



**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD**  
**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**September 12, 1997 -- 9:00 a.m. to - 5:30 p.m.**

**The Wyndham Warwick Hotel, Houston, Texas**

**FINAL MINUTES**

**I. Introductory Items**

Mr. Bray welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee (EC) members to Houston. New EC members were welcomed, and Mr. Buccigross was recognized for his interview in the "GISB Review". Mr. Bray read a notice sent by Mr. Hahn, recognizing Mr. Hahn's efforts on and his resignation as chair for the Title Transfer Tracking Task Force. Mr. Bray asked EC members to consider chairing task forces as part of their participation on the EC. Mr. Holbrook reviewed the antitrust guidelines. The agenda was adopted with a reordering of items. Draft Executive Committee minutes from August 13, 1997 were reviewed and adopted with changes.

**II. ANSI and DISA Issues**

Ms. Harrison of Conoco presented the ANSI organization and the procedures for approval for changes to X12 standards. Group X12L represents the petroleum and utility interests, and X12J is the technical assessment group. Ms. Harrison noted that it was important for GISB to have representation at the meetings of the X12 groups where the agendas note a review of any changes proposed by GISB. Attendance is recommended to respond to questions and represent the need for the changes as proposed by GISB. After approval by the X12 committee through the DISA secretariat, the pending standard changes are included in an X12 document which is published once per year. Every four years, the DISA approved pending changes are forwarded to ANSI for approval. User groups such as PIDX can forward proposed changes to X12, including those offered by GISB, or GISB can directly submit changes to the appropriate X12 group of ANSI.

In the GISB implementation guides, there are some mappings that do not conform with the X12 standards:

1. Leave the implementation guides alone and recognize that there are some non-conforming parts of the GISB X12 implementation.
2. Make the appropriate data maintenance requests to X12 to add only those required changes where codes do not exist, and fit into existing transactions as much as possible -- which would require that GISB move to a new release from the current version 3040 in use by GISB to version 4010 - the current X12 version, or a subsequent version when the changes are adopted by the X12 committee. To interact with the X12 groups could require significant time from the GISB staff and GISB members.
3. Set a plan and make the appropriate data maintenance requests to X12 to add required changes and new transactions where needed -- which would also require that GISB move to a new release from the current version 3040 in use by GISB to version 4010 - the current X12 version, or a subsequent version when the changes are adopted by the X12 committee. To interact with the X12 groups could require significant time from the GISB staff and GISB members.

Mr. Bray noted that DTSU -- Draft Standards for Trial Use, a practice currently used by the X12 committee could be employed by GISB. Mr. Caldwell asked if it would be more prudent to ask for new transactions, rather than changes to existing transactions. Ms. Harrison responded that for common sets such as invoicing, GISB should work within the existing structures, but for transactions which do not easily fit into existing transactions such as capacity release or nominations, GISB could ask for new transactions. The time required for new X12 transactions and changes to existing transactions would depend on the number of participants in the effort. Mr. Scheel asked if the plan is to ask for X12 changes and then develop new implementation guides would those activities hinder industry EDI implementation until the needed X12 changes are processed. Ms. Harrison said that companies should recognize that there will always be new releases and the earlier implementation occurs, the easier it is for companies to modify for new releases.

Mr. Hahn noted that this is a significant effort, but GISB has been and continues to be committed to X12 standards. Strategies for submitting changes was discussed by Mr. Love. Mr. Wallenhorst observed that implementing another version could require changes in that version that were not requested by GISB and are different than the version that GISB has endorsed in its current implementation guides.

Ms. Harrison gave her opinion option 3 is the best route for GISB in preparing for the future, albeit the one that requires the most effort. Mr. Holbrook noted that Ms. DeLogu has left ANSI, and Mr. Holbrook is now working with Mr. Jim Thompson of ANSI to obtain ANSI accreditation as a Standards Development Organization (SDO). A two-thirds vote is required of the Executive Standards Committee (XSC) of ANSI for acceptance as an SDO. The process by ANSI for consideration as GISB as an SDO is currently underway.

