway facilities to be local**
    - **Majority decision creates perverse incentives**
  - **Agreed with majority on state/local law rehearing**

- **FERC accepted SPP's explanations and justifications for:**
  - **QRP application fee for non-Members**
  - **RFP selection process point weightings**
  - **IEP's ability to recommend a proposal other than the one with the highest score and ability to recommend that one or more proposals be rejected due to a low score in a category**



- **FERC found the following aspects of SPP's prior filing compliant:**
  - **Revisions to address Public Policy Requirements**
  - **Revisions to include Byway facilities as Competitive Upgrades**
  - **Revisions to address Short-Term Reliability Projects**
    - **Including elimination of mitigation requirement and requirement for BOD approval**

- **FERC found the following aspects of SPP's prior filing compliant:**
  - **Proposed definition of “Local Transmission Facility”**
  - **Qualification criteria revisions**
  - **RFP information requirements, RFP deposit amounts, and method for calculating true-up**
    - **FERC also accepted SPP's proposal to pay earned interest on refunds**

- **FERC found the following aspects of SPP's prior filing compliant:**
  - **Revisions to address process if all proposals are disqualified because of a low score in a category**
  - **DTO firm capital commitment requirements**
  - **Reevaluation provisions**
  - **Clarifications/revisions addressing impact/cost responsibility for neighboring systems**

- **FERC found the following aspects of SPP's prior filing partially compliant:**
  - **SPP's merchant developer requirements**
    - Definition potentially precludes merchant from transferring control to SPP
  - **Definition of “rebuild”**
    - Definition may improperly treat a replacement of an entire facility as a rebuild
    - SPP must adopt language to clarify how Attachment Y Section I.2 works with I.1

- **FERC found the following aspects of SPP's prior filing partially compliant:**
  - **Points system**
    - **SPP must revise rate analysis category to ensure that IEP will only consider quantitative cost impact of materials on hand, assets on hand, and ROW ownership, control, or acquisition**



- **FERC found the following aspects of SPP's prior filing partially compliant:**
  - **Points system**
    - **SPP must revise rate analysis category to ensure that IEP will only consider quantitative cost impact of materials on hand, assets on hand, and ROW ownership, control, or acquisition**

- 1. Revise the definition of Merchant Transmission Developer to remove the provision that a merchant not intend to transfer control to SPP  
[P 57]**
- 2. Restore language in Att. Y Sec. I.1(c) and I.1(d) relating to state/local laws and ROW  
[P 146]**
- 3. Revise “rebuild” so that replacement of an entire existing facility does not qualify  
[P 158]**

- 4. Revise Att. Y Sec. I.1 to state at the beginning  
“As determined in accordance with Section I.2 of  
this Attachment Y.”  
[P 162]**
  
- 5. Remove proposed revisions to Attachment Y to  
classify Service Upgrades as Competitive  
Upgrades  
[P 177]**

- 6. Revise Rate Analysis category to specify that IEP will only consider quantitative cost impact of material on hand, assets on hand, and ROW  
[P 249]**
  
- 7. Delete proposed revisions to point categories to reflect state/local law and ROW and restore previous language  
[P 256]**

# Questions?



## **Business Practice 059 Issuing RFPs**

### **Outline of BPR Topics**

BPR Start Point = Publishing of the RFP

BPR End Point = SPP receiving responses from QRPs

1. Review BPR 054 do we need any new clarifications
2. Review tariff for other items that need clarification
3. Describe project report that will be produced to show:
  - a. Competitive projects
  - b. Expected RFP Issue Date
  - c. RFP Response Window
    - i. When will this report be produced?
    - ii. Where will this report be posted?
4. Outage Requests
5. Deposit Refunds for Withdrawn Projects
6. Development Cost Calculations
7. Use of DPP Information in the RFP (10/9 meeting)
8. Date Regulatory Approvals Needed (10/9 Meeting)
9. What level of project to bid out (original BPR054 and SPCTF Discussions)
  - a. Lines
  - b. Substations
  - c. State lines
10. Confidential Information
11. State ROFR Ben/Aaron
12. Minimum design Standards
13. ATRR Template

### Scope, Specification and Criteria

The new BPR should require that the Transmission Provider's RFP should not only point to the Minimum Design Standards ("MDS") but include a detailed project scope for the Competitive Upgrade and any specifications and criteria that SPP, or existing Transmission Owner(s) of terminal points, may require that are beyond the MDS and relevant SPP Criteria.

