

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 1

Jerry Hahn: Opened the meeting at 9:10 AM. He explained the next two days were a 'wrap-up' prior to presentation to the EC.

Jim Buccigross read the anti-trust statement.

Brian White explained the logistics.

Hahn: Reviewed the agenda. Issues that can't be completed will be characterized for the EC so that they can understand how a decision can impact the final product. At the conclusion of tomorrow's meeting, the chairs will develop a product for presentation to the EC.

Voting rule is one vote per company; segment checks will be taken.

Greg Lander made a motion to adopt the agenda.

Hahn: Are there any other open issues?

Joe Bianchi: 1) The 2 hours confirmation timeline for the 1st intraday cycle.
 2) Discussion and recognition of the *Confirmation True-up* between upstream and downstream TSPs

Dolores Chezar: I would like to discuss whether the one time bump timing election be in the tariff filing as opposed to the operating statement.

Lander: 1) Sync up begin & end date times for request to confirm
 2) Sync up begin & end date time for scheduling
 3) Notification of changes
 4) Zero Quantity

Joel Greene: Cycle nomenclature change

Bill Griffith: 1) More discussion on variable bump times
 2) Elapsed prorated quantity
 3) Form of no bump notice & usage

Lander: 5) 8 nomenclature issues

Hahn: Where we have captured these issues within the Standards Group product discussion, we will attempt to incorporate discussion

The agenda was adopted unanimously as amended.

Mike Novak reviewed the minutes from the September 17-18 meeting. They were adopted as posted in DRAFT form unanimously.

DISCUSSION of 11/4/97 STANDARDS GROUP REMAINING ISSUES

Issue 1) *Nomination Timing intent*

Hahn: I think this is occurring today in the timely nominations cycle . Companies are managing however. Should we consider being silent on this until more experience is gained?

Beaver: If everyone agrees, I can go along.

Lander: Some intraday implementations default handling to the next available cycle start where as others will try to handle immediately. There are two issues:

- 1) When the nomination is received; an informational timestamp
- 2) Some way to capture the intent of the shipper placing the nomination. An indicator could avoid the possibility of two TSPs interpreting the timing of the nomination differently. I think this is no different than someone submitting a nomination a few days in advance.

Hahn: I think 2) is going to be addressed. (It is referred to as *tagging*) Can item 1) be treated as I have suggested (i.e. remain silent).

Lander: Yes

Randy Young: I agree with Lander. We need to receive this instruction from the shipper.

Chuck Beaver: Let's frame the issue. Do we need to discuss tagging? If so, how? Data Tag or Logical Test (No Tag).

Sylvia Munson: I'm concerned tags would tie us down into a minimum standard. People who want to exceed would need their own tags. Let's eliminate time and look at everything as being on a day basis.

Lander: We need an effective set of rules for time. We keep on hearing about people being confused about time (because of Central Clock time). The problem with eliminating time is that a third nomination could override a second inadvertently. A logical test could be used but it would involve setting up new business practices about when to submit nominations which could be more confusing. Finally, if we had more cycles, we could use code values for the tag.

Tom Ehinger: I'd rather not see a new data element but we could use a code value in the time field. The onus should be on the person submitting the intraday to instruct the operators when the nomination should be effective.

Mark Gracey: Intradays are not new. We (Tennessee) have been doing hourly nominations. Time is essential. We need to communicate hourly flows. We need to communicate time; not tags.

Griffith: Scheduling of gas is between the operators. The information is already within the data set.

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 3

Kim VanPelt: You cannot do anything with the date field other than putting in a valid date. You would need a new field to put a tag in the data set (a tag could not be put in the date/time field).

Beaver: On this issue of whether we should pursue this issue:

Yes 20 No 18

Segment Check *Yes* *No*

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| EU | 4 | 1 |
| LDC | 3 | 2 |
| Prod | 2 | 1 |
| P/L | 3 | 14 |
| Services | 8 | 0 |

Lander: I'd like to remove the data tag from consideration and spend the effort on developing a clear logical test.

Love: I'd like to offer a third option. SR should submit the intraday nomination in time for the appropriate cycle.

Chezar: I think tags make it easier for those TSPs that want to exceed.

Love: No, in fact this is the same issue a continuous TSP faces. There would be additional nomination deadlines for additional cycles.

Beaver: Should we keep the Tag in consideration?

Yes 7 No 31

Segment Check *Yes* *No*

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| EU | 0 | 5 |
| LDC | 2 | 3 |
| Prod | 1 | 2 |
| P/L | 2 | 16 |
| Services | 2 | 5 |

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
 ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
 FINAL MINUTES
 PAGE 4

Logical test:

1) Nomination receipt time

Lander: You need to consider both effective date and receipt time or else a timely nomination submitted well in advance could be confused with an intraday.