Several noted that option 3 is the only outcome, and the real consideration is timing for migration to a new release and the transition to that new release. Mr. Scheel noted his concern that a plan should be drafted before the EC determines which option should be selected. Mr. Walker made the motion that the Technical Subcommittee prepare a migration plan for option 3 to be ready for EC consideration in November. It was seconded and discussion was supportive of the action with suggestions made to the Technical Subcommittee. A procedural vote was called and the motion passed with 21 out of 21 votes in favor and none opposed.

### **III. Definitions Task Force**

Mr. Kardas reviewed the issues and sensitivities regarding the efforts of the Definitions Task Force, (DTF). At the August 13 EC meeting, Mr. Wolgel made the motion that the mission of the DTF is: "Identify all defined terms in the GISB standards and provide a cross reference, and table any further responsibilities for the Definitions Task Force at this time." At the August 13 EC meeting, the motion was tabled for later consideration at the September 12 meeting. Mr. Wolgel's motion was placed on the table for consideration, and the procedural motion failed with eight votes in favor and eleven votes opposed.

There was discussion on the vote just taken. It was explained by Mr. Walker that the understanding was that all defined terms in the x.2.x standards would be cross-referenced to the x.3.x and x.4.x standards, and this would be the first step. Mr. Kardas, as chair of the DTF, noted that definitions are needed for clarity and his opinion was that step 1 as defined by Mr. Walker was not sufficient. Mr. Bray observed that there was concern that a list of over 500 terms for definitions was exceeding the expectations of the scope of the group and was a significant burden on the already scarce resources. Mr. Walker noted that the EC should see a plan for proceeding before a vote can be taken on the activities of the DTF.

Ms. Phillips joined the EC for Mike Bray. Mr. Hahn assumed the chair and asked that Mr. Holbrook chair the meeting as he would represent Texaco as an advocate in the discussion. Mr. Hahn made the motion which was seconded to define the mission of the DTF as: 'Identify terms in the GISB standards (and provide a cross reference) and craft recommendations for definitions where none exist or contradictory terms are identified.' Mr. Ehinger suggested an amendment to the motion that as new terms are used, the group responsible for the definition of the term is the group that first uses the term -- an example was given on the term "bump" for the Intra-Day Nominations Task Force. Mr. Hahn noted

that his motion did not preclude Mr. Ehinger's amendment as a procedure to be used. This procedure could be included in a plan from the DTF, including interaction with other groups.

After discussion, the motion was restated as:

*"Identify terms in the GISB standards in existence now (and provide a cross reference) and craft recommendations for definitions for those existing terms and terms that are contradictory. For new terms used, the groups responsible for introducing the term should provide a definition to the DTF."*

which was supported by Mr. Hahn and seconded. Mr. Kardas offered that as requests come in which ask for definitions, those requests would be forwarded to the Triage Group for consideration in determining the group responsible for crafting the definition. Mr. Love observed that there is a confusion on if the DTF is creating a glossary or a set of standards.

Another restatement of Mr. Hahn's motion was made:

*"The mission of the DTF is to cross reference existing terms in the GISB documentation and provide uniform definitions where contradictory definitions of the same term are identified, including any new terms submitted to the DTF by other task forces or subcommittees."*

Another suggestion was made that those existing terms for which no definitions exist, should be forwarded to the appropriate group for development of a definition to be forwarded to the DTF. There was concern stated that it may be difficult to identify contradictory terms.

The procedural vote was called for on the above restated motion:

*"The mission of the DTF is to cross reference existing terms in the GISB documentation and provide uniform definitions where contradictory definitions of the same term are identified, including any new terms submitted to the DTF by other task forces or subcommittees."*

with the resulting acceptance of fifteen in favor and six opposed.

