



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

**TO:** Executive Committee (EC) Members  
Posting for Interested Industry Participants

**FROM:** Rae McQuade, Executive Director

**RE:** Final Minutes from the Executive Committee Meeting – November 11, 1999

**DATE:** February 10, 2000

---

**GAS INDUSTRY STANDARDS BOARD**  
**GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**KeySpan Offices, Brooklyn, New York**

**November 11, 1999**

**FINAL MINUTES**

### **I. Administrative**

Mr. Buccigross welcomed the attendees and the Executive Committee (EC) members to Houston and thanked Brooklyn Union, KeySpan Energy and ConEd for hosting this week's meetings. Mr. Costan was welcomed as our general counsel, and gave the antitrust advice. Ms. McQuade read the roll. The agenda was adopted with no modifications. Mr. Scheel asked that we discuss the EC meeting dates and locations for 2000, which will be addressed at the end of the meeting. With modifications made during the meeting, the redlined minutes for September 16 were adopted. It was noted that Mr. Wiley has resigned from the Executive Committee and his efforts were recognized and he was thanked for his support of the organization. Mr. Johnson and Ms. Munson were welcomed as new EC members. For a full accounting of the discussion from today's meeting, the transcripts should be ordered from Ms. Copeland of Ak/Ret Reporting (361-882-9037).

### **II. New Requests**

The motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved that the new requests (R99049 – R99052) were within GISB scope. After each of the requests was presented, each was unanimously approved to follow the Triage Group recommended disposition and priority:

**R99049** Submitted by Williams Gas Pipelines on Sept. 30, 1999, Contact is Jim Keisler

**Description:** Williams Gas Pipeline (WGP) on behalf of the ANSI Compliance Team requests that the data element Remit to Party be added to the Transportation/Sales Invoice (GISB Std. 3.4.1). In the current Invoice, the Remittance Address data element is used to send both the name and the address for the Remit to Party.

This request is similar to request R98009, which asked that the Remit to Party be added to the Payment Remittance (GISB Std. 3.4.2) and the Statement of Account (GISB Std. 3.4.3). Like the Invoice, those datasets had used the Remittance Address to send both the name and the address for the Remit to Party. On January 21, 1999 the Executive Committee adopted the recommendation and it is reflected in Version 1.4.

**Triage:** Send Request No. R99049 to Business Practices Subcommittee.

**Priority:** At the conclusion of its dealing with remaining Capacity Release requests.



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.gisb.org

- 
- R99050** Submitted by Williams Gas Pipelines on Sept. 30, 1999, Contact is Jim Keisler
- Description: Williams Gas Pipeline (WGP) on behalf of the ANSI Compliance Team requests that the definition of the data element Tax Identification Code in the Transportation/Sales Invoice (3.4.1) be changed to reflect that the code is assigned to the Remit to Party. The current definition is: "Code assigned by government recognizing a business entity." The proposed revised definition is: "The tax identification code assigned by a government to the Remit to Party."
- Triage: Send Request No. R99050 to Information Requirements Subcommittee.
- Priority: To be addressed by IR in conjunction with processing the high priority R99049 request.
- R99051** Submitted by Williams Gas Pipelines on Sept. 30, 1999, Contact is Jim Keisler
- Description: Williams Gas Pipeline (WGP) on behalf of the ANSI Compliance Team requests that the fields on the Transportation/Sales Invoice (3.4.1) whose usage code is Business Conditional (BC) be changed to Sender's Option (SO). A usage code of BC would be appropriate if the presence or absence of these fields was dependent on the business practices of the receiver of the document, but this is not what was envisioned for these fields. The sending of these data elements is determined by the sender of the document. Therefore, the usage code for the following data elements needs to be changed: Currency, Effective Exchange Date, Electronic Funds Transfer Address, Electronic Funds Transfer Due Date, Exchange Rate, Price Tier and Tax Identification Code.
- Triage: Send Request No. R99051 to Business Practices Subcommittee.
- Priority: To be addressed along with R99049.
- R99052** Submitted by Enron Gas Pipelines on Oct. 22, 1999, Contact is Theresa Hess
- Description: Add a code value description for the Service Code data element in the Transportation/Sales Invoice (3.4.1). The Service Code data element is used to specify the type of service being rendered under the contract. The additional code value description 'Limited Firm Transportation' indicates that the transportation service was provided on a limited basis. The additional code value description will allow us to indicate that an Invoice is being rendered under our new 'Limited Firm Transportation Service' rate schedule
- Triage: Send Request No. R99052 to Information Requirements Subcommittee.
- Priority: To be addressed in the normal course of business for that subcommittee.