Love: I agree with Lander.

Norm Walker: Likewise, I assumed effective date was being considered.

Proposal 1: Consider Nomination receipt time and effective date **only**. [Minimum Batch Grid wide]

| <u>RECEIPT TIME</u> | <u>EFF DATE</u> | <u>CYCLE</u> |
|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Now: YYYYMMDD | For: | |
| Day 1 - Noon | Day 2 | 6 PM |
| Day 1 - Noon | Day 1 | 5 PM |
| Day 1 - 5:30 PM | Day 2 | 6 PM |
| Day 1 - 5:30 PM | Day 1 | Reject |
| Day 1 - 5:30 PM | Day 3+ | Timely for Day 2+ |
| Day 1 - 9:50 AM | Day 1 | 10 AM |
| Day 1 - 9:50 AM | Day 2 | Timely for Day 2 |
| Day 1 - 10:30 AM | Day 1 | 5 PM |
| Day 1 - 10:30 AM | Day 2 | Timely for Day 2 |
| Day 1 - 9:45 AM | Day 1 for 9PM | 10 AM holding for 5PM |

Reminder: All times are Central Clock Time

Alternative: Continuous Processing/[Batch Exceeds]

| <u>RECEIPT TIME</u> | <u>EFF DATE/TIME</u> | <u>CYCLE</u> | <u>CYCLE</u> |
|----------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Now: YYYYMMDDHHMM | For: YYYYMMDDHHMM | Gridwide | On-System |
| Day 1 - 3:00 PM | Day 1 - 9:00 PM | 5:00 PM | 4:00 PM [7:00 PM] |
| Day 1 - 7:00 PM | Day 1 - 9:00 PM | Rejected | 8:00 PM [7:00 PM] |
| Day 1 - 10:00 AM | Day 1 - 5:00 PM | 5:00 PM | 11:00 AM [11:00 AM] |
| Day 1 - 10:00 AM | Day 1 - 9:00 PM | 5:00 PM | [7:00 PM] |
| Day 1 - 10:01 AM | Day 1 - 9:00 PM | Rejected | [7:00 PM] |

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 5

Chezar: What if I want to nominate for a later cycle?

Novak: Why can't we use the continuous model on all TSPs (Grid wide) but time options would be limited for batch TSPs (who are at the minimum)

Gracey: The Continuous model works for a batch TSP that has extra batches. It is important for the shipper to tell the TSP when the gas should flow. Time is essential.

Theresa Hess: Can't we tie to the date designation to the first alternative?

Gracey: I support Hess's proposal. Receipt time is important because it tells us whether a nomination is on time or not.

Love: I don't want to accept any changes to my proposal (Alternative 1).

Munson: Why can't the continuous model be complementary to the first proposal?

Munson Proposal:

TSP should determine the applicable nomination processing cycle based upon receipt time and beginning effective day of the nomination. Where TSP's support the processing of beginning effective time, that TSP should also use the beginning effective date and time in determining the start of the nomination in lieu of using the receipt date and time to determine the processing cycle.

Scott: If we use a default time when shippers do not submit an effective time, doesn't that make things clear?

Ehinger: I'm concerned about whether or not a TSP can tell an operator to support effective time or not.

Novak: No, some TSPs will support effective time work and some won't.

Lander: We need to make time mandatory.

Hahn: If we can't simplify (by making time mandatory) then we aren't doing our best for the industry. What can we do to make things easier for shippers to operate? This motion is the status quo; we can do better.

Munson: I agree with Ehinger's concerns. We could incorporate beginning effective date and time, where supported, and submitted by the shipper.

Hahn: Supporting effective time means that TSPs should hold intraday nominations.

Hess: We are only holding the nomination, not capacity.

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 6

Hahn: Yes.

Carl Caldwell: Shippers must make their nomination effective time clear.

Novak: With chair's hat off, I will vote no because this is not a standard. If we are committed to 7/24 we have to start processing time. I agree with Hahn; the motion is status quo. We need to capture our shipper's intentions. Otherwise, let's tell the industry that we don't support 7/24; maybe it's 5/12.

Sense of the room on motion:

Yes 17 No 22 Abstain 3

Segment Check Yes No

| | | |
|----------|----|---|
| EU | 0 | 4 |
| LDC | 0 | 6 |
| Prod | 0 | 3 |
| P/L | 12 | 6 |
| Services | 5 | 3 |

Lunch...