Mr. Walker made a complementary motion which was seconded that:

*"The first course of action of the DTF is to construct the cross-reference and provide it to the subcommittees and EC. The subcommittees and EC will then communicate back to the DTF those terms that will be defined. The DTF will wait until the subcommittees and EC will communicate back those terms and definitions, before the DTF constructs the definition."*

As a response to a clarifying questions, Mr. Walker noted that it is implied that after a reasonable amount of time, if no response is received from the subcommittees and EC, the DTF is empowered to create the definition. There were concerns raised on whether the DTF could accept requests for definitions, whether contradictory definitions for terms should be forwarded to the Interpretations Subcommittee, whether the EC is over-engineering the process, and whether the EC is creating a process of inefficiency by having several groups defining the same term.

The procedural vote was called for on the above motion:

*"The first course of action of the DTF is to construct the cross-reference and provide the cross-reference to the subcommittees and EC. The subcommittees and EC will then communicate back to the DTF those terms that will be defined and the definitions. The DTF will wait until the subcommittees and EC will communicate back those terms and definitions, before the DTF constructs the definition."*

with the resulting acceptance of twelve votes in favor and nine votes opposed.

#### **IV. Internet Resolution**

Mr. Hahn resumed chair for the meeting. Mr. Lowry described the resolution and made a motion which was amended and that was seconded to:

*"Be it resolved that the "Internet Look and Feel" Group is directed to include completion of the development of standards to address all of GISB Standard 4.3.6 after completing their current scope."*

The procedural vote was taken with unanimous support of 20 out of 20 votes.

## V. Proposed Standards and Interpretations

Mr. Bray resumed the chair and Ms. Phillips stepped down from the EC.

### C97010

For C97010, the request was:

*Does the language of Standards 2.3.14, 2.3.26, 3.3.15, and 4.3.4 mean that contractual audit rights are excluded from the six-month time limitation and that no statement adjustments can be made after the six-month period? In addition, is GISB recommending that audit rights be excluded from contracts or otherwise limited in contracts to a six-month period?*

and the interpretation offered was:

*Audit rights, to the extent they exist in a contract are contractual rights within the meaning of Standards 2.3.14, 2.3.26, 3.3.15, and 4.3.4. Further, the GISB standards make no finding or recommendation with respect to the advisability of including or excluding audit rights, specifying audit timing or specifying the timing of subsequent audit corrections in a contract.*

The resulting vote was unanimous with 19 votes in favor.

### C97011

For request C97011, the request was:

*Prior period adjustments are limited to six (6) months from the date of the initial transportation invoice. Can a pipeline which became GISB compliant on April 1, 1997 include in its September 1997 transportation invoice a prior period adjustment for May 1996 production?*

and was restated to :

*From what date does the six-month period limitation on prior period adjustments begin? Is it from the date of adoption of GISB Standards? or is it with the Transportation invoice which is issued during the sixth month prior to adoption of the GISB Standards? Can a pipeline which became GISB compliant on April 1, 1997, include in its September 1997 transportation invoice a prior period adjustment for May 1996 production? What is the effect of the three month rebuttal period on the six-month limit on prior period adjustments?*

with the resulting interpretation including the commentary as part of the interpretation:

*"GISB Standard 3.3.16 refers to the prior period adjustments being reported by production date. Prior to the date of adoption of the GISB Standards by the subject party(ies), whatever convention they followed previously would be and would continue to be in effect for the invoices related to production and transportation related transactions occurring up through the day prior to adoption of the GISB Standards."*

*"For example, a Transportation Service Provider adopting the GISB Standards effective April 1, 1997, a March 31st, 1997 (or earlier) transaction would not be governed by the GISB Standards 3.3.15 or 3.3.16; and a transaction occurring on or after April 1, 1997 would be governed by the GISB standards. Thus, a September 1997 invoice could have prior period adjustments for any production month (pursuant to the previously effective convention for those transactions occurring prior to or on March 31, 1997). Likewise, the latest date (six months from the initial transportation invoice) that an April, 1997 production month (invoiced in May, 1997) would be subject to a prior period adjustment, (consistent with the relevant standards and [interpretation C97010 -- replace with applicable designation when known]), would be the last business day of November, 1997."*