- The new BPR should require that incumbent Transmission Owners are to provide or point to, in advance of RFP issuance, all specifications and criteria for interconnection and continued operations.
- As well, the new BPR should require that any such incumbent Transmission Owner specifications and criteria will apply to its Response, or its affiliate's Response, as well as to all other QRP Responses.
- Given such an approach, SPP should develop a standard interconnection agreement covering indemnity and joint operating requirements for multiple-party facilities.
- The new BPR should require RFP Responders' willingness and ability to enter into such a standard form interconnection agreement if, as a consequence of Competitive Upgrade award, a multiple-party facility may exist.

Based on the content of the RFP, as should be required by the new BPR, all involved parties should have a common understanding of what will be considered in-scope for purposes of IEP scoring and evaluation.

- An RFP Response that proposes a project with a scope that is materially different than any selected and studied DPP will be considered non-responsive to the RFP.
- The purpose of such a BPR provision is to ensure that the content of RFPs will facilitate a clear and common understanding of each Competitive Upgrade among SPP, RFP Respondents and IEP members.

Without a clear set of RFP business practices and processes:

- SPP staff will lack the guidance needed to properly identify and precisely define the scope, specification and criteria applicable to each Competitive Upgrade in RFP documents.
- IEP members will be left to apply their own interpretations of scope, specification and criteria applicable to Competitive Upgrades, without limit, albeit within the scoring method for Competitive Upgrades set forth in the Tariff; with potentially controversial results.
- RFP Responders will expend time and effort in preparing RFP Responses only to find, after award, that a different project scope, a peculiar specification or an unknown criteria was the basis for awarding the Competitive Upgrade; again, with potentially controversial results.

### Scope of Competition

A new Project has historically included the line and interconnections and the fact that it is now competitive should not change that result.

- The new BPR should provide that a new Project is not a rebuild Project just because it may propose using rights-of-way owned by others where facilities do not already exist.
- Consistent with SPP's policies, the new BPR should encourage efficient use of existing facilities and rights-of-way to avoid unnecessary cost of more condemnations and land acquisitions, when connection to an existing facility is feasible.
- The new BPR should provide that ownership of rights-of-way where facilities do not exist cannot be the basis for denying access.

### Use of Existing Property Rights

The fact that a project cannot be built without using existing rights-of-way should not determine whether it is a Competitive Upgrade. The control of rights-of-way is properly subject to scoring, but cannot be a bar to competition if state siting authorities are willing to direct sharing of such ratepayer funded assets.

- The new BPR should set forth that whether an incumbent Transmission Owner must share right-of-way is a matter to be determined by state siting and regulatory authorities.
- Respondents proposing to use existing rights-of-way controlled by an incumbent Transmission Owner should be allowed to demonstrate that siting and permitting authority will allow for a Competitive Upgrade to be owned, constructed and operated by either incumbent or non-incumbent utilities that have the authority to construct in their jurisdiction(s).

# Request for Proposal (RFP) Response Form\*

Click on Section	Requirement	Completed: Yes/No/NA	Respondent Comments
<b>RFP RESPONDENT INFORMATION and PROJECT SUMMARY SECTION</b>			
<a href="#">A</a>	RFP Respondent Information		
<a href="#">B</a>	RFP Project Summary (including DPP identification)		
<a href="#">C</a>	Index of all Supporting Documentation		
<b>1 Engineering Design (Reliability/Quality/General Design)</b>			
<b>LINE</b>			
<a href="#">1A</a>	Type of Line Construction (wood, steel, design loading, etc.)		
<a href="#">1A</a>	Losses - line (design efficiency)		
<a href="#">1A</a>	Estimated life of construction - line		
<a href="#">1A</a>	Reliability/quality metrics - line		
<b>SUBSTATION</b>			
<a href="#">1B</a>	Type of Substation Construction (wood, steel, design loading, etc.)		
<a href="#">1B</a>	Losses - substation (design efficiency)		
<a href="#">1B</a>	Estimated life of construction - substation		
<a href="#">1B</a>	Reliability/quality metrics - substation		
<b>2 Project Management (Construction Project Management)</b>			
<b>LINE</b>			
<a href="#">1A</a>	Environmental issues related to line work		
<a href="#">1A</a>	Rights-of-way ownership, control, or acquisition for transmission line		
<a href="#">1A</a>	Construction - line		
<a href="#">1A</a>	Commissioning - line		
<b>SUBSTATION</b>			
<a href="#">1B</a>	Environmental issues related to substation work		
<a href="#">1B</a>	Rights-of-way ownership, control, or acquisition related to substation work		
<a href="#">1B</a>	Construction - substation		
<a href="#">1B</a>	Commissioning - substation		
<b>OVERALL</b>			
<a href="#">B</a>	Project Scope		
<a href="#">2A</a>	Project development schedule (including obtaining necessary regulatory approvals - tab 2B) <b>Note: Complete tabs 2A and 2B</b>		
<a href="#">2A</a>	Timeframe to construct - line <b>Note: Complete tabs 2A and 2B for all project dates</b>		
<a href="#">B</a>	Procurement Process related to line work (narrative) <b>Note: Complete tabs 2A and 2B for all project dates</b>		