New motion by Chuck Beaver (concept):

EFFECTIVE TIME CONTROLS

THEN

IF EFFECTIVE TIME \neq GRID TIME

THEN IF NOM = ON-SYSTEM

ACCEPT

ELSE IF NOM \neq ON-SYSTEM

1) REJECT

2) HOLD TILL NEXT GRID TIME

CHANGE EFFECTIVE TIME TO PENDING GRID TIME

3) ACCEPT AND ATTEMPT NON-GRID TIME CONFIRMATION

IF FAILS, THEN SHIPPER MUST RENOMINATE

IF EFFECTIVE TIME = GRID TIME

HOLD AND PROCESS WITH GRID TIME

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 7

Joe Kardas: If the NOM \langle ON-SYSTEM then 1) Reject. Keep it simple and let the shipper know where it stands.

Caldwell: Perhaps 2) and 3) by Mutual Agreement is a way of exceeding the standard

Lander: You can 1) or 3) vs. 1) or 2) but you can't 1) or 2) or 3).

Beaver: Change to motion:

EFFECTIVE TIME CONTROLS

THEN IF BATCH/GRID : REJECT

ELSE CONTINUOUS : IF EFFECTIVE TIME \langle GRID TIME

 THEN IF NOM= ON-SYSTEM

 ACCEPT

 ELSE IF NOM \langle ON-SYSTEM

 1) REJECT

 2) PROCESS ON BEST EFFORT

 IF FAILS, THEN SHIPPER RENOMINATES

IF EFFECTIVE TIME = GRID TIME

 HOLD AND PROCESS WITH GRID TIME

final re-write...

EFF TIME CONTROLS

THEN

IF EFF TIME \langle GRID TIME

 - IF BATCH/GRID PIPE

 THEN REJECT

 ELSE IF CONTINUOUS

 THEN IF NOM= ON SYSTEM

 THEN ACCEPT

 ELSE IF NOM \langle ON SYSTEM

 THEN

 - REJECT or

 - PROCESS BEST EFFORTS

 IF NOM FAILS, THEN SHIPPER RENOMINATES

IF EFF TIME = GRIDTIME

 THEN PROCESS WITH GRID TIME

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 8

Shelly Corman: This changes the rules for some continuous pipelines who base priority on time of receipt. Since the rules change, pipelines should have the right to switch to batch.

Vote

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|----|------------|-----------|---------|----|
| Yes | 15 | No | 15 | Abstain | 10 |
| <i>Segment Check</i> | | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|--|--|
| EU | | 1 | 1 | | |
| LDC | | 3 | 1 | | |
| Prod | | 3 | 0 | | |
| P/L | | 3 | 12 | | |
| Services | | 6 | 1 | | |

Motion does not carry.

Lander: Let's re-vote the first proposal because the alternative is nothing.

Chezar: Second

TSP should determine the applicable nomination processing cycle based upon receipt time and beginning effective day of the nomination. Where TSP's support the processing of beginning effective time, the TSP should also utilize the beginning effective date and time in determining the applicable nomination processing cycle in lieu of using the nomination's receipt date and time to determine the processing cycle.

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|----|------------|-----------|---------|---|
| Yes | 28 | No | 10 | Abstain | 2 |
| <i>Segment Check</i> | | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------|--|----|---|--|--|
| EU | | 4 | 1 | | |
| LDC | | 4 | 0 | | |
| Prod | | 0 | 2 | | |
| P/L | | 13 | 7 | | |
| Services | | 7 | 0 | | |

Issue 2) starting with *also that the...* is stricken Now, should *changes only* be sent?

Corman: We should vote changes only now as a principle. This is where we are headed. This is an intraday and there can be an end of day complete recap.

Lander: But doesn't this allow people to say I'll only accept changes?

Corman: Yes, that is the reality now...some people can process changes only.

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 9

Lander: Fine, then who decides Sender or Receiver? I think Sender.

Hahn: Change Only is the better way to go. I think we need to take a positive step so I think that Lander's proposal, Sender Decision, makes sense. We need to know which way from a systems perspective.

Beaver: I think we got as far as we could in the Standards Committee. P.3 is as far as we could go.

Bob Wallenhorst: I think we need to differentiate between Operators and Shippers.

Lander: Perhaps for Operators it could be all transactions and for Shippers, it could be Sender's Option (i.e. the TSP's option)

Paul Love: I think by current standards, we will have to send all reports to everyone at every intraday scheduling opportunity.

Joyce Phillips: Do I send everyone everything or do I send changes to those that were impacted? I think the latter is better, i.e. send reports to affected shippers and operators.

Lander: Then, you should vote no.