### III. Recommendations for Proposed Standards

- R97124** Add Contract Level Tracking ID data element to the Nomination and Nomination Quick Response. Revise GISB Standard No. 1.3.54 to include the new data element. Add one error code value for the Validation Code data element in the Nomination Quick Response. Revise the Technical Implementation of Business Process and the Sample Paper Transaction for the Nomination and the Nomination Quick Response.
- Motion: Adopt the recommendation.



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org)

---

Discussion: Mr. Scheel noted that the data element should not be mandatory, and it was confirmed that this element is not required for ANSI compliance.

Vote: The motion to adopt the recommended standard modification failed.

**R98057** EII Task Force (November 20, 1998) – IR17. Add Delivery Scheduling Status and Receipt Scheduling Status data elements to the Scheduled Quantity. Revise GISB Standard No. 1.3.61 to include the new data elements in the data groups for the Scheduled Quantity. Add Scheduling Status data element to the Scheduled Quantity for Operator. Revise GISB Standard No. 1.3.63 to include the new data element in the data groups for the Scheduled Quantity for Operator. Add code value descriptions for the three new data elements.

Motion: Adopt the recommendation.

Discussion: None

Vote: Motion passes unanimously

**R98066** EII Task Force (December 1 – 2, 1998) – IR25. Add five (5) existing code value descriptions for the Transaction Type data element to the PDA and Allocation datasets.

Motion: Adopt the recommendation.

Discussion: None.

Vote: Motion passes unanimously.

**R98067** EII Task Force (December 1 – 2, 1998) – IR26. Add two (2) existing code value descriptions for the Transaction Type data element to the PDA and Allocation datasets.

Motion: Adopt the recommendation.

Discussion: None.

Vote: Motion passes unanimously.

**R99039** EII Task Force (July 14, 1999). Add a code value description for the Transaction Type data element to the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, PDA, Allocation, Imbalance and Invoice datasets. Add an existing code value description for the Transaction Type to the Allocation dataset.

Motion: Adopt the recommendation.

Discussion: None.

Vote: Motion passes unanimously.

**R99044** EII Task Force (July 14, 1999). Add code value description for the Transaction Type in the Nomination, Scheduled Quantity, Shipper Imbalance, PDA, Allocation and Invoice.

Motion: Adopt the recommendation.

Discussion: None.

Vote: Motion passes unanimously.



**R99048** Change GISB Standard 6.3.1 to remove references to the "19" century in the date fields.

Motion: Adopt the recommendation.

Discussion: None.

Vote: Motion passes unanimously.

#### **IV. EDM Manual**

The motion was made to modify the EDM Manual to adopt the comments from CIG, Williams and Duke Energy – Texas Eastern (pages 13 and 82), with the footnotes for registration marks placed only once. After discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Shahan described the Future Technology Task Force recommendation regarding the version of JAVA Development Kit. He also noted that the EDM Manual and changes just endorsed include support of software versions that can no longer be obtained from the vendor. Several noted the report being discussed was actually comments submitted by CNG since the report was not adopted by the FTTF. The recommendation included in the report was voted on by the FTTF.