Click on Section	Requirement	Completed: Yes/No/NA	Respondent Comments
<a href="#">B</a>	RFP respondent's plan to obtain authorization to construct transmission facilities in the state(s) in which the Competitive Upgrade will be located <b>Note: Complete tab 2B for any regulatory dates</b>		
<a href="#">B</a>	RFP respondent has a right of first refusal granted under relevant law for the Competitive Upgrade		
<a href="#">B</a>	Experience/track record related to Construction Project Management		
<b>3 Operations (Operations/Maintenance/Safety)</b>			
<a href="#">3</a>	Control center operations (staffing, etc.)		
<a href="#">3</a>	Storm/outage response plan		
<a href="#">3</a>	Reliability metrics		
<a href="#">3</a>	Restoration experience/performance		
<a href="#">3</a>	Maintenance staffing/training		
<a href="#">3</a>	Maintenance plans		
<a href="#">3</a>	Equipment		
<a href="#">3</a>	Maintenance performance/expertise		
<a href="#">3</a>	NERC compliance-process/history		
<a href="#">3</a>	Internal safety program		
<a href="#">3</a>	Contractor safety program		
<a href="#">3</a>	Safety performance record (program execution)		
<b>4 Rate Analysis (Cost to Customer)</b>			
<a href="#">4A</a>	Itemized cost of transmission line work		
<a href="#">4B</a>	Itemized cost of substation work		
<a href="#">4C</a>	Estimated total cost of project		AEP/Transource comment: On Tab 4C, engineering labor is shown. Also, overheads are lumped into this tab at the very end for both line and station, which can be different. The estimating seems awkward. We do not see the need the construction labor costs as detailed as shown on 4B. Suggest adding a line item to 4C
<a href="#">4D</a>	Financing costs		
<a href="#">4D</a>	FERC incentives		AEP/Transource comment: On FERC incentives, will entities with a FERC Formula Rate be required to show their rates and incentives on file to show the IEP what their approved incentive rates are

Click on Section	Requirement	Completed: Yes/No/NA	Respondent Comments
<a href="#">4D</a>	Revenue requirements (ATRR)		AEP/Transource comment: SPP needs to provide the standard assumptions to prevent gaming of the ATRR (inflation rate, straight line depreciation over 40 years, ....) and the way the participant needs to calculate ATRR in the instructions
<a href="#">4D</a>	Lifetime cost of the project to customers		AEP/Transource comment: This section needs to clearly describe in the instructions that all the O&M and Capital improvements need to be in the estimate.
<a href="#">4D</a>	Return on equity		AEP/Transource comment: If the entity has a formula rate this rate needs to be described in the instruction manual.
<a href="#">4D</a>	Material on hand, assets on hand, or, rights-of-way ownership, control, or acquisition		
<a href="#">4D</a>	Cost Certainty guarantee		
<b>5 Finance (Financial Viability and Creditworthiness)</b>			
<a href="#">5</a>	Evidence of financing		
<a href="#">5</a>	Material conditions		
<a href="#">5</a>	Financial/business plan(s)		
<a href="#">5</a>	Pro forma financial statements		
<a href="#">5</a>	Expected financial leverage		
<a href="#">5</a>	Debt covenants		
<a href="#">5</a>	Projected liquidity		
<a href="#">5</a>	Dividend policy		
<a href="#">5</a>	Cash flow analysis		
<a href="#">5</a>	Other requirements		
<b>* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A."</b>			

**RFP Respondent(s) Information\***

**RFP Number:** SPP-RFP-2015001

**Section 1A: RFP Respondent Company Information**

Legal Name:	
Mailing Address:	
City/State/Zip:	
Business Phone:	
Company Tax Identification Number:	
Dun & Bradstreet Number:	

