

North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

TO: Interested Industry Participants
FROM: BPS Chairs (Tina Burnett, Mike Novak, Kim Van Pelt, Producer vacancy, Services vacancy)
Rae McQuade, Executive Director
RE: Final Minutes from the Business Practices Subcommittee Meeting,
January 22-23, 2003
DATE: January 29, 2003

1. Administrative

Ms. Van Pelt welcomed guests and made announcements. Ms. Van Pelt announced there was no court reporter present to transcribe the meeting, but one would arrive later in the meeting. Mr. Buccigross read the antitrust guidelines. Ms. Scott, as representative of the host company, welcomed attendees and handled housekeeping matters. Ms. Van Pelt explained balanced voting. The attendees introduced themselves. Ms. Van Pelt informed participants that if they were not normally a WGQ participant, they should align themselves with a WGQ segment.

The meeting agenda was adopted unanimously without modification.

The adoption of the January 20 conference call minutes was postponed until later in the meeting.

2. Workplan Item II. A. Type of Information that the Service Requester should supply for Creditworthiness Evaluation

Ms. Van Pelt opened discussion. Mr. Nelson distributed a proposal drafted by the pipelines. He said this is a list of information pretty common to pipeline tariffs. He said the idea was that the service provider could request the service requester to provide this information, and it gives the pipeline flexibility in each circumstance. Ms. Chezar asked if the proposal would apply only to a new customer, or also to an existing shipper? Mr. Nelson said the pipeline proposal would apply to everybody, including the request of additional information for a change in status. Ms. Chezar asked if the title to this section should be changed to be more descriptive as to whom the language would apply.

Mr. Love explained shippers are "service requesters" in NAESB speak. Mr. Young said the information in the pipeline proposal is information that would be required for new service or for any kind of evaluation of information for credit. Ms. Deegan stated concern that some of the listed information may be non-public. She asserted this situation could lead to antitrust issues. In particular, she was concerned with the credit reports and interim financial statements. Ms. Kimball said her interpretation is that all information that is non-public would be provided in confidence. Also, Ms. Kimball said her interpretation of service requester includes a shipper. Ms. Gibbs asked if service requester is defined in NAESB standards. Ms. Davis said service requester is a generic term used throughout the data sets, which translated for these purposes means shipper.

Ms. Carter asked for elaboration on the "Such other information" item. Mr. Nelson said the idea is that since the future is unpredictable, there should be something else available that is not on this list. Mr. Kardas noted this language has been used before in other standards, though he does not remember specific examples. Ms. Gibbs said this language is open-ended and PGC states concern about broad terms in the last statement of the pipeline work paper. Ms. Carter asked if this language was designed to be a broad

North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

catchall to get anything? Mr. Nelson said no, but Ms. Carter's suggestion might address an additional point. Mr. Nelson said the point of this language was for information not yet contemplated at the time the standard was drafted. Mr. Young stated concern that if a standard does not have a list such as this, FERC could interpret additional documents requested as not needed because of lack of industry consensus. Mr. Young said this listing sends a signal to FERC.

Ms. Carter suggested the removal of the "or contracts" language if the pipeline proposal is really about the tariff. Mr. Downs said his understanding is that NAESB cannot trump Section 4 of the NGA. He said companies are always allowed to file a Section 4 proposal, which FERC will consider in a section 4 proceeding. Ms. Chezar asked if the items listed were included in all existing pipeline tariffs. Mr. Nelson responded to Ms. Chezar that there might be some tariffs that have items not on the list. Mr. Nelson said the intent would be to have it on a going forward basis. Mr. Nelson said if we agree on a standard, the standard would include this list and there would be no need to include something in the service agreement. Ms. Carter asked if "or contracts" will be taken out of the document. Mr. Nelson said if the language "such information" is added, then yes.

Mr. Sappenfield said he could live with mutual agreement for non-public information. Mr. Kardas asked if the group agrees to add Ms. Carter's proposal. Ms. Van Pelt noted the last phrase of the original proposal was derived from existing standards language.

Ms. Gibbs asked the following clarifying questions. 1) Does "should supply any or all," mean the pipeline has discretion on the documents required. Mr. Nelson responded the short answer is yes, but the practical answer is no because some documents overlap. Mr. Nelson said the process involved would be proceeding down the list of items requested. 2) In the "such other information" sentence, Ms. Gibbs noted confusion as to whether the proposal was geared towards some new document in the future that can show the financial health of a company that the pipeline would like to be able to request without FERC approval. Mr. Nelson said, in that situation, a pipeline would go to the shipper and tell them of the current information needed. If shippers would not provide the requested information, he said the pipeline would probably go to FERC and ask the document be added to list.