Mr. Novak noted that this issue has two concerns: (1) implementation date, and (2) customer dissatisfaction with multiple levels being implemented. In response to the question of why Sun created version 1.2.x to be not backward compatible to version 1.1.x, it was noted that Sun has additional software that allows for compatibility. Ms. Van Pelt noted that while she understood the two concerns outlined by Mr. Novak, she added a third concern – the process by which this issue was raised to the Executive Committee. She also noted her opposition to a change at this time, as pipelines have already begun implementing version 1.1.6 (currently in the GISB standards), and a change to any other version would cause additional work for the implementers. Ms. Gussow argued that we should implement the new version (1.2.x) as soon as possible and no later than June 2000. Ms. Munson noted that multiple browser problems would continue as companies access multiple web sites across industries. She also reiterated Ms. Van Pelt's concerns about the process by which this issue was brought before the EC. Ms. Gussow questioned why she continues to experience problems with multiple browsers if the pipelines she accesses are GISB compliant. Mr. Novak summarized that the issue in front of the committee is when to migrate to version 1.2.2 and if we should adopt version 1.1.7 now rather than version 1.1.6 as stated in the standards.

Mr. Hartmann made the motion that the EDM standards manual remain at its current language for version 1.1.6 for JDK, with a note added indicating that migration to version 1.2.x is expected by June 1, 2000, which was seconded by Ms. Gussow. A break was taken, after which Mr. Hartmann withdrew his motion. Mr. Sappenfield made the motion to change version 1.1.6 to 1.1.x, which was seconded by Ms. McVicker. After discussion, Mr. Sappenfield withdrew his motion. Mr. Buccigross noted that the FTTF motion adopted on October 29 would be submitted as a recommendation to the EC after an industry comment period. Ms. Van Pelt made the motion that a footnote be added to version 1.4 of the EDM manual that the migration to 1.2.x be implemented by October 31, 2000 – which was seconded by Ms. Unruh. Mr. Hartmann commented that the addition of a footnote to the standards manual does not have the weight of a standard.

After further discussion and a break for lunch, Ms. Van Pelt withdrew her motion, and made another motion that a notice be placed on the main page GISB home page that a recommendation regarding JDK level 1.2.x and an implementation date as approved by the



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.gisb.org

Future Technology Task Force in October 29, 1999 would be forthcoming and considered by the EC in its February 2000 meeting after an industry comment period. Ms. Munson seconded the motion. Ms. Daly made the motion that we waive the notice for comment. Ms. Daly's motion was deferred as the condition defined by Ms. Van Pelt was made into a motion. Ms. Van Pelt's motion carried 11 to 10 with two abstentions. Ms. McVicker noted that a request would be made of the Process Subcommittee to review the way information technology issues are addressed.

### V. Confirmations and Cross Contract Ranking Meeting

Ms. Scott reviewed the recommendations of the Confirmations and Cross Contract Ranking Subcommittee (CXKR). The motion was made by Ms. McVicker and seconded and Mr. Hartmann to adopt the following proposed standards as recommended by the CXKR:

Motion (CXKR-1):

S1 Proposed Standard 1

Absent mutual agreement to the contrary, the standard level of confirmation should be entity to entity.

S2 Revised Proposed Standard 2

As part of the confirmation and scheduling process between a Transportation Service Provider (TSP) and a Local Distribution Company (LDC), upon request by the LDC, the TSP should make available, via EBB/EDM, supplemental information obtained during or derived from the nomination process necessary for the LDC to meet its statutory and/or regulatory obligations. Such supplemental information, if available, should include the

TSP's Service Requester Contract and, based upon the TSP's business practice may also, on a mutually agreeable basis, include 1) a derivable indicator characterizing the type of contract and service being provided, 2) Downstream Contract Identifier and/or 3) Service Requester's Package ID.