*"With respect to the three month rebuttal period, this rebuttal period attaches to the reporting of the prior period adjustment. A rebuttal period is the time during which the rebuttal should be submitted, and unless submitted within this period, (consistent with the relevant standards and [interpretation C97010 -- replace with applicable designation when known]), the prior period adjustment would be deemed accepted. The rebuttal period does not itself extend the reporting period of the prior period adjustment, it may however extend the ultimate resolution. For example, if a prior period adjustment for May 1997 production was posted in October 1997, the*

three month rebuttal period (the period during which the rebuttal should be submitted and after which (consistent with the relevant standards and [interpretation C97010 -- replace with applicable designation when known]), the prior period adjustment would be deemed accepted) would end on the last business day of January, 1998. For example, if a prior period adjustment for May 1997 production month was posted in November 1997, its rebuttal period (again the period during which the rebuttal should be submitted and after which (consistent with the relevant standards and [interpretation C97010 -- replace with applicable designation when known]), the prior period adjustment would be deemed accepted) would extend through the last business day of February, 1998.

"With respect to the prior period adjustment time frame, the purpose for choosing the last business day of the sixth month following the initial transportation invoice is to account for differences in the actual date that an invoice may be rendered, and making it clear that the timing of holidays, weekends, and delays to invoices in one or another month would not engender disputes as to whether the six month period was a period of exact days, (182 or 183 depending on the year) or the coincidence of a weekend with the expiration of a particular date, or the tardiness of the sixth-month's invoice relative to the original invoice, etc.

"Likewise, with respect to the rebuttal period time frame, the purpose for choosing the last business day of the third month following the submittal of the prior period adjustment is to account for differences in the actual date that a prior period adjustment may be submitted, and making it clear that the timing of holidays, weekends, and delays to prior period adjustments (contained in invoices) in one or another month would not engender disputes as to whether the three month period was a period of exact days, (90, 91 or 92 days depending on the initial month) or the coincidence of a weekend with the expiration of a particular date."

with the resulting vote of 19 total in favor and none opposed.

#### **C96024**

For request C96024, the request was:

*Which location code should be sent in a request for confirmation and confirmation response? Sender's Code or Recipient's Code?*

and the resulting proposed standard amended by Mr. Hahn to add the last sentence was:

*"In the confirmation process, where a party requesting confirmation (a Confirmation Requester) is not itself a Transportation Service Provider, the location code to be used when sending a Request to Confirm should be the location code associated with the location where gas will be scheduled by the Transportation Service Provider; and, where a Confirmation Requester is also a Transportation Service Provider; then, as between these confirming parties (the Confirmation Requester and the Confirming Party), and absent their mutual agreement to the contrary, the location code to be used when sending a Request for Confirmation should be the location code used by the Transportation Service Provider sending the Request for Confirmation. The Confirming Party is responsible to return the same location code in the confirmation response."*

In discussion, Mr. Lander provided several examples. Ms. Munson noted that previously adopted interpretations 7.3.6 and 7.3.16 respond to the interpretation request and another interpretation is not needed. Mr. Lander disagreed that the interpretations 7.3.6 and 7.3.16 were sufficient as the interpretations were addressing Transportation Service Provider (TSP) to TSP communications, and the above interpretation addresses Confirmation Requester to Confirming Party communications. Mr. Young from Koch Gateway, the original requester of this item, suggested and a member of the EC made a motion that this item be postponed until the October EC meeting to see if the request is addressed through standard 7.3.16. The request was postponed to October with the resulting vote of 14 in favor and three opposed.

#### **R96120**

For request R96120, "Add 4 new code values to Charge Type on the Transportation/Sales Invoice", the motion was made and seconded to adopt the recommended modification. The request was made by ANR and the proposed recommendation was supported by ANR. The

recommended standard modification with no changes was adopted unanimously with 22 votes in favor.