**RFP Respondent Primary Contact Information**

Name:	
Title:	
Mailing Address:	
City/State/Zip:	
Phone Number(s):	
Email Address:	

**RFP Respondent Alternate Contact Information**

Name:	
Title:	
Mailing Address:	
City/State/Zip:	
Phone Number(s):	
Email Address:	

**Joint RFP Proposal**

*If this is a Joint RFP Proposal by more than one QRP to identify more than one (1) designated transmission owner for this RFP, please complete the section below.*

<i>Provide a narrative describing the joint RFP submission:</i>	
---	--

**Joint RFP Respondent #1 Company Information**

Legal Name:	
Mailing Address:	
City/State/Zip:	
Business Phone:	
Company Tax Identification Number:	
Dun & Bradstreet Number:	

**Joint RFP Respondent #1 Primary Contact Information**

Name:	
Title:	
Mailing Address:	
City/State/Zip:	
Phone:	
Email Address:	

**Joint RFP Respondent #2 Company Information**

Legal Name:	
Mailing Address:	
City/State/Zip:	
Business Phone:	
Company Tax Identification Number:	
Dun & Bradstreet Number:	

**Joint RFP Respondent #2 Primary Contact Information**

Name:	
Title:	
Mailing Address:	
City/State/Zip:	
Phone:	
Email Address:	

**RFP Assignment Information**

*Respondent must declare in its RFP proposal whether it intends to assign the Competitive Upgrade to an Affiliate pursuant to Section III.2(d)(xi) of Attachment Y, if so the DTO for the Competitive Upgrade, along with a description of each such Affiliate.*

**Assignment Description:**

--

**Affiliate Assignment #1 Company Information**

Legal Name:	
Mailing Address:	
City/State/Zip:	
Business Phone:	
Company Tax Identification Number:	
Dun & Bradstreet Number:	

**Affiliate Assignment #1 Primary Contact Information**

Name:	
Title:	
Mailing Address:	
City/State/Zip:	
Phone:	
Email Address:	

**Affiliate Assignment #2 Company Information**

Legal Name:	
Mailing Address:	
City/State/Zip:	
Business Phone:	
Company Tax Identification Number:	
Dun & Bradstreet Number:	

**Affiliate Assignment #2 Primary Contact Information**

Name:	
Title:	
Mailing Address:	
City/State/Zip:	
Phone:	
Email Address:	

**\* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A."**



# RFP Project Summary\*

[Return to RFP Response Form](#)

**\* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A."**

**DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY**

<b>Network Upgrade Name</b>	Woodward District EHV – Tatonga – Matthewson – Cimarron 345 kV Ckt 2
<b>RFP Respondent (Company)</b>	
<b>Point of Contact</b>	
<b>Provide DPP Number if selected notification was received from ITP process</b>	Example: DPP-2015ITP##-####
<b>Project ID</b>	30364
<b>Upgrade ID(s)</b>	50420, 50421, 50456, 50458
<b>High Voltage</b>	345 kV
<b>Low Voltage</b>	138 kV
<b>RTO Determined Need Date</b>	3/1/2021
<b>In-Service Date</b>	
<b>Date Regulatory Approvals Complete</b>	9/1/2014
<b>Expected Financial Expenditure Date</b>	3/1/2015
<b>RFP Project Overview</b>	<p>Construct a second 345 kV circuit approximately 126 miles long from the Woodward District EHV to Tatonga to Matthewson to Cimarron substations. Construct a new Matthewson 345 kV substation at the intersection point of the existing Cimarron – Woodring and Northwest – Tatonga 345 kV lines.</p> <p><b>AEP/Transource request: Need the technical specifications (opacity requirements, limited operations, relay type, more details on how SPP wants the project to operate otherwise the incumbent has a huge advantage over the bidders.... Any DPP information should be included, such as table top routing, if SVCs, cap banks, or other network enhancements are needed.</b></p>
<b>Network Upgrade Description</b>	
<b>Project Scope</b>	
<b>Procurement Plan</b>	
<b>RFP respondent's plan to obtain authorization to construct transmission facilities in the state(s) in which the Competitive Upgrade will be located</b>	
<b>Describe any right of first refusal granted to RFP Respondent under relevant law for the Competitive Upgrade</b>	
<b>Describe process for obtaining third-party contractors and identify them, if available.</b>	