Vote: Support P.3 as written in 10/28/97 Standards Group Proposal

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|----|------------|-----------|---------|---|
| Yes | 29 | No | 8 | Abstain | 3 |
| <i>Segment Check</i> | | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | | |
| EU | | 2 | 1 | | |
| LDC | | 3 | 0 | | |
| Prod | | 1 | 2 | | |
| P/L | | 17 | 3 | | |
| Services | | 6 | 2 | | |

Issue 3) *At least 1 intraday nomination concept*

Lander Motion:

For services that provide for intraday nominations and scheduling, there is no limitation as to the number of intraday nominations(line items as per 1.2.1) which a service requester may submit at any one deadline or in total across all deadlines.

Chezar: Second

Corman: Can we accomplish in the preface to 1.3.2 and not develop another standard?

Lander: Yes, but we would have to eliminate 1.3.10 and 1.3.32 (because of the issue of 'one'). We could capture some of the issues in this motion in 1.3.2 revised language.

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 10

Chezar: I think Lander's proposal provides clarity. There is ambiguity in the current standards.

Young: I think we need the protection the 'one' offers especially during the winter. We need experience. People could keep on resubmitting nominations every 15 minutes.

Novak: I think that keeping 'one' is inconsistent with 7/24 yet I'm sympathetic to the need to gain experience. Perhaps we could have some interim period after which limits could be phased out.

Love: What about one batch per cycle with as many nominations in that batch as needed.

Smith: As an enduser, it is essential that we remove the 'one' limitation.

Lander: Accepting Love's comment as a friendly amendment:

For services that provide for intraday nominations and scheduling, there is no limitation as to the number of intraday nominations(line items as per 1.2.1) which a service requester may submit at any one standard nomination timeline or in total across all standard nomination timeline. TSPs may for an interim period limit Service Requesters to one transmittal of nominations per standard nomination timeline.

Chezar: I accept the modifications.

Note: This motion eliminates 1.3.32 and 1.3.10

Cynthia Corcoran: Is the cycle limitation per contract or service requester?

Lander: The line item reference makes the issue go away.

Wallenhorst: I don't think this language is consistent (standard nomination timeline) for a continuous pipeline.

Corman: The proposal pertains to the standard nomination timeline. Continuous is over and above.

Dale Davis: This could be a complete rescheduling of the pipeline 4 times a day. We need to follow up with Bianchi's suggestion to add at least one hour to the first intraday processing timeline.

Vote

Yes 28 No 7 Abstain 5

| <i>Segment</i> | <i>Check</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
|----------------|--------------|------------|-----------|
| EU | | 5 | 0 |
| LDC | | 4 | 0 |
| Prod | | 0 | 3 |
| P/L | | 16 | 1 |
| Services | | 3 | 3 |

Issue 4) *Holding Capacity*

Lander : I propose that we strike the first 3 lines as written and However.

It is understood that TSPs exceeding the standard nomination timeline are not required to hold capacity for grid wide nomination until the standard nomination cycle.

Kardas: Can't we just say TSP and drop *exceeding the standard nomination timeline*.

Corman: Doesn't S.17 cover this?

Beaver: We never got to discuss S.17 in the Standards Group and so we need to discuss it here.

Ehinger: I think batch TSPs do not hold capacity for grid wide confirmations.

Chezar: I agree but what about batch TSPs who exceed standards?

Lander: For the incremental opportunities, the TSP is not required to hold capacity for a grid wide nomination.

Paul Keeler: I think you are creating a preference for on system shippers. An IT on system shipper could grab capacity prior to the grid wide nomination time. Without a bump, IT could hold onto capacity over a FT shipper. Or it could be FT versus FT.

Griffith: While I conceptually agree with Keeler, this issue is a fact of life for continuous pipeline now.

Lander: Consider the opposite... the TSP would then only be able to schedule on a grid wide basis.

Vote
Yes 35 No 0 Abstain 5

| <i>Segment Check</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|
| EU | 1 | 0 |
| LDC | 4 | 0 |
| Prod | 3 | 0 |
| P/L | 19 | 0 |
| Services | 8 | 0 |

Issue 5) *Tag for Scheduled Quantities document*

Lander: Because there are multiple times that this document could be issued (depending upon the number of cycles a TSP processes per day). I prefer effective time with something to distinguish between the initial 9AM and a subsequent modified 9AM. Perhaps the Processing Cycle or 'time' would be an identifier that supplements the Effective date

HOW TO IDENTIFY THE STAGE OF THE DATA

1) *LATEST ONE IS MOST CURRENT*

2) *USE NEW "TAG" DATA ELEMENT*

Corman: What about using nominator's tracking ID?

Caldwell: I agree with Corman's suggestion.

Lander: There is an issue concerning whether we send 'changes only' or send everything. Also, what about unsolicited changes?

Hahn: Let's set this aside for tomorrow morning. Issue 6 will also be discussed tomorrow. Let's move onto Joel Greene's nomenclature issue.