S3 Proposed Standard 3

Absent mutual agreement to the contrary between the TSP and the Operator for confirmations at a production location, the TSP should support the fact that the operator will confirm with the TSP to only the upstream entity level. These upstream entities should either confirm or nominate (at the TSP's determination) at an entity level with the TSP.

D1 Proposed Definition 1

Production locations includes wellheads, platforms, plant tailgates (excluding straddle plants) and physical wellhead aggregation points.

S4 Proposed Standard 4

When nominated quantities exceed available capacity, the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) should first utilize its tariff requirements to assign capacity to each service level for each Service Requester (SR). The TSP should then use the SR's provided scheduling ranks to determine how the available quantities should be distributed within a single service level. The SR's provided scheduling ranks (as applicable) should be used



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

as follows:

For reductions identified at or upstream of the constraint location, the order for application of ranks is Receipt Rank (Priority), Upstream Rank (Priority), Delivery Rank (Priority), Downstream Rank (Priority).

For reductions identified at or downstream of the constraint location, the order for application of ranks is Delivery Rank (Priority), Downstream Rank (Priority), Receipt Rank (Priority), Upstream Rank (Priority).

S5 Proposed Standard 5

When applying a confirmation reduction to an entity at a location, the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) should use the Service Requester's (SR's) scheduling ranks provided on all nominations for that location and entity to determine the appropriate nomination(s) to be reduced, except where superseded by the TSP's tariff, general terms and conditions, or contractual obligations. The SR's provided scheduling ranks (as applicable) should be used as follows:

For receipt side reductions, the order for application of ranks is Upstream Rank (Priority), Receipt Rank (Priority), Delivery Rank (Priority), and Downstream Rank (Priority).

For delivery side reductions, the order for application of ranks is Downstream Rank (Priority), Delivery Rank (Priority), Receipt Rank (Priority), and Upstream Rank (Priority).

P1 Proposed Principle 1

In order to effectuate cross contract ranking, the level of confirmation at a location should occur at the entity to entity level.

S6 Revised Proposed Standard 6

Transportation Service Providers should utilize Standard 1.3.7 for ranks submitted in a nomination.

Discussion: It was determined to vote the proposed standards as a package. Several participants noted that this body of proposed standards represents a great deal of work and a significant number of meetings, with compromises made.

Vote: Motion failed, 13 in favor, 11 opposed.

The motion was made and seconded by the same individuals with amendments to revised proposed standard 2 (CXKR-2):

S2 Amended Revised Proposed Standard 2

As part of the confirmation and scheduling process upon request, the TSP should make available, via EBB/EDM, supplemental information obtained during or derived from the nomination process. Such supplemental information, if available, should include the TSP's Service Requester Contract and, based upon the TSP's business practice may also, on a mutually agreeable basis, include 1) a derivable indicator characterizing the type of contract and service being provided, 2) Downstream Contract Identifier and/or 3) Service Requester's Package ID.

Discussion: It was noted that the modification addresses concerns raised by the end users



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

regarding the confirmation process.

Vote: The motion failed, 18 in favor, five opposed.

Ms. Unruh made the following motion (CXKR-3), which was seconded by Mr. Griffith to adopt the standards as proposed by the pipeline segment in its comments (published in the EC material for the meeting):

Motion: P1 New Principle

In order to effectuate cross contract ranking, the level of confirmation at a location should occur at the entity-to-entity level.

S1 New Standard

The standard level of confirmation should be entity to entity.

S4 New Standard

When nominated quantities exceed available capacity on a Transportation Service Provider's (TSP's) system, such TSP should first utilize its tariff requirements to assign capacity to each service level for each Service Requester (SR). The TSP should then use the SR's provided scheduling ranks as provided in the SR's nomination to determine how the available quantities should be distributed within a single service level.

The SR's provided scheduling ranks (as applicable) should be used as follows:

- For reductions identified at or upstream of the constraint location, the order for application of ranks is Receipt Rank (Priority), Upstream Rank (Priority), Delivery Rank (Priority), Downstream Rank (Priority).
- For reductions identified at or downstream of the constraint location, the order for application of ranks is Delivery Rank (Priority), Downstream Rank (Priority), Receipt Rank (Priority), Upstream Rank (Priority).