**R96125B**

For request R96125B, 'Add a data element to the PDA, PDA Quick Response and Allocation Statement data sets to identify the level of allocation', after discussion a vote was called on the recommendation with unanimous acceptance of twenty-one votes in favor and no votes in opposition.

**R97006**

For request R97006, 'Modify the PDA dataset to indicate the swing contract', after discussion a vote was called on the recommendation with unanimous acceptance of twenty votes in favor, no votes in opposition, and one abstention.

**R97009A**

For request R97009A, 'Add a comment segment to the Withdrawal Upload and Withdrawal Download datasets' -- add a NTE comment segment, after discussion a vote was called on the recommendation with unanimous acceptance of twenty-one votes in favor, no votes in opposition, and one abstention.

**R97009B**

For request R97009B, 'Add a comment segment to the Withdrawal Upload and Withdrawal Download datasets' -- add a 864 note/special instructions transaction, after discussion a vote was called on the recommendation with unanimous acceptance of twenty-two votes in favor and no votes in opposition.

**R97010**

Dale Davis joined the EC for Norm Walker. For request R97010, 'Add Rate Identification Code and Surcharge Identification Code to the UPPD Validation' after discussion a vote was called on the recommendation with unanimous acceptance of twenty-one votes in favor and no votes in opposition. This standard modification is a response to only a portion of request R97010 and the remainder of the request is still active.

**R97016**

For request R97016, 'Modify the mapping of the rate segment in capacity release', after discussion, a vote was called on the recommendation with unanimous acceptance of nineteen votes in favor, one abstention and no votes in opposition.

**R97029**

For request R97029, "Add transaction type to the invoice as a mandatory data element including a description in the technical implementation and the addition of three codes for the data element -- gathering, unauthorized overrun, and capacity release', during discussion, Ms. Hess of Enron offered that the transaction type be added as sender's option to the invoice which was accepted as an amendment to the recommendation. There was considerable discussion on the benefits and costs of the mandatory, sender's option, or business conditional usage code for transaction type in the invoice transactions. A vote was called on the amended recommendation which failed with five votes in favor, one abstention and sixteen votes in opposition. A vote was then called on the original recommendation which passed with nineteen votes in favor, two abstentions and one vote in opposition.

**R97039**

Mark Gracey joined the EC for Paul Love. For request R97039, "Add two codes to the data element capacity type indicator in the nominations and the scheduled quantity data sets. -- tertiary to primary, tertiary to secondary', after discussion a vote was called on the recommendation which passed with twenty votes in favor, and one vote in opposition.

#### **R97044**

For request R97044, 'Modify the reduction reason codes of the Confirmation Response and Scheduled Quantity for consistency', after discussion a vote was called on the recommendation with unanimous acceptance of twenty-two votes in favor and no votes in opposition.

#### **R97050**

For request R97050, 'Add all data elements in the Nominations transaction key to the data dictionary for the Invoice Data Set', there was discussion on the need for the data elements to be mutually agreeable or mandatory. A vote was called on the original recommendation of adding five data elements to the invoice transaction with usage codes of mutually agreeable. The resulting vote was in favor of the original recommendation with acceptance of twenty-one votes in favor and one vote in opposition.

#### **R97051**

For request R97051, 'Remove the data element "Service Provider's Activity Code" from the transaction key defined in GISB Standard 1.3.27', after discussion a vote was called on the recommendation with unanimous acceptance of twenty-two votes in favor and no votes in opposition.

#### **R97054**

For request R97054, 'Add a new data element "Detail Code" to the Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response transactions', after discussion this was supported and accepted at the last meeting and no vote was needed.

#### **R97055**

For request R97055, 'Rename the data element "Nominator's Tracking Number" to "Nominator's Tracking ID" for the Nomination, Nomination Quick Response and Scheduled Quantity, transactions and clarify that the data element value contains alpha-numeric data', after discussion a vote was called on the recommendation with unanimous acceptance of twenty-two votes in favor and no votes in opposition.

Mr. Walker returned to the EC and Mr. Gracey stepped down.