Mr. Conner expressed concern over the "sworn filing" concept. Mr. Conner noted that for LDCs, some filings are made with state regulators and NAESB should be sensitive about how that is written and what it means. Mr. Conner said this is a good list to start, but it needs some work.

Mr. Love asked if the WGQ intends to add "any other documents as may be mutually agreed." Mr. Ishikawa echoed the concerns stated earlier about the opening sentence. He stated concern about the word all, since it is not an inclusive list (some of the items are alternatives).

Mr. Bass said the WGQ needs to keep in mind these standards are being developed for the industry, not just the pipelines. He noted there are service providers that do not have tariffs or GT&C, but only have contracts. Ms. Deegan restated her concerns about standardizing the production of non-public information. Additionally, she asked if the term 'credit report' refers to the public information or something produced after the review of non-public information. Mr. Downs said he cannot tell if this is a list of required or suggested documents.

Mr. Young said his concern, as a pipeline, is that he needs the best information possible to make the credit determination. If the public information is 9 months old, that is not necessarily a representation of the current credit of the company being evaluated. He said a credit report would be readily available, and he did not think it included nonpublic information.

North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

Mr. Love noted many pipelines work with companies that do not have credit ratings. Ms. Kimball said a lot of shippers are not publicly held. She said you cannot find good information on those companies in the public domain. Ms. Carter stated continued concern for companies that do have publicly traded stock and financial statements. Ms. Carter asked if there is a way to limit the statement to “companies without publicly available information.” Ms. Carter suggested the document make it clear that non-public information is requested for non-public companies. Ms. Deegan again said we don’t want to be in possession of non-public financial records.

Mr. Conner noted that while the group is starting out with a list of 8 things, 10 exceptions have been developed, and we are still fighting with the “other” item. Mr. Conner suggested this result shows how difficult it is to standardize on this issue. Ms. Harrington said she did not intend that the nonpublic information would be for a public company. She interpreted that it would be the most recent SEC statements from the publics; and on credit ratings, she thought you were looking for the public report from S&P and Moodys. Ms. Deegan noted, as information, a public credit report is not always issued.

Chair’s note: The court reporter arrived at this point during the meeting.

Mr. Nelson proposed some changed language in light of the comments and concerns expressed during the earlier session. In part, Mr. Nelson said this change would address the issues of making privately held information publicly disclosed. Ms. Van Pelt read the pipeline proposal as amended.

Ms. Gibbs asked, as a procedural question, why the group was discussing the pipeline paper instead of the work paper submitted by Calpine prior to this meeting. She stated concern that the group not dismiss and fail to discuss the Calpine paper. Mr. Novak noted it was up to Mr. Downs, the representative from Calpine, to initiate discussion of his paper.

Mr. Dotterweich said he favored the bifurcation that has appeared in the changes to the pipeline document, but cautioned some language is still open ended. Mr. Dotterweich noted this is just the first piece of a credit determination, that this is information handed over to start a credit file, not how it is used or whether other information may be used.

Ms. Chezar asked several questions. 1) Does the SEC have different filing requirements based on size of company? Ms. Chezar noted the group should check this as it relates to small publicly traded entities. 2) What do the pipelines mean by public or non-public? Ms. Chezar noted that her parent company was publicly traded, but the LDCs are non-public. Ms. Kimball said in that case the LDCs would provide the documents requested of the private companies. Ms. Chezar expressed concern that under this definition everyone will be non-public. Additionally, Ms. Chezar noted FERC allows pipelines to deviate from NAESB standards as long as the pipeline is adding value.

Mr. Conner suggested a public entity be defined as a company required to file documents with the SEC. Mr. Novak suggested the language being discussed could be broken down into several standards, so the language here did not become unmanageable.

Mr. Downs initiated discussion of the Calpine paper. He said items 1 through 5 on the pipeline proposal are similar to Calpine’s Item 1. However, he differentiated that if the information is public, the service requester could just direct the pipeline to the public information.