S5 New Standard

When applying a confirmation reduction to an entity (Service Requester (SR)) at a location, the Transportation Service Provider (TSP) should use such SR's scheduling ranks as provided on that SR's nominations at that location to determine the appropriate nomination(s) to be reduced, except where superceded by the TSP's tariff, general terms and conditions, or contractual obligations.

The SR's provided scheduling ranks (as applicable) should be used as follows:

- For receipt side reductions, the order for application of ranks is Upstream Rank (Priority), Receipt Rank (Priority), Delivery Rank (Priority), Downstream Rank (Priority).
- For delivery side reductions, the order for application of ranks is Downstream Rank (Priority), Delivery Rank (Priority), Receipt Rank (Priority), Upstream Rank (Priority).

Discussion: Mr. Novak, Mr. Hartmann and Ms. Patton noted their lack of support for the motion – citing lack of standardization, the assertion that entity to entity



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

confirmation does not work, and that the statutory requirements of the LDCs are not met. Ms. Unruh explained why the original proposed standards recommended by the XKR were unworkable, and Mr. Love explained that the original set of proposed standards carried a significant cost to be borne by one segment of the industry. Mr. Scheel and Mr. Keeler noted that several of the standards were a result of industry compromise and an attempt to craft practices best for the entire industry. Mr. Griffith responded that the intent of the pipeline proposal was to streamline the process and eliminate ambiguities, while also garnering industry support for cross contract ranking.

- Vote: The motion failed: five in favor, seventeen opposed and one abstention.
- R97043 The motion was made to decline the request, which passed unanimously.
- R97116 The motion was made to decline the request, which passed unanimously.
- R99037 The EC did not need to take action as the CXKR Subcommittee transferred this request Information Requirement (IR) Subcommittee:
- "Instruct Information Requirement (IR) Subcommittee to accommodate the sending of information necessary when a multi-level confirmation is sent to differentiate between the roles of the Confirming Parties. In the Request for Confirmation, the usage of this data is Senders Option when the TSP is the sender of the Request for Confirmation and Business Conditional when the TSP is the receiver of the Request for Confirmation or an unsolicited Confirmation Response. In a solicited Confirmation Response, the usage is Conditional, and the condition is: Mandatory when present in the Request for Confirmation. In a Scheduled Quantity for Operator, the usage is Conditional, and the condition is: Mandatory when present in the Confirmation process. IR should also determine whether this data should be included in the Confirmation Response Quick Response."
- R97089 The EC did not need to take action as the CXKR Subcommittee transferred this request to BPS:
- CXKR transferred R97089B to BPS to be dealt with in conjunction with R97089A. The data element being requested "Source Location" would need to be added to the Nomination prior to being discussed in the confirmation. It was therefore concluded that the request should not be split into two parts but should be handled by BPS as originally requested in R97089.
- R97022B This request is considered resolved (declined) as a result of actions taken on the proposed standards from CXKR being denied. The motion passed 22 in favor and one opposed.
- XKR - AP The subcommittee instructed Information Requirements to change the condition of upstream rank and downstream rank in the Data Element Cross Reference Table to "NU" for the pathed and non-path models.

## VI. Terms for 2000 and EC Officers

Ms Davis informed the Executive Committee that Ms. Corman and Mr. Walker would not be returning to the Executive Committee in 2000. New members representing the pipeline segment are Mr. Griffith and Mr. Gracey. Mr. Novak noted that the LDC segment should complete its election shortly. The producer segment will determine its segment representation before the next EC meeting. Ms. McQuade offered assistance to the segments as they conducted their elections. Her office will begin conducting the elections for the service segment and the end user segment shortly. Mr. Buccigross and Mr. Novak were nominated as chair



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.gisb.org

---

and vice-chair of the Executive Committee for 2000. They were unanimously elected.

