LPSC DOCKET NO. I-34694
ELL 2019 INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLAN

ELL'S RESPONSES TO APRIL 19, 2018
INFORMAL STAKEHOLDER QUESTIONS

During the April 19, 2018 Integrated Resource Plan ("IRP") stakeholder meeting ("Stakeholder Meeting"), a number of stakeholders posed questions to Entergy Louisiana, LLC ("ELL") and its consultant, ICF. ELL hereby provides responses to those questions that were not fully answered at the Stakeholder Meeting or otherwise merit further response:[1]

1. ELL was asked which, if any, planned Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") Transmission Expansion Plan ("MTEP") projects were included in ELL's IRP modeling. ELL's IRP modeling in the AURORA model uses a simplified zonal construct in which separate zones are modeled for the South (which includes Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, and Arkansas), Central, and North regions of MISO. Transmission limitations are represented by the transfer capability between these zones, and no transmission limitations are modeled within each zone. The transfer limit between MISO South and MISO North/Central is based on a contractual agreement and is held constant throughout the IRP study period.

2. Stakeholders requested an explanation for the shape of the historical load curve on slide 8 of ELL's presentation. As part of ELL's load forecasting process, historical load data is "weather normalized." In other words, ELL's historical load data is adjusted to a "normal" level based on whether the actual temperatures were higher or lower than normal. All of the loads shown on slide 8 (historical and forecasted peaks) are weather-normalized. August 2014 was a milder month than normal, and August 2015 was a significantly warmer month than normal. In the process of weather-normalizing those periods, the 2014 peak was adjusted upward, and the 2015 peak was adjusted downward, causing the dip shown in the chart on Slide 8. For reference, the actual peaks for 2014 and 2015 were 9.3 GW and 10.1 GW, respectively.

3. ELL was asked what factors contribute to ELL's projected load growth. ELL's peak and total load is forecasted to increase over time primarily due to increases in consumption from large industrial customers. Increasing load is also supported by expected increases in the numbers of residential and commercial customers but offset by expected decreases in average kWh usage for these residential and commercial customers.

4. A stakeholder asked if ELL's peak load data on slide 8 of ELL's presentation is the sum of the expected individual maximum load values of the various customer classes (*e.g.*, commercial, residential, industrial) or the maximum load value of all customer classes

[1] Because the Stakeholder Meeting was not transcribed, it is possible that the ELL did not capture all of the unanswered questions raised during the meeting.

combined. ELL responds that the peak load data (both forecasted and actual) is the maximum value of the total load for all of the customer classes taken as a whole.

5. A stakeholder asked if ELL's resource planning was done separately for the individual customer classes. ELL's resource planning decisions are generally based on ELL's total load from all customer classes. There are no explicit capacity requirements by class. Overall long-term capacity requirements are determined by adding a 12% installed capacity reserve margin to ELL's forecasted non-coincident peak load (for all customer classes in total). However, ELL has certain planning targets for types of capacity (*e.g.*, baseload, peaking, etc.) based on its customers' collective hourly load shape. If ELL had a different mix of industrial, commercial, and residential customers, then the resulting hourly load shape could result in different resource targets for ELL.

6. The Company notes that electric vehicle penetration was factored into the load forecast, the assumptions for the volumes of which in the near-term are very conservative.

7. The Company was asked to provide its deactivation assumptions by resource. Unit-specific deactivation assumptions are market sensitive information, and disclosure of such information to the market could negatively impact ELL and its customers. Aggregated annual deactivation assumptions are the greatest level of detail required to produce the supply deficit curves for the long-term supply need graphic on slide 9 of ELL's Data Assumptions presentation covered at the Stakeholder Meeting. Instead, ELL provides the aggregated annual deactivations in the table below.

Table 1 - 2019 ELL IRP Supply Resource Deactivation Assumptions (Total MW by Year)

2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028
0	11	0	46	0	0	0	401	13	12

2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038
508	149	928	1,154	1,754	0	798	0	0	0

Notes:
1- MW values represent ELL's ownership share of the installed capacity ("ICAP") of resources owned by ELL, based on the GVTC ratings effective for the 2018-2019 MISO Planning Year.
2- Deactivation assumptions are planning inputs based on age, criticality, reliability, and unit condition (both current and projected). These deactivation planning assumptions do not represent a deactivation schedule and are subject to change based on changes in unit condition, market condition, or economics.

8. During ICF's DSM Potential Study presentation, ICF was asked to provide assumptions behind time of use ("TOU") rate designs and direct load control ("DLC") measure and cost-effectiveness results for its Energy Efficiency and Demand Response program tests. ICF has provided an updated presentation that includes this information. The Company has attached this updated presentation, which has also been added to the Company's IRP website.