

## **Brief Summary of Grid West RRG Meeting December 9, 2004**

---

### **Introduction**

This summary is intended to briefly describe the discussion during the December 9, 2004 meeting of the Grid West Regional Representatives Group (RRG). It is not intended to be a verbatim transcript of anyone's remarks, and it is not intended to suggest that any particular representative or entity at the RRG meeting agreed with or endorsed the views described in this summary.

### **Overview of December 9 Meeting**

- The RRG met at the Sheraton Portland Airport Hotel in Portland, Oregon on Thursday, December 9, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:20 p.m. PST.
- Approximately 75 people attended the RRG meeting, including twenty-six designated RRG representatives. Three state representatives attended the meeting in person and two state representatives participated by phone.
- The Bylaws Work Group described final clean-up and editorial corrections to both the Developmental and Operational Bylaws with the RRG. The Work Group presented alternatives to Section 5.14.1 regarding "dual representation" of members across sub-classes and the RRG settled on final provisions of this section (in both sets of bylaws).
- Each RRG member and other participants at the meeting gave an assessment of the bylaws and advised the filing utilities on the question of whether the filing utilities should adopt the bylaws. Views ranged from most RRG participants urging the filing utilities to adopt the bylaws to several representatives of publicly-owned utilities voicing objections to Grid West moving forward.
- The filing utilities thanked the RRG for its input and stated their views on the 18-month process and the question of moving ahead and adopting the bylaws.

### **Walk Through of Clean-up of Proposed Bylaws and Decision Concerning Dual Representation Across Sub-Classes – "Stable" Bylaws**

The Bylaws Work Group described the final technical corrections made to the bylaws since the November 24 versions were posted. These corrections were made as RRG members pointed out technical discrepancies and the need for clarification in specific sections of the bylaws. Excerpts of the bylaws showing the technical corrections are posted on the website at [http://www.gridwest.org/RRGPastMtgs\\_NovDec2004.htm](http://www.gridwest.org/RRGPastMtgs_NovDec2004.htm) and were distributed at the meeting.

Don Brookhyser explained the changes made in both the Developmental and Operational Bylaws. The definition of "Generator" in Section 1.1.13 (1.1.15) was clarified at (iv)(a) to "an aggregate net generating capacity of not less than ten MW." In Section 1.1.23

(1.1.24), the “Large TDU” definition was clarified, including provisions clarifying “Qualifying Load” for Large TDUs.

Based on inconsistencies pointed out in Sections 6.2, 6.3.2, and 6.3.3, clarifying corrections were made to cover all possibilities concerning member class allocation, calculation of votes, voting thresholds, and special rules when thresholds are not met.

In Section 5.14.1, Voting of Members (Other Than Advisory Votes), the Bylaws Work Group asked the RRG to consider the idea of allowing multi-representation of Members even if the Members are in different Sub-Classes -- “dual representation.” After some discussion by the RRG among potential members of the same class, the RRG agreed on:

- a TDU designated representative or alternate may represent more than one Member in the TDU Class (even if the Members are in different Sub-Classes);
- a Generators, Power Marketers, Large Generating End-Use Consumers and Others designated representative or alternate may represent more than one Member in that Class (even if the Members are in different Sub-Classes);
- for other Member Classes, a designated representative or alternate may represent more than one Member only in the same Member Sub-Class, *unless* a majority of the voting power within each Sub-Class has voted that a representative is allowed to represent Members in multiple Sub-Classes.

The Bylaws Work Group also briefly described other final cleanup revisions that were made to the Bylaws to get them ready for adoption, but the RRG did not feel it was necessary to have detailed review of the specific language.

After checking if there were any other questions, Bud Krogh asked the RRG if there was agreement that the bylaws (Developmental and Operational) were “stable.” The RRG voiced no disagreement.

### **RRG Assessment and Views on Whether the Bylaws Should be Adopted Non-Filing Utility Comments**

Bud asked each RRG member to give his or her assessment and views on whether the filing utilities should adopt the bylaws for Grid West. This was followed by statements from other participants at the RRG meeting.

Many of the comments acknowledged that the region has problems on the transmission grid that need to be addressed. Several participants stated that there was a need to find a way to use the grid wisely to deliver power to load and meet load growth. Interests and concerns were varied and views differed on whether Grid West was a good way to address needed improvements. Some RRG members expressed appreciation that changes to the bylaws developed through the RRG process had produced more regional flexibility, input on cost control of the organization, and accountability to the region.

Most RRG members urged the filing utilities to move forward with development of an independent entity. Others stressed that such an entity was not the answer and did not support adopting the bylaws.

Many said their continued or possible future support was contingent on learning more about the operational and market design details as they are developed, plus a number of statements stressed the importance of future benefit/cost evaluation. Some parties identified particular issues that were important to them.

Following RRG member comments, other meeting participants offered a range of views for and against adopting the bylaws.

### **Thoughts of Filing Utilities**

When there were no other views to be offered, the filing utilities offered their thoughts, observing that they had learned a lot from the statements and comments of the RRG. Several filers commented on the number of years that the region has attempted to come up with a widely supported workable regional proposal and thanked the RRG participants for engaging in the most recent 18-month bottom-up process. Most stated the belief that the region now is working toward reaching a broadly acceptable middle ground, and voiced commitments to move forward, show progress, and keep the RRG together.

Overall, filers acknowledged that they had not heard unanimous approval for moving ahead with the first decision point, adoption of the bylaws; but said that they believed significant support was expressed for taking the next step.

### **Conclusion**

Bud Krogh thanked the RRG, the work groups, and especially the Bylaws Work Group for its heroic efforts, noting that the RRG had come a long way towards success.

**Postscript:** After the RRG meeting, on December 9 the RTO West Board met and unanimously adopted the bylaws as presented to, discussed and finalized with the RRG during the December 9 RRG meeting.