### **VII. 1999 and 2000 Annual Plan**

Ms. Van Pelt addressed the progress made by several of the committees: the timeline for preparing GISB documents to be submitted to ANSI was adopted by the EC in September and has not changed. BPS is addressing capacity release requests and high priority invoicing requests and is scheduled to complete addressing these requests by the end of the year. The EDM Subcommittee is addressing standards convergence issues (AS2).

The Information Requirements Subcommittee has a considerable backlog of open requests from EII Subcommittee, Title Transfer Tracking Subcommittee, and Imbalances Subcommittee. They are currently addressing EII requests related to nominations. Ms. Hess indicated that she is stepping down as chair of Information Requirements Subcommittee. The two new co-chairs for the Information Requirements Subcommittee are Mr. LaTour and Mr. Keisler. Ms. Davis volunteered to act as liaison to the EC for the group. Ms. Hess was thanked for her invaluable contributions as IR co-chair.

Ms. Van Pelt also noted that the Technical Subcommittee is working on open requests as they are forwarded from IR and other committees. It was noted that with the IR backlog, it is conceivable that title transfer tracking will not be addressed in the next version of standards. That is obviously true then for the imbalance standards, which are to be addressed after title transfer tracking. The IR group will bring the outstanding request backlog to the EC for its meeting in February, during which meeting, the EC will prioritize those items.

Mr. Buccigross, Mr. Novak and Ms. McQuade discussed the efforts of the Annual Plan Planning Committee and reviewed the proposed 2000 Annual Plan. The plan includes items for contracts, interoperability, and ongoing maintenance, with items to investigate retail-marketing standards. It should be posted shortly for comment. It was also noted that unlike previous years, the Executive Committee was not provided an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed plan. Therefore, any comments / concerns should be passed on to the appropriate Board representatives.

### **VIII. Other Business**

Mr. Scheel asked that we review the schedule for 2000 and move the Colorado Springs meeting to October and Ms. Gussow offered her facilities in West Palm Beach for a meeting. The GISB office will review these suggestions with the meeting sponsors.

### **IX. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.gisb.org

## X. Attendance and Voting Record

Executive Committee	Segment	Present	Member
	End Users	✓	Mike Bray
		✓	Kelly Daly
		✓	Dona Gussow
		✓	Diane McVicker
		✓	Tina Patton
	LDCs	✓	Dolores Chezar for Bob Betonte (ballot provided)
		✓	Chris Maturo
		✓	Mike Novak
		✓	Bill Oppenheim
		✓	Steve Sullivan
	Pipelines	✓	Bill Griffith for Shelley Corman
		✓	Dale Davis
		✓	Paul Love
		✓	Julie Unruh
		✓	Norm Walker
	Producers	✓	Paul Keeler
		✓	Tommie Hartmann for Bob Wallenhorst
		✓	Mike Johnson
		✗	Richard Smith (Ballot provided)
		✗	Vacancy
	Services	✓	Jim Buccigross
		✓	Carl Caldwell
		✓	Keith Sappenfield
		✓	Mark Scheel
		✓	Sylvia Munson
Administrative:	Rae McQuade		- Executive Director
	JoAnn Garcia		- GISB Staff
	Veronica Thomason		- GISB Staff
	Jay Costan		- GISB General Counsel
	Jane Copeland		- Ak/Ret Reporting