North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

Mr. Nelson expressed reluctance at the concept of the service provider finding the information, noting this could slow the process of information gathering. It was also noted the level of technological competence of workers is not known. Further, it was noted the service requester does not know the actual information gathered by the pipeline. Mr. Nelson noted the information is already in the service requester's possession. Mr. Downs responded that he sees contemporaneous investigative work between the provider and requester. Mr. Kardas said the process would only be quicker if the service requester has the information electronically available.

Ms. Gibbs stated concern about the triggers for pipelines to request additional information and re-evaluate credit determinations. She said to the extent that the review and requesting of information would be happening frequently, she was concerned that maybe the pipeline could do some triage first before requesting information of the shipper. For new service, Ms. Gibbs did not see a problem with submitting the documents discussed here. It is the periodic checking she is worried about. Mr. Kardas noted that under Ms. Gibbs's circumstances, it is to the pipeline's benefit to do the research. Additionally, Mr. Kardas noted evaluation of the requested information comes at a cost as well. Ms. Gibbs suggested this might be an area for a principle, not a standard.

Mr. Downs says item 7 on pipeline proposal (credit reports) does not address if a service requester does not have its own rating. He said in the Calpine proposal, bullet 2 addresses that issue. In part, the service requester would have the right, at its own expense, to use a creditable service to get a private rating. He noted this exists in certain tariffs and it is not new.

Mr. Downs offered clarification on the Calpine credit reports proposal. Mr. Downs said he envisions a scenario where a credit report is requested, but the service requester does not have a credit report. He asked if the service provider would look to the parent company's rating or move on and ask for other documents. Calpine would want to have the right for the requester to inform the credit officer it is going to obtain a private rating. Ms. Harrington noted the fact that a company may not have a publicly available credit report would not signify lack of creditworthiness. Instead, she said it would just be a gap in information and she could use the other information available. Mr. Downs said Calpine wants to avoid the service provider ignoring the information developed by the service requester and going straight to a parent company's information.

Mr. Nelson addressed the issue of a private rating. He said he is of the view that you can provide anything you want. He said "credible" is subjective, and this could mean the pipeline has to use the credit rating. Mr. Nelson suggested broadening the language so the service requester could provide any additional information it wants.

Ms. Gibbs said she would like a legitimate credit report to be binding and evaluated alone and bar the request of additional information. She wanted the credit report to be accepted as legitimate and binding. Mr. Nelson said this gets into an information sufficiency issue that was not set for standardization. As a practical matter, Mr. Nelson said an independent credit evaluation is problematic, because one side is paying for it.

Ms. Carter noted that some pipelines specify credit and bond rating services in their tariff. She said this is helpful for the shippers. She recommended pipelines specify services in their tariffs. Mr. Downs said specificity of accepted agencies would probably be valuable. He said he has seen a lot of reports issued from Moodys and S&P.

North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

Ms. Kimball said she does not think pipelines should be forced to use ratings to do credit opinions. She said they should be able to use their own judgment.

Mr. Young said NAESB has not picked services before (S&P or MOODYs), and noted the ratings produced differ. He said if ratings for the same company differ, he would take the lowest available, because he thinks that is prudent. He said the market indicates if credit agencies are doing things correctly. He said if the agencies were not, people would stop using the agencies. That is how the marketplace works.

Ms. Carter said having multiple ratings from different agencies does not bother her, as long as the service requester knows which rating to get. She said standardization is one thing, but clear requirements are also a goal.

Mr. Young said using the lowest rating is the prudent thing. He noted it is one of many factors taken into consideration in the overall process. He said there is not that much disparity between ratings. Mr. Nelson noted the use of rating is decision criteria, which is not an issue here.

Mr. Dotterweich noted he hears a lot of debate as to how should a pipeline evaluate credit and what should be considered. He said it has been agreed this is a contentious issue and it seems we are getting back to issues we agreed not to address. He said the topic on the table is what should be standardized and submitted. He said we need to get back to the standard data required.

Ms. Gibbs said the information on the pipeline list right now means essentially that by putting it on the list you will consider it. She said she is asking to add to the list. On policy, she said FERC has issued an order on rehearing stating FERC would be deciding an order before the NAESB process is over. She said we would talk about them in the future, so it is good to start talking about them now.

Ms. Van Pelt distributed additional handouts (redlined copy of the pipeline proposal) to the meeting participants. She noted that they would attempt to be as considerate as possible when modifying documents during a meeting but posting them.