Joel Greene: At the September meeting we had a close vote to assign nomenclature to the intraday nomination cycles. For that reason, a number of companies asked that this matter be reconsidered. The labels chosen reflected Central Time which could be confusing to people outside of the central time zone. We are seeking to reduce confusion so a poll of the standards committee was conducted and 17 out of 25 voted for a new proposal. [OPTION 1] OPTION 1 OPTION 2

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Timely Nomination | Timely Nomination |
| Evening Nomination | 6PM Nomination |
| Intraday Nomination 1 | Intraday Nomination 10AM |
| Intraday Nomination 2 | Intraday Nomination 5PM |

Lander: In support of Option 2, while it's difficult on either coast, we need to stick with this nomenclature. We all deal in Central Time. We can get use to it. Additionally, if we want to add cycles, we don't have to think about names because we can use time as a descriptor.

Greene: With thousands of service requesters trying to adjust to new standards, Option 1 will remove one level of confusion without hindering our overall goals. Additional cycles are unlikely, and if needed, would require GISB to reconsider the compromise model; our responsibility is to implement existing GISB standards in a way that is user friendly.

Vote

| | | | | | |
|----------|----|----------|----|---------|---|
| Option 1 | 20 | Option 2 | 20 | Abstain | 0 |
|----------|----|----------|----|---------|---|

Lander: Motion to Table.

Corcoran: Second

Adjourn for Day..

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 13

Reconvene on November 12, 1997

Hahn: A revised Model reflecting PG&E's suggestions on the organization of notes is being circulated. No substantive changes are intended. If anyone believes this revised Intraday Nomination Model is substantively different than the old Model, please advise one of the Co-Chairs.

A review of the remaining agenda was made by Hahn.

Buccigross gave the anti-trust invocation.

Issue 5) *Tag for Scheduled Quantities document continued*

New Lander Proposal:

TSP's should issue a given gas day's Scheduled Quantity Documents in sequential order as processed so that the receiving service requesters and point operators can rely on that sequence to understand their daily position.

Phillips: Are all reports sent at the same time (for each hour) with time stamps? i.e. multiple reports sent at the same time in chronological order?

Lander: Reports would be sent as they are ready. If there was a change to a subsequent hour that had been sent, then a new report would be sent for that hour.

Phillips: So there would be no multiple reports sent at the same time in chronological order?

Lander: Correct.

Griffith: Sequential order is based off of the cycle time within a gas day, not the effective time of the flow?

Lander: Yes

Hess: The Scheduled Quantity X12 transaction includes the date the document is issued.

Lander: That would be a way to implement.

Caldwell: The date is available in the header.

Hess: The date is there but we have to add the time. If we add time, then we won't need a 1.3.x standard to get this done. The sequential order will be known.

Ehinger: If one shipper schedules at 1PM for 5PM and another is scheduled at 2PM for 4PM, which sequence is correct?

Lander: It doesn't matter because Scheduled Quantity Reports would be issued for each effective hour. The hour that the transaction was initiated doesn't really have an impact for reporting purposes.

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 14

Love: I think this would work fine as we move to changes only but when you send everything, there could be confusion.

Tammy Lee Jaquet: From our experience with a tracking number, the current data set works. I don't think we need to add anything.

Lander: I'll withdraw this initial motion. Here's a proposed definition that could work in place of the proposed standard:

TSP's should provide the date and time that the scheduled quantity was generated as part of the Scheduled Quantity Document.

Beaver: Second

Kardas: When you print a report, you put a date and time on it. This is the same thing. Let's vote and move on.

Beaver: This could be an instruction to IR.

Lander: Yes

Vote to send language to IR as an instruction
Yes 30 No 1 Abstain 4

| <i>Segment Check</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|
| EU | 3 | 1 |
| LDC | 3 | 0 |
| Prod | 3 | 0 |
| P/L | 13 | 0 |
| Services | 8 | 0 |

Issue 6) *Confirmation Matrix Issues*

Beaver: The basic issues are 1) The 'Lesser of' Rule and 2) Non-Communications

LESSER OF RULE ALTERNATIVE:

IF COMMUNICATING

IF NOT IN AGREEMENT

USE PREVIOUSLY AGREED and NOT LESSER OF

ELSE IF NOT COMMUNICATING

ALLOW NOMINATION TO PREVAIL (same result as 'lesser of' rule) IN ALL CASES

(Increases or decreases)

Wallenhorst: We felt that the lesser of rule allowed people to who were not communicating to override intentions of those who were communicating. This concept stabilizes deals and allows gas to flow as intended. It recognizes staffing realities; people are not available during off hours. There are safety concerns with sending people out to platforms.

Hahn: Bob, you are saying that the lesser of rule would prevail for timely nominations. Once the 24 hour number is set, we would use this alternative methodology (rather than 'lesser of') for intraday nominations.