#### **R97056**

For request R97056, 'Rename the data element "confirmation requester's tracking number" to "confirmation requester's tracking number" in the Request For Confirmation and Confirmation Response Transactions and clarify that the data element contains alphanumeric data', after discussion a vote was called on the recommendation with unanimous acceptance of twenty-two votes in favor and no votes in opposition.

#### **R97057A**

For request R97057A, 'Add a data element, Validation Code, to the Confirmation Response', after discussion a vote was called on the recommendation with unanimous acceptance of twenty-one votes in favor and no votes in opposition.

### **VI. Triage Actions -- New Requests**

For request **R97111**, 'Modify the Capacity Release UPPD and Bidder Confirmation datasets to enable Releasing Shippers (without pre-arranged bidders) and bidders (in addition to pre-arranged bidders) to employ the EDI datasets to effectuate capacity release transactions other than through on-line EBBs' submitted by TransCapacity Limited Partnership, the Executive Committee found the request within scope unanimously with nineteen votes in favor and no opposition. The Executive Committee also approved unanimously by twenty-two votes and no opposition, the priority and direction proposed by the Triage Group: send to Business Practices Subcommittee (BPS) to be addressed with the Capacity Release requests.

Mr. Buccigross stepped in as the interim general counsel for the remainder of the meeting replacing Mr. Holbrook. Mr. Love returned to the EC and Ms. Davis stepped down.

For request **R97112**, 'Create a new business practice standard for storage, make-up and pooling nominations to be regarded as stand-alone nominations', submitted by TransCapacity Limited Partnership, the Executive Committee found the request within scope unanimously with twenty-two votes in favor and no opposition. The request was modified by Mr. Lander, the requester, to remove references to the non-pathed model. There was considerable discussion on the priority. Mr. Lander agreed to resubmit the request for consideration with the wording changes, which will be considered at the next EC meeting.

For request **R97113**, 'Reclassify the standards 2.3.14, 2.3.26 and 3.3.15 which are categorized as business practice standards to standards which are categorized as principles', submitted by Exxon, the EC found the request within scope unanimously through a vote of twenty in favor and no opposing votes. The Triage Group recommended that the request be addressed and resolved by the EC during the October meeting, through the drafting a recommendation by the EC in this September meeting. The recommendation could be considered with request R96022 and placed on a subsequent EC agenda. The motion was made and seconded to send the request to the BPS to be considered with request R96022, along with definitions for what is a business practice standard, principle, and definition. The motion passed with nineteen affirmative votes and no opposing votes.

#### **VII. Intra-Day Nominations Task Force**

The Intra-day Nominations Task Force, on September 11, modified the model such that if a TSP is a bumping pipeline, it has the choice of making the bump effective at 9:00 am or at 5:00 pm. On September 17 and October 18, the Intra-day Nominations Task Force will meet in Niagara Falls. Mr. Hahn noted that interested parties and the EC members should participate in the meetings or requests for comments or work papers, or they should follow the progress through monitoring the GISB home page if they cannot participate.

#### **VIII. Adjourn**

The next meeting will be held in October 16 in Houston. There was a motion to adjourn which was seconded and passed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

**IX. Attendance**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

---

	<u>SEGMENT</u>	<u>ATTENDING</u>	<u>MEMBERS/ALTERNATES</u>
1.	END USERS:	✓	Kristine Mespelli
2.		✓	Diane McVicker
3.		✓	Lee Smith
4.		✓	Kelly Daly for Lynette Wilson
5.		✓	Dona Gussow
6.	LDCs:	✓	Dolores Chezar for William Boswell
7.		X <sup>1</sup>	Darlene Buchholz
8.		✓	Kirt Kleinman
9.		✓	Mike Novak
10.		✓	Gary Beland
11.	PIPELINES:	✓	Mike Bray <sup>2</sup>
12.		✓	Max Feldman
13.		✓	Paul Love <sup>3</sup> for vacancy
14.		✓	Theresa Hess for vacancy
15.		✓	Norm Walker <sup>4</sup>
16.	PRODUCERS:	✓	Jerry Hahn
17.		✓	Tom Ehinger
18.		X	Vacancy
19.		✓	Paul Keeler for Hugh Roberts
20.	SERVICES:	✓	Bob Wallenhorst
21.		✓	Carl Caldwell
22.		✓	Walker Lowry for Dave Pfeifer
23.		X	Cheryl Loewen
24.		✓	Mark Scheel
25.		✓	Keith Sappenfield