Mr. Nelson motioned to adopt the pipeline proposal and Mr. Curtis seconded. Ms. Van Pelt read the redlined proposal under consideration. Ms. Carter proposed a modification to the motion (refer to hard copy). Ms. Carter voiced concerns about the "sworn filing with a regulatory agency" section. Mr. Downs asked if the pipelines would object to including something about the protection of non-public information. Ms. Davis said NAESB could develop additional standards to deal with confidential material.

Mr. Busch proposed the language to be added: "in the event that the service requester does not have its own financial or credit reports or statements as indicated above, service requestor may instead supply such reports or statements for service requestors parents or other entity that is guaranteeing service requestor's credit, to the extent that such alternative reports or statements are available." It was suggested that this language should be a separate standard (possibly under item C). It was suggested that the language 'service provider' be replaced by 'transportation service provider.' Ms. Chezar suggested a modification to note that information will be provided on a confidential basis. Mr. Novak suggested that for now the group discuss what is on the table now and make a decision about what we will have in the motion and not bring up anything new. Mr. Love discussed how pipeline FERC filings work.

Mr. Novak suggested the group break into caucus sections and, upon returning from break, they review what the proponents of the motion accept and proceed to some kind of vote (either sense of the room or proposed

North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

standards vote) about whether or not to adopt the pipeline proposal. Ms. Chezar suggested a sense of the room might work better at this point in order to move forward.

Mr. Nelson reviewed the proposed modifications with his suggested modifications to the motion/proposal.

Mr. Novak suggested that they take the sense of the room vote as a balanced vote. Mr. Buccigross suggested that a sense of the room doesn't really accomplish anything at this point. He proposed the group take this proposal back and think it over and vote on it when they are ready to make it a recommendation. Ms. Van Pelt proposed that they get an idea of where the group stands on this proposal before leaving this meeting. Mr. Busch suggested tabling this proposal to come back when the group can vote on it as an entire package.

Mr. Novak stated that based on the response of the people in the room, a vote should not be taken now because people have a problem with the "such other information as required by TSP's lender(s)" language. He noted they needed more information (examples of when this might occur, what types of info required, etc.). Mr. Dotterweich proposed the group discuss the Calpine proposal, noting his feeling the Calpine proposal better captured the language. Mr. Sappenfield objected to the lender language included in the proposed standard z1. He stated that the language was too open-ended and uncertain. Further, he stated that TSPs could use one of the other provisions to include lender credit requirements in the TSP's tariff upon approval by the Commission. Mr. Busch also indicated the lender language was too broad and unacceptable and could not support the proposed standard z1 if the lender language remained as proposed.

Mr. Novak stated everything on this list is 'if available', if you don't have something it is obviously not required. Ms. Van Pelt would like to determine if there are other things in this proposal that need to be fine tuned before a vote is taken. Mr. Griffith suggested people take a look at the document tonight and talk about it first thing tomorrow and if it appears that we can't get a vote, then we should move on for now. Ms. Van Pelt read the most recent redlined version of the document. Copies of the redlined document were distributed to participants.

A motion to recess the meeting until Thursday morning passed unanimously.

4. Administrative - January 23, 2003

Mr. Novak opened the meeting and noted that attendance sheets would be circulated again. Introductions were made. He reminded participants antitrust guidelines were still in effect. The January 20, 2003 minutes were discussed. Ms. Davis moved, seconded by Ms. Chezar, to adopt the draft minutes. Upon a procedural vote the draft minutes were adopted as written.

5. Workplan Item II. A. Type of Information that the Service Requester should Supply for Creditworthiness Evaluation (continued)

Mr. Novak called attention to the new handout, which is the most recent redlined version of the motion (the pipeline proposal) made by Mr. Nelson and seconded by Mr. Kardas, and also noted that it is posted on the NAESB web site.

Mr. Nelson said they talked over the possibility of narrowing the information required by lender and came up with two points of additional language (noted on hard copy). Since the original party to second the motion to adopt the pipeline proposal was not present, Mr. Griffith seconded the modified motion.

North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
Home Page: www.naesb.org

After the bullet reading, "Such other information as required by the TSP's lender", new language added reads:

"from

- 1) SR(s) of TSPs project financed facilities or
- 2) SR(s) requesting service on proposed or newly constructed facilities financed by that lender(s)"

Mr. Sappenfield reiterated his objection to the revised lender language included in the proposed standard z1.