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.gisb.org

## Voting Record

Member	R97124	R98057	R98066	R98067	R99039	R99044	R99048	CXKR-1
Mike Bray <sup>1</sup>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Kelly Daly	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Dona Gussow	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Diane McVicker	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Tina Patton	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Dolores Chezar	abstain	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Chris Maturo	abstain	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mike Novak	abstain	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bill Oppenheim	abstain	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Steve Sullivan	abstain	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bill Griffith	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Dale Davis	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Paul Love	abstain	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Julie Unruh	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Norm Walker <sup>2</sup>	abstain	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Paul Keeler	abstain	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tommie Hartmann	abstain	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mike Johnson	abstain	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Richard Smith (Ballot)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Jim Buccigross	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Carl Caldwell	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Keith Sappenfield	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Mark Scheel	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sylvia Munson	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Total Votes For	9	24	24	24	24	24	24	13
Total Votes Against	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Ratification?	n/a	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	n/a
Pass/Fail	Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Fail

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Greene substituted for Mr. Bray after the CXKR vote.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Gracey substituted for Mr. Walker beginning with the CXKR vote.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.gisb.org

## Voting Record Continued

Member	CXKR-2	CXKR-3	R97043	R97116	R99039	R97022B
Mike Bray	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kelly Daly	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dona Gussow	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Diane McVicker	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tina Patton	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dolores Chezar	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Chris Maturo	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mike Novak	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bill Oppenheim	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Steve Sullivan	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bill Griffith	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dale Davis	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Paul Love	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Julie Unruh	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Norm Walker	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Paul Keeler	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tommie Hartmann	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mike Johnson	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Richard Smith (Ballot)			✓	✓	✓	✓
Jim Buccigross	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Carl Caldwell	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Keith Sappenfield	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mark Scheel	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sylvia Munson	✓	abstain	✓	✓	✓	✓
Total Votes For	18	5	24	24	24	24
Total Votes Against	5	17	0	0	0	0
Ratification?	n/a	n/a	no	no	no	no
Pass/Fail	Fail	Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass



## Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4925, Houston, Texas 77002

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

Home Page: www.gisb.org

### Observers to the Meeting - November 11, 1999:

Name	Company	Address	GISB Member
<b>PIPELINES:</b>			
Joe Bianchi	ANR Pipeline	joseph.bianchi@coastalcorp.com	Yes
Iris King	CNG Transmission	iris_g_king2cngt.cng.com	Yes
Twyla Strogen	CNG Transmission	twyla.s.strogen@cngt.cng.com	Yes
Theresa Hess	Enron Gas Pipelines	thess@enron.com	Yes
Tammy Hopkins	Enron - Transwestern	thopkins@enron.com	Yes
Tom Gwilliam	Iroquois	tom_gwilliam@iroquois.com	Yes
Betty Barnum	Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line	babarnum@cmsenergy.com	Yes
Prince McDougal	Southern Natural Gas	prince_mcdougal@sonat.com	Yes
Nancy Fitzgerald	Tejas Offshore Pipelines	njfitzgerald@coral-energy.com	Yes
Mark Gracey	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	graceym@epenegy.com	Yes
Ken Schubert	TransCanada Pipelines	ken_schubert@trnscanada.com	Yes
Kim Van Pelt	Trunkline	kvanpelt@cmsenergy.com	Yes
Jim Keisler	Williams Gas Pipeline	jim.e.keisler@wgp.twc.com	Yes
Kurt Link	Williston Basin Interstate	linkkl@wbip.com	Yes
<b>LDCs:</b>			
Mike Shahan	Peoples Natural Gas	mshahan@cngt.cng.com	Yes
<b>SERVICES:</b>			
Cynthia Corcoran	Corcoran Law Offices	cynthiacorcoran@corcoran-law.com	Yes
Gary Payne	Enron Capital and Trade	gary.l.payne@enron.com	Yes
Randy Young	Koch Midstream	young0r@kochind.com	Yes
Leigh Spangler	Latitude Technology	lspangler@latitudetech.net	Yes
<b>END USERS</b>			
Joel Greene	SRP/Energy Advocates	jlgreene@energyadvocates.com	Yes
<b>ASSOCIATIONS:</b>			
Joan Dreskin	INGAA	jdreskin@ingaa.org	
Anne Roland	INGAA	aroland@ingaa.org	