<p>Describe experience/track record related to Construction Project Management. Provide support documentation, if necessary.</p>	
<p>RFP Respondent Comments</p>	



Line Assumptions*		Return to RFP Response Form	TLINE1	TLINE2	TLINE3	TLINE4
* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A."		Additional Documents Provided (Y/N)	DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY			
Number of Circuits:						
ROUTING	Preliminary Line Route (Full description of the proposed routing, including location, identifying any barriers or impediments to direct through, possible line crossings, and why the route was chosen)					
	Line Route Map (Provide a map of the proposed routing, identifying any relevant physical or environmental elements)					
	New Line (Miles)					
	Reconductor (Miles)					
	Voltage Conversion (Miles)					
OTHER ITEMS - please detail:						
TERMINATION POINTS	TO Substation					
	FROM Substation					
	Tap? Y/N					
	OTHER ITEMS - please detail:					
CONDUCTOR	Type					
	Size (kcmil)					
	Voltage (kV)					
	Ampacity					
	Line Rating (3Ø MVA) - Normal and Emergency					
	Number of Conductors per Phase					
	OTHER ITEMS - please detail:					
STRUCTURE	Configuration					
	Foundation Type					
	Soil Type					
	<del>TWG recommended removal - Soil Resistivity</del>					
	Type of Terrain					
	Material					
	NESC Assumptions					
	Dead Ends (Qty)					
AEP/Transource comments: (1) Re: Soil Resistivity - provide study summary & justification of results (Are you going to remove this field per TWG?)						

Line Assumptions*	Return to RFP Response Form	TLINE1	TLINE2	TLINE3	TLINE4
* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A."		DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY			
<p><small>we going to remove this field per TWGr)</small>  <small>(2) Re: NESC Assumptions - What information is desired here? Clearance or Loading. Structure loading is provided in another section. If it's clearances, ask for the governing line loading condition and clearance buffer.</small></p>	Tangents (Qty)				
	Storm Structures (Qty)				
	Dependent on final route -Running Corners (Qty)				
	Underbuild (Y/N)				
	BIL Rating				
	Geotechnical Assumptions				
	OTHER ITEMS - please detail:				
<b>TAP SWITCH</b> Depends on MTDS Document	Configuration				
	Switch Requirments				
	Communication				
	Relaying				
	OTHER ITEMS - please detail:				
<b>SHIELD WIRE</b>	Number				
	Fiber - Y/N				
	Number of Fibers				
	Size (kcmil)				
	OTHER ITEMS - please detail:				
<b>RIGHT-OF-WAY</b>	Width (ft)				
	Ownership, Control or Acquisition description				
	EPA, State or Local requirements				
	Clearing Requirements				
	OTHER ITEMS - please detail:				
<b>DESIGN CRITERIA</b>	Weather Loading				
	Live Line Maintenance, if required				
	Unbalanced Structural Loads				

Line Assumptions*	Return to RFP Response Form		TLINE1	TLINE2	TLINE3	TLINE4	
* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A."			Additional Documents Provided (Y/N)	DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY			
	OTHER ITEMS - please detail:						
PERMITTING	Traffic Control Requirements						
	FAA Requirements						
	Corps of Engineers Requirements						
	OTHER ITEMS - please detail:						
ENVIRONMENTAL	Study Requirements						
	Wetland Requirements/Mitigation						
	Threatened and Endangered Species Mitigation						
	Cultural/Historical Resource Requirements						
	SWPPP (Storm Water Protection Plan) Requirements						
	OTHER ITEMS - please detail:						
	Provide estimated life expectancy for each line segment						
	Legal Requirements						
	Describe Construction Project Management processes:						

Line Assumptions*	Return to RFP Response Form	TLINE1	TLINE2	TLINE3	TLINE4
* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A."		Additional Documents Provided (Y/N)	DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY		
Security Measures					
<i>Need to explore further if/how this should be captured/evaluated.</i>	Losses (See comment)				
Provide a narrative for any material on hand, assets on hand, or, rights-of-way ownership, control, or acquisition					
Special Material Requirements					
Commissioning Requirements					
Access Road Requirements <i>AEP/Transource comment: Provide a description of the type of road construction required.</i>					
Outage Coordination & Scheduling (Describe possible outages and identify any impacted facilities)					
Communication with existing Transmission Owner					