Wallenhorst: Yes. I'd like to add that reductions for rounding differences could be made. Additionally, this is not intended for somebody to defeat a bump.

Hahn: I think this methodology is intended to encourage not only communication, but explicit agreement between parties.

Bianchi: I really disagree. I don't think it promotes communications but it promotes imbalances and operational problems. Additionally, there is a difference between one party having a nomination while the other doesn't versus two parties having nominations with different quantities.

Hahn: But 'lesser of' results in imbalances too.

Bianchi: Yes but the imbalances will likely be of a greater magnitude without 'lesser of'.

Lander: We came to 'lesser of' because of what the alternatives were. Bianchi says unequivocally 'lesser of' while Wallenhorst says usually 'lesser of'; it's a matter of degrees. Look to 1.3.22iii in the 10/28/97 Standards Group Document. This is a difficult issue. We just can't reward non-communications.

With respect to the processing of requests for decreases during the intraday nomination/confirmation process, in the absence of agreement to the contrary, if the confirming parties are communicating and there is no agreement as to the decrease; then the previously scheduled quantity should be the new confirmed quantity, but in any event no less than the elapsed prorated quantity.

Keeler: Second

Gracey: I still disagree with Bob's proposal. I still agree with 'lesser of' rule. Only operators (who have control over flow) can help to alleviate the situation. Also, this doesn't address unsolicited increases which could be a greater problem. The pipeline should not have to be put in this type of situation.

Novak: I agree with Gracey. But the people taking gas off my system are residential customers. I can't shut 750,000 people off simultaneously. If we don't communicate with each other, the system becomes unreliable. Communications and the 'lesser of' rule send the appropriate signals and cause people to take actions to promote reliability even if they are uneconomic.

Wallenhorst: The question is who takes responsibility for the imbalance. I think the initiator of the change has to bear some responsibility to seeing that everyone gets in line. I think Lander's proposal is an attempt to reach a middle ground.

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 16

Richard Ishikawa: If there is communication but people don't agree on the extent, there still is an implicit agreement to the extent of the 'lesser of'. When there is no communication, we should recognize that the elapsed prorated scheduled quantity may prevail in the case of a nomination for a decrease.

Munson: I agree with Ishikawa on the extent concept. In 1.3.22i, where there is no communication, how can you have a confirmation quantity?

Lander: The confirmation would be the requested quantity. Perhaps what I've proposed leads us to a 'Law of Unintended Consequences'. I think we need to vote to get some direction.

Griffith: Keep in mind physical operations. You can't force people to take gas nor can you take it from them if they don't have it. The 'lesser of' rule forces people to recognize what is going on and then to take actions.

Keeler: I agree with fairness but we shouldn't look at this piece meal. We need to look at a complete matrix. We also need to focus on 'what was the deal'. The American way is that you can't unilaterally break a deal. Not the entire matrix but complete from the perspective of the increase/decrease on the intraday without communications or when there is disagreement.

Caldwell: A cut on a transportation contract generates an imbalance because the operator can't make a physical change. A positive imbalance is better than a shortage but those uninvolved (in the deal) shouldn't bear the consequences.

Daly: Greg's changes do not address non-communications. We have to promote flow of gas. We have to count on people doing their job. Non-communication should not be recognized as an appropriate response, yet it appears we are condoning it. We have a Transportation Service Agreement, yet there are many middlemen involved. I'm just not sure we can have a general application of the lesser of rule.

Hess: Daly's issue is where(in the Standards Group Document)?

Hahn: 1.3.22ii. Lander's is 1.3.22iii

Joe Pollard: Can OFO's still allow pipelines to issue cuts?

Lander: OFO prevails.

Pollard: Can you tell the difference between a nominated cut and an OFO cut in the datasets?

Lander: No

Vote on Lander proposal

Yes 5 No 30 Abstain 2

| <i>Segment Check</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|
| EU | 2 | 3 |
| LDC | 0 | 3 |
| Prod | 3 | 0 |
| P/L | 0 | 19 |
| Services | 0 | 5 |

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 17

Beaver: We have a typographical change to 1.3.22ii.

The last sentence should read:

If there is no response to a request for confirmation or an unsolicited confirmation response, the previously scheduled quantity should be the new scheduled quantity.

Wallenhorst: This is a motion to develop a replacement for both 1.3.22ii and 1.3.22iii:

With respect to requests for confirmation during the intraday nomination/confirmation process, where there is communication and there is disagreement regarding the proposed change, the current scheduled quantity should be the new confirmed quantity. If there is no response to a request for confirmation or to an unsolicited confirmation response, the requested quantity should be the new confirmed quantity but, in any event, no less than the elapsed prorated scheduled quantity.