Mr. Novak noted that Ms. Burch needed to leave and another person from Duke Energy would be taking over voting for her (it was not noted who would be voting in her place). The votes were counted in the room and then on the phone. A balanced vote was taken by segment on the motion below:

Proposed Standard z1: (motioned by Howard Nelson, seconded by Joe Kardas)

For credit evaluation purposes, the Service Requester (SR) should supply any of the following information as specified by the Transportation Service Provider (TSP):

Audited Financial Statements;

Annual Report;

Most recent filed statements with the Securities and Exchange Commission (or an equivalent authority) or such other publicly available information;

For public entities, the most recent publicly available interim financial statements, with an attestation by its Chief Financial Officer (CFO) that such statements constitute a true, correct, and fair representation of financial condition prepared in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) or equivalent;

For non-public entities, the most recent available interim financial statements, with an attestation by its CFO that such statements constitute a true, correct, and fair representation of financial condition prepared in accordance with GAAP or equivalent;

For non-public entities, an existing sworn filing with a regulatory agency showing SR's current financial condition;

List of Affiliates, Parent Companies and Subsidiaries;

Publicly Available Credit Reports from Credit and Bond Rating Agencies;

Private Credit Ratings, if obtained by the SR;

Bank References;

Trade References;

Statement of Legal Composition;

Statement of Length of Time Business has been in Operation;

Such other information as required by the TSP's lender from

1) SR(s) of TSP's project financed facilities or

2) SR(s) requesting service on proposed or newly constructed facilities financed by that lender(s);

Such other information as may be mutually agreed to by the parties; and

Such other information as the TSP may receive approval to include in its tariff or general terms and conditions.

Non-public information supplied by the SR should be treated by the TSP and its lender(s) as confidential.

Sense of the Room Balanced Vote

Segments

Vote For

Balanced For

Vote Against

Balanced Against

North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com

Home Page: www.naesb.org

End Users	0	0	3	2
LDCs	7	1.56	2	.44
Services	1	.67	2	1.33
Pipelines	15	1.88	1	.12
Producers	0	0	0	0
Totals	23	4.11	8	3.89

Motion passes

6. Workplan Item II. B. Type of Confirmation and Notification that the Service Requester Should Supply for Creditworthiness

Mr. Downs noted that Calpine did submit a proposed work paper with proposals that fit under both items 2B and 2E. There are timelines in the proposal that can be considered as placeholders. The substance of the information deals with 2B and 2E. There was a conference call on Monday January 20 to discuss this workpaper. He invited the group to discuss his workpaper and hopefully conduct a vote. He reviewed the workpaper as drafted and entertained questions.

The pipeline proposal for II. B and II. E was distributed along with a copy of the previous motion on Proposed Standard II A. (pipeline proposal), which was passed earlier. Mr. Nelson reviewed the pipeline proposal for II. B. Mr. Sappenfield would like to make a motion to adopt the proposal by Calpine when the content of the motion is agreed upon. Mr. Downs seconded Mr. Sappenfield's motion to adopt Calpine's proposal for II B. Proposed standards z.2-6 were drafted. Mr. Sappenfield motioned that z2-6 be adopted as proposed standards and Mr. Downs seconded.

The text of proposed standards z.2 through z.6 are as follows:

Proposed Standard z2

If the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) requests additional information for purposes of credit evaluation after the initiation of service, the TSP should provide the Service Requester its reason(s) for requesting the additional information.

Proposed Standard z3

Upon receipt of a request for information from the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) for the purpose of credit evaluation, the Service Requester's authorized representative(s) should be required to confirm receipt of the TSP's request.

Proposed Standard z4

Upon receipt of any credit information requested and received from the Service Requester (SR), the Transportation Service Provider should notify the SR's authorized representative(s) that it has received such information.

Proposed Standard z5

The Service Requester (SR) should provide the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) with the Internet E-mail addresses of up to two authorized representatives who are designated to receive notifications regarding the SR's creditworthiness. The obligation of the TSP to provide notification is waived until the above requirement has been met. Affected parties should manage internal distribution of such notices that are received.

Proposed Standard z6

North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002
 Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com
 Home Page: www.naesb.org

The Service Requester's (SR) authorized representative(s) should respond to the Transportation Service Provider's request for credit information on or before the due date. The SR should provide the information requested or the reason(s) why any of the requested information was not provided.

It was decided to postpone the vote on these proposed standards until the next conference call.