Line Assumptions*	<a href="#">Return to RFP Response Form</a>		TLINE1	TLINE2	TLINE3	TLINE4
* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A."			Additional Documents Provided (Y/N)	DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY		
<p><i>Need to define - Section 3.11 of the RFP Template</i></p>	<p>Reliability/Quality metrics <i>delete?</i></p>					
<p>SPS/XE Comments - would suggest each respondent provide average forced outage rate of line of this general type design bsaed on last 5 years of data history of similar lines.</p>	<p>Distribution/Joint Use Requirements</p>					
	<p>Demolition and Disposal Costs / Description</p>					
<p><b>OTHER ITEMS - please detail:</b></p>						



# Substation Assumptions\*

DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY

* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A."		Additional Documents Provided (Y/N)	Station 1			Station 2			Station 3		
			High Side	Low Side	Tertiary	High Side	Low Side	Tertiary	High Side	Low Side	Tertiary
<a href="#">Return to RFP Response Form</a>											
<b>Voltage</b>											
<b>Location</b>	Bus1 Name										
	Bus2 Name										
<b>Transformers</b>	Quantity										
	Proposed Manufacturer										
	Number of Windings										
	Rating (MVA)										
	OTHER ITEMS - please detail:										
<b>Breaker Scheme</b>	Quantity										
	Configuration										
	Ampacity										
	CTs per bushing (Qty)										
	Interrupting Capacity Rating (kA)										
<b>Wave Traps</b>	Quantity										
	Ampacity										
<b>Switches</b>	Switches Total (Qty)										
	Motor-Operated (Qty)										
	Type										
	Ampacity										
	Interruptors (Qty)										
<b>Stand Alone CTs</b>	Quantity										
	Ampacity										
	Revenue Accuracy										
<b>PTs</b>	Quantity										
	Voltage (kV)										
<b>CCVTs</b>	Quantity										
	Voltage (kV)										
<b>Capacitor Bank</b>	Quantity										
	Switching Device (Type)										
	Voltage (kV)										
	Size (MVAR)										
<b>Reactors</b>	Quantity										
	Switching Device (Type)										
	Voltage (kV)										
	Size (MVAR)										
<b>Relay Control Panels</b>	Line Panel										
	Bus Differential Panel										
	Transformer Differential Panel										
	RTU Panel										
	Digital Fault Recorder (DFR) Panel										
	Metering Panel										

SPS/XE Comment: Need box for BILL level of equipment.

**Substation Assumptions\***

**DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY**

* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A."		Additional Documents Provided (Y/N)	Station 1			Station 2			Station 3		
			High Side	Low Side	Tertiary	High Side	Low Side	Tertiary	High Side	Low Side	Tertiary
<a href="#">Return to RFP Response Form</a>											
<b>Control House with Battery Bank</b>	Misc. Panels (Describe under "Other" below)										
	Total Panels (Qty)										
	New or Expansion										
	Dimensions										
	Battery Bank Size										
	Backup Power Source										
	Backup Power Source description:										
Cable Trench:											
OTHER ITEMS - please detail:											
<b>Environmental</b>	Study Requirements										
	Site Preparation Requirements										
	Siting Improvement Requirements										
	SWPPP (Storm Water Protection) Requirements										
	Wetland Requirements/Mitigation										
	Threatened and Endangered Species Mitigation										
	Cultural/Historical Resource Requirements										
	Corrosive/Heavy Contamination Area Requirements										
	OTHER ITEMS - please detail:										
<b>Lightning Arrestor</b>	Quantity										
	Size										
	Type										
	Type										

SPS/XE Comments - add row for Additional comments under Control House. Separate battery systems may be required, per recent NERC inquiries.

# Substation Assumptions\*

DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY

* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A."		Additional Documents Provided (Y/N)	Station 1			Station 2			Station 3		
			High Side	Low Side	Tertiary	High Side	Low Side	Tertiary	High Side	Low Side	Tertiary
<a href="#">Return to RFP Response Form</a>											
<i>See comment - BIL Rating (kV Crest)</i>			AEP/Transource comment: Different BIL ratings are required for different series elements. Should they be listed under each?								
Estimated life of construction - substation											
Describe Construction Project Management processes											
Provide a narrative for commissioning processes											
Required Substation Property Dimensions (Indicate new or expansion)											
Substation Fencing Requirements (Description / Qty)											
Security Measures											
Provide a narrative for any material on hand, assets on hand, or, rights-of-way ownership, control, or acquisition											
<i>Need to define - Section 3.11 of the RFP Template</i>	Reliability/quality metrics										
Ground Grid Study			WG comment: Model availability question brought up - Requirement for final sizing or not (probably not) - need to specify what is required/expected for this. AEP/Transource comment: Provide study summary and justification of results								