Keeler: Second

Beaver: In the cases of OFO, bumps or capacity constrained gas resulting decreases, it is unacceptable for a downstream TSP to not accept the decrease. There is no way to track unless you path all gas. This is too difficult.

Lander: Someday we could have a flag that indicated if there was an OFO situation which would cause lesser of to prevail.

Keeler: We could amend the proposal to add:

Notwithstanding the foregoing, TSP may unilaterally change scheduled quantity when necessary for safety or to maintain the operational integrity .

Novak: To require a TSP to advance gas in the no communication scenario has all sorts of service implications. It's a shame that everyone in the chain did not perform but there has to be a legal recourse, via contract, from the party that did not perform.

Daly: I think we should drop all references to no communication.

Walker: Shippers have space and operators have gas. We match them up. The 'lesser of' rule imposes discipline. The 'lessor of' rule has different impacts on an intraday basis. It's one thing to bump paper; gas is another. We can't keep a bumped shipper flowing when some other market is pulling on the bumped space 3 states away. It's not a pretty picture (the 'lesser of' rule) but we don't have a better solution.

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 18

Motion now reads:

With respect to requests for confirmation during the intraday nomination/confirmation process, where there is communication and there is disagreement regarding the proposed change, the current scheduled quantity should be the new confirmed quantity. If there is no response to a request for confirmation or to an unsolicited confirmation response, the requested quantity should be the new confirmed quantity but, in any event, no less than the elapsed prorated scheduled quantity. Notwithstanding the foregoing, TSPs may unilaterally change scheduled quantities when necessary for safety or to maintain the operational integrity of the TSP's system .

Vote on Wallenhorst proposal

| | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|----|---------|---|
| Yes | 11 | No | 22 | Abstain | 2 |
|-----|----|----|----|---------|---|

| <i>Segment Check</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|
| EU | 4 | 1 |
| LDC | 1 | 2 |
| Prod | 3 | 0 |
| P/L | 3 | 15 |
| Services | 0 | 4 |

Hahn: Next issue for discussion is the Standards Group Proposal. Is the entire package acceptable as is? If we vote the package in, then we can vote the other issues as amendments to the package.

Kardas: I make a motion that we accept the Standards Group Proposal package.

Lanyard Sledge: Second

Buccigross: Do we include changes that we voted on in the past two days?

Hahn: Yes

Beaver: There is now an S.18 (Sylvia Proposal) and we have minor changes such as pipeline to TSP and shipper to Service Requester.

Greene: What about the nomenclature issue?

Hahn: It's open and will be forwarded to the EC.

Novak: Note that we are using the 9/17 nomenclature for drafting purposes. That can change at the EC.

Hahn: Note that all open issues are being forwarded to the EC.

Novak recited the open issues brought up in yesterday's meeting. Dolores Chezar has dropped her issue.

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 19

Vote on Standard Group Proposal

Yes 28 No 0 Abstain 10

| <i>Segment Check</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | <i>Abstain</i> |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|----------------|
| EU | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| LDC | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Prod | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| P/L | 17 | 0 | 3 |
| Services | 7 | 0 | 0 |

Lunch...

Hahn: The agenda for the afternoon is as follows:

Joe Bianchi: 1) The 2 hours confirmation timeline for the 1st intraday cycle.
[45 minutes] 2) Discussion and recognition of the *Confirmation True-up* between upstream and downstream TSPs

Lander: 1) Sync up begin & end date times for request to confirm
[60 minutes] 2) Sync up begin & end date time for scheduling
3) Notification of changes
4) Zero Quantity

Bill Griffith: 1) More discussion on variable bump times
[30 minutes] 2) Elapsed prorated quantity
3) Form of no bump notice & usage

Lander: 5) 8 nomenclature issues
[15 minutes]

Bianchi: For the 10AM intraday nomination, it is too difficult to complete by 12:00 PM. One additional hour would come at the expense of the notice to bumped parties. This is preferable to moving the nomination deadline up to 9AM which might be too early for west coast parties.

Motion: Move Confirmation Deadline to 1:00 PM for the 10:00 AM nomination cycle.

Lander: Second. These are changes to 1.3.2.iii where 12:00 Noon becomes 1:00 PM

Vote on Motion

Yes 23 No 0 Abstain 4

| <i>Segment Check</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|
| EU | 2 | 0 |
| LDC | 2 | 0 |
| Prod | 2 | 0 |
| P/L | 11 | 0 |
| Services | 6 | 0 |

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 20

Bianchi: We have a principle that is preferable to spelling out times within the confirmation process as a standard. It is in two parts.

Principle 1-A

True-up of the Upstream and Downstream Operators initial confirmation by the TSP should be done after initial confirmations are received.