Mr. Novak noted the group is still somewhere between B and E and we will pick up there on January 30th. This discussion will include any proposed standards that evolve out of the pipeline's workpaper.

7. Upcoming Meetings

Mr. Colombo reminded attendees of the 2/5-6/2003 BPS meetings should notify the NAESB office if they intended to attend in person so that meeting arrangements could be finalized.

1/30/2003	12:30-3:30 CST	BPS Conference Call	
2/05/2003	9a-5p EST	BPS Face-to-Face Meeting	Dominion - Richmond VA
2/06/2003	8a-3p EST	BPS Face-to-Face Meeting	Dominion - Richmond VA
2/11/2003	12:30-3:30 CST	BPS Conference Call	
2/14/2003	12:30-3:30 CST	BPS Conference Call	

8. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting, passed unanimously.

Meeting Attendees and Voting Record

Attendee	Organization	1/22	1/23	NAESB WGQ Member?
Pipelines:				
Charlie Bass	ANR Pipeline	√	√	√
Kathryn Burch	Duke Energy	√	√	√
Christopher Burden	Williams Gas Pipeline	√	√*	√
Paul Cherry	Florida Gas Transmission	√	√	NO
Mary Darveaux	Northern Natural Gas	√*	√*	√
Dale Davis	Williams Gas Pipeline	√	√	√
Hein Duong	Duke Energy	√	√	√
Gene Fava	Great Lakes Gas Transmission	√*		√
Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	√	√	√
Bill Griffith	Colorado Interstate	√	√	NO
Bill Grygar	Panhandle Eastern Pipeline	√		√
Tom Gwilliam	Iroquois Gas Transmission System	√		√
Sabra Harrington	Duke Energy	√		√
Joe Kardas	National Fuel Gas Supply	√		√
Sharon Kimball	Wyoming Interstate	√	√	NO
Iris King	Dominion Transmission	√	√	√
Karen Lastovica	Northern Border Pipeline	√*	√*	√

North American Energy Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 3625, Houston, Texas 77002

Phone: (713) 356-0060, Fax: (713) 356-0067, E-mail: naesb@aol.com

Home Page: www.naesb.org

Paul Love	NGPL	√	√	√
Howard Nelson	Southern Natural Gas	√	√	√
Janie Nielsen	Kern River	√	√	√
Donna Scott	Transwestern	√	√	√
Kim Van Pelt	Panhandle Eastern Pipeline	√	√	√
Kelly Wachter	Williston Basin	√*	√*	√
Kevin White	Duke Energy	√		√
Mark Wilke	CMS Trunkline	√	√*	NO
Brian Wilmoth	Northern Natural Gas	√	√	√
Michelle Winckowski	Northern Natural Gas	√*	√*	√
Randy Young	Gulf South Pipeline	√	√	√
Services:				
Jim Buccigross	Group 8760	√	√	√
Georgia Carter	Virginia Power Energy Marketing	√	√	NO
Anastasia Heinzelman	Midwest ISO	√*	√*	NO
Theresa Hess	Reliant Energy Retail Services	√		NO
Keith Sappenfield	Encana	√*	√*	√
Tuyet Storm	CMS Energy MST		√	NO
Producers:				
Jim Busch	BP	√*		√
Sheri Heslington	Dominion E&P	√		√
End Users:				
Miguel Correa	CMS Generation		√	NO
Jim Downs	Calpine	√	√	√
Kirstin Gibbs	Process Gas Consumers Group	√	√	NO
Gary Hinners	Reliant Energy	√	√	√
Alan Johnson	Mirant Corp	√*	√*	NO
LDCs:				
Dolores Chezar	KeySpan	√	√	√
Craig Colombo	Dominion Resources	√	√	√
Pete Connor	NiSource Distribution	√	√	√
Jennifer Deegan	Washington Gas	√	√	√
Andy Dotterweich	Consumers Energy	√	√	NO
Richard Ishikawa	Southern California Gas	√	√	√
Brent Mishler	Southern California Gas	√*	√*	√
Mike Novak	National Fuel Gas Distribution	√	√	√
Mark Vaughn	Cascade Natural Gas	√*	√*	NO
Steve Zavodnick	Baltimore Gas & Electric	√*	√*	√
Associations:				
Mariam Arnaout	American Gas Association	√	√	NO
NAESB Office:				
Todd Onken		√		
Meghan McMillan		√	√	

Bold signifies a BPS Chair

nv – not voting

(*) Attended via conference call