**Substation Assumptions\***

**DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY**

**\* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A."**

Additional Documents Provided (Y/N)

**Station 1**

**Station 2**

**Station 3**

[Return to RFP Response Form](#)

**High Side**

**Low Side**

**Tertiary**

**High Side**

**Low Side**

**Tertiary**

**High Side**

**Low Side**

**Tertiary**

**OTHER ITEMS - please detail:**

Project Development Schedule		<a href="#">Return to RFP Response Form</a>	Additional Documents Provided (Y/N)
Task	Start Date	Duration	
Regulatory Approvals Complete*	9/1/2014	-----	
Right-of-Way Complete	No later than DATE	-----	
Environmental Complete	No later than DATE	-----	
Engineering Complete	No later than DATE	-----	
Procurement Complete	No later than DATE	-----	
Construction Complete	No later than DATE	-----	
<b>In-Service Date</b>	No later than DATE	-----	
*Complete Tab 2B for all regulatory approval dates leading up to the regulatory approvals completion date.			
Description of Project Schedule			
Description of any Risks			

Itemize Regulatory Approval Dates		<a href="#">Return to RFP Response Form</a>	Additional Documents Provided (Y/N)
Task	Start Date	Duration	
Regulatory Approval #1	No later than DATE	-----	
Regulatory Approval #2	No later than DATE	-----	
Regulatory Approval #3	No later than DATE	-----	
Regulatory Approval #4	No later than DATE	-----	
Regulatory Approval #5	No later than DATE	-----	
Regulatory Approval #6	No later than DATE	-----	
<b>Date Regulatory Approvals Complete</b>	<b>9/1/2014</b>	-----	

Description of Regulatory Approval Process		
--	--	--

Description of any Risks		
--------------------------	--	--

**Operations (Operations/Maintenance/Safety)\***

Additional Documents Provided (Y/ N)

**\* Please complete all fields for both line and/or substation. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A." If additional attachments will be included, please reference them in the appropriate section by document name, including the section in the file name.**

**DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY**

<p>Identify entity operating and maintaining the transmission facility</p>		
<p>Describe experience with control center operations (staffing, etc.)</p>		
<p>Describe storm/outage response plans and provide any relevant documentation</p>		
<p>Provide any reliability metrics utilized</p>		
<p>Describe restoration experience and itemize past performance</p>		
<p>Provide an overview of O&amp;M staffing and what training they require (as well as any required qualifications)</p>		



**Operations (Operations/Maintenance/Safety)\***

Additional Documents Provided (Y/ N)

**\* Please complete all fields for both line and/or substation. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A." If additional attachments will be included, please reference them in the appropriate section by document name, including the section in the file name.**

**DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY**

<p>Describe any specific maintenance plans utilized and provide any relevant documentation</p>		
<p>Equipment</p>		
<p>Maintenance Performance / Expertise</p>		
<p>NERC compliance-process; history</p>		
<p>Internal Safety Program</p>		
<p>Contractor safety program</p>		

Operations (Operations/Maintenance/Safety)*		Additional Documents Provided (Y/ N)
<p><b>* Please complete all fields for both line and/or substation. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A." If additional attachments will be included, please reference them in the appropriate section by document name, including the section in the file name.</b></p>		
<b>DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY</b>		
<p>Safety performance record related to program execution (past maintenance and outage restoration performance)</p>		
<p>Other RFP Respondent Comments related to O&amp;M and Safety</p>		
<a href="#">Return to RFP Response Form</a>		