Principle 1-B

Initial and True-up confirmations must be completed by the end of confirmation period for each cycle as stated in the standards.

Lander: Second. There has to be an interval between initial and true-up confirmations. Perhaps we need another principle or an addition.

Bianchi: Yes.

Walker: Is there an upstream or downstream direction to start with?

Bianchi: No.

Walker: So you need two 'wraps' at this?

Bianchi: We need at least two cycles to fit within the time period.

Lander: Amend as follows:

Principle 1-B

Initial Confirmations should be completed sufficiently in advance so that True-up confirmations must be completed by the end of confirmation period for each cycle as stated in the standards.

Wallenhorst: This is a confirmation process in which there are at least two attempts. Does this apply to intradays or both intradays and start of day? Do we need to specify times for the initial confirmation?

Bianchi: Both. No because they will be vary from TSP to TSP.

Wallenhorst: So if I have 10 TSPs, I could have 10 initial confirmations.

Bianchi: The point is that you don't wait until the last minute to initiate confirmations.

Love: The true-up confirmations will be the scheduled quantities?

Bianchi: Yes. Shipper would not have to be sent the initial scheduled quantities.

Love: Amend as follows:

Principle 1-B

*Initial Confirmations should be completed sufficiently in advance so that True-up confirmations must be completed by the end of confirmation period for each cycle as stated in the standards. **Final Confirmation True-ups should be used by TSPs for scheduling and communication in Scheduled Quantity documents.***

Bianchi: I accept the amendment (it was subsequently seconded).

Davis: What is the definition of True-up Confirmation?

Bianchi: A True-up confirmation is a procedure that when an Operator has confirmed a lower quantity on one side of the transaction then the operator on the other side of the transaction, the TSP needs time to balance the transaction and inform the Operator.

Gracey: I disagree with Love's amendment because it might restrict a TSP's ability to do a capacity restriction.

Bianchi: Capacity restriction could be one of the reasons you would have a difference between initial and true-up confirmations.

Griffith: Confirmations are like voting; *they should be done early and often.*

Hess: What about dropping "***and communication in Scheduled Quantity documents***"?

Bianchi: No

Hess: How about the following amendment:

Principle 1-A

To the extent true-up is utilized by a TSP, true-up of the Upstream and Downstream Operators initial confirmation by the TSP should be done after initial confirmations are received.

Bianchi: I accept (it was subsequently seconded).

Young: We have experienced this problem. I think this helps to identify the problem but there needs to be a firm time to strengthen the principle. Perhaps at least an hour before for the initial confirmation.

Lander: This is progress towards continuous and contiguous processing.

Walker: I agree with both Young and Lander but Joe, could you suggest a time?

Bianchi: Perhaps backup one half hour on a regular nomination and 15 minutes on an intraday.

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 22

Vote on combination of 1-A and 1-B

Yes 22 No 11 Abstain 4

| <i>Segment Check</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|
| EU | 4 | 0 |
| LDC | 2 | 1 |
| Prod | 0 | 3 |
| P/L | 10 | 6 |
| Services | 6 | 1 |

Lander: What is the beginning date time communicated between parties? (and ending date) When we confirm a nomination for days 1-30 on day 5, should the beginning date be day 1 or day 6? At the end, do you respond into the future?

Proposal:

Standard A:

As between the Confirming Parties (the Confirmation Requester and the Confirming Party); and, absent mutual agreement to the contrary, with respect to the Beginning Date/Time in the confirmations and scheduling process, when transaction(s) are attempted to be confirmed and scheduled, the Beginning Date/Time in the Request for Confirmation or unsolicited Confirmation Response (as applicable) should be: a) for timely and 6:00 PM nominations, no earlier than the beginning of the next gas day; and, b) for intraday 10:00 am and intraday 5:00 PM nominations, no earlier than the beginning of the current gas day.

As between the Confirming Parties (the Confirmation Requester and the Confirming Party); and, absent mutual agreement to the contrary, with respect to the Ending Date/Time in the confirmations and scheduling process, when transaction(s) are attempted to be confirmed and scheduled, the Ending Date/Time in the Request for Confirmation or unsolicited Confirmation Response (as applicable) should be: a) for timely and 6:00 PM nominations, no later than the end of the next gas day; and, b) for intraday 10:00 am and intraday 5:00 PM nominations, no later than the end of the current gas day.

Standard B:

With respect to the Beginning Date/Time in a Confirmation Response, when transaction(s) in a Request for Confirmation are responded to with a Confirmation Response, the Beginning Date/Time for such transaction(s) in such Confirmation Response should be equal to the Beginning Date/Time in the associated transaction(s) in the Request for Confirmation to