Administrative:      Rae McQuade,                      - Executive Director  
    Veronica Thomason                      - GISB Staff  
    Dennis Holbrook                      - General Counsel  
    Jane Copeland                      - Ak/Ret Reporting

<u>Observers:</u>		<u>Members</u>
Sandra Barnett	Koch Gateway	✓
Diane Biegel	Enron Capital & Trade	✓
Denise Breeden	El Paso Energy	✓
Jim Buccigross	TransCapacity	✓
Catherine Calpotura	PG&E	✓
Dolores Chezar	Brooklyn Union	✓
Cynthia Corcoran	Texas Eastern	✓
Dale Davis	Transco	✓
Julie Dennis	Koch Gateway	✓
Sharon Eady	NorAm Gas Transmission	✓
Nancy Fitzgerald	Shell Gas Pipeline	✓

---

<sup>1</sup> Those Executive Committee members absent were given an opportunity to cast their votes notationally based on the language from the meeting.  
<sup>2</sup> Joyce Phillips represented Mike Bray for a portion of the meeting.  
<sup>3</sup> Mark Gracey represented Paul Love for a portion of the meeting.  
<sup>4</sup> Dale Davis represented Norm Walker for a portion of the meeting.

Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	✓
Joel Greene	Salt River Project	✓
Lisa Harrison	Conoco	✓
Wade Hopper	Texaco	✓
Joe Kardas	National Fuel Gas Supply	✓
Greg Lander	TransCapacity	✓
Kurt Link	Williston Basin	✓
Walker Lowry	NrG Information Services	✓
Laura Moseley	FTG/Enron	✓
Sylvia Munson	Altra Energy Technologies	✓
Catherine O'Hara	Panhandle Field Services	✓
Gary Payne	Enron Capital & Trade	✓
Joyce Phillips	Algonquin	✗
Anne Roland	INGAA	<sup>5</sup>
Leigh Spangler	Latitude Technologies	✓
Laverne Tillson	Defense Fuel Supply Center	✓
Kim Van Pelt	Trunkline Gas	✗
Randall Young	Koch Gateway	✓

---

<sup>5</sup> INGAA is a formal trade liaison of GISB.



October 16, 1997

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE VOTING RECORD FOR SEPTEMBER 12, 1997 EC MEETING**

	C97 011	R96 120	R96 125 B	R97 006	R97 009- 1	R97 009- 2	R97 010	R97 016	R97 029	R97 029	R97 039	R97 044	R97 050	R97 051	R97 055	R97 056	R97 057 A	C97 010
1 Kelly Daly (alternate)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2 Dona Gussow	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
3 Lee Smith	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
4 Kristine Mespelli	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
5 Diane McVicar	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
6 Max Feldman	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
7 Theresa Hess (alternate)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
8 Norm Walker	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
9 Paul Love (alternate)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
10 Mike Bray	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11 Carl Caldwell	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
12 Mark Scheel	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	A	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
13 Keith Sappenfield		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
14 Walker Lowry	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
15 Cheryl Loewen	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
16 Paul Keeler (alternate)	A	✓	✓	A	A	✓	✓	A	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
17 Bob Wallenhorst	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
18 Tom Ehinger	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
19 Jerry Hahn	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
20 Mike Novak	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
21 Kirt Kleinman		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
22 Gary Beland	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
23 Dolores Chezar (alternate)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

A notational ballot was not returned by Hugh Roberts, and Darlene Buchholz has resigned from the EC, leaving 24 members to vote