<b>RRE Summary Cost Estimate*</b>	<a href="#">Return to RFP Response Form</a>
<b>Transmission Line #1 - Costs</b>	<b>Current Year \$</b>
Engineering Labor	
Construction Labor	
Right-of-Way Clearing and Real Estate Acquisition	
Material	\$0
<b>TLine1 Sub-Total:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Transmission Line #2 - Costs</b>	
Engineering Labor	
Construction Labor	
Right-of-Way Clearing and Real Estate Acquisition	
Material	\$0
<b>TLine2 Sub-Total:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Transmission Line #3 - Costs</b>	
Engineering Labor	
Construction Labor	
Right-of-Way Clearing and Real Estate Acquisition	
Material	\$0
<b>TLine3 Sub-Total:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Transmission Line #4 - Costs</b>	
Engineering Labor	
Construction Labor	
Right-of-Way Clearing and Real Estate Acquisition	
Material	\$0
<b>TLine4 Sub-Total:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Substation #1 - Costs</b>	
Engineering Labor	
Construction Labor	
Real Estate Acquisition - better define in Instructions	
Material	\$0
<b>Substation1 Sub-Total:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Substation #2 - Costs</b>	
Engineering Labor	
Construction Labor	
Real Estate Acquisition - better define in Instructions	
Material	\$0
<b>Substation2 Sub-Total:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Substation #3 - Costs</b>	
Engineering Labor	
Construction Labor	
Real Estate Acquisition - better define in Instructions	
Material	\$0
<b>Substation3 Sub-Total:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Summary Info</b>	
Transmission Line Total	\$0
Substation Total	\$0
AFUDC (If amount given, CWIP should be "No")	
Contingency	
Overhead	
Risk Management	
Legal Expenses	
Environmental Expenses	
Permitting Expenses	
Other - Misc. Expenses (Describe below)	
<b>Total Project Cost Estimate:</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Miscellaneous Cost Info</b>	
CWIP (Y/N) (If Yes, no AFUDC Is required)	
Internal Escalation Rate (For Multi-Year Upgrades)	

**DRAFT DOCUMENT  
FOR REVIEW ONLY**

**\* Please complete all fields.**

# Rate Analysis

[Return to RFP Response Form](#)

Additional Documents Provided (Y/N)

**\* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A." If additional attachments will be included, please reference them in the appropriate section by document name, including the section in the file name.**

## DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY

Provide a description of all Financing Costs and provide supporting documentation		
Provide a description of any anticipated FERC Incentives and provide supporting documentation		
Detail Revenue Requirements (ATRR) and provide supporting documentation		
Detail Lifetime Cost of the Project to Customers and provide supporting documentation		
Detail Return on Equity and provide supporting documentation		
Detail material on hand, assets on hand, or rights-of-way ownership, control, or acquisition and provide supporting documentation		
Detail any Cost Certainty Guarantee and provide supporting documentation		
OTHER INFORMATION - please detail and provide any supporting documentation		

**Finance (Financial Viability and Creditworthiness)**

[Return to RFP Response Form](#)

**Additional Documents Provided (Y/ N)**

**\* Please complete all fields. For fields not applicable to this RFP Response, please enter "N/A." If additional attachments will be included, please reference them in the appropriate section by document name, including the section in the file name.**

**DRAFT DOCUMENT - FOR REVIEW ONLY**

<p><b>Provide evidence of financing and provide supporting documentation</b></p>		
<p><b>Identify which of the following is being provided to demonstrate QRP's financial strength</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration the QRP continues to satisfy the financial criteria set forth in Section III.1(b)(ii)(1) or (2) of Attachment Y and that the Competitive Upgrade does not exceed 30% of the total capitalization of the QRP or its parent Guarantor; or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A performance bond is being provided from an insurance/surety company acceptable to SPP in an amount equal to the total cost of the Competitive Upgrade, including financing costs, and a 30% contingency; or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A letter of credit from a financial institution is being provided which is acceptable to SPP in an amount equal to the total cost of the Competitive Upgrade including financing costs, and a 30% contingency.</p>	
<p><b>Describe the material conditions of any financing and provide supporting documentation</b></p>		
<p><b>Include financial/business plan(s) and provide supporting documentation</b></p>		
<p><b>Describe pro forma financial statements and provide supporting documentation</b></p>		
<p><b>Describe any expected financial leverage and provide supporting documentation</b></p>		
<p><b>Describe any debt covenants and provide supporting documentation</b></p>		
<p><b>Detail projected liquidity and provide supporting documentation</b></p>		
<p><b>Describe any dividend policy and provide supporting documentation</b></p>		
<p><b>Detail cash flow analysis and provide supporting documentation</b></p>		
<p><b>QRP or its parent, controlling shareholder, or entity providing a Guaranty pursuant to Section III.1(b)(ii)(2) of Attachment Y must provide any credit rating changes, bankruptcies, dissolutions, mergers or acquisitions within the past five (5) year period and provide supporting documentation</b></p>		
<p><b>OTHER INFORMATION - please detail and provide any supporting documentation</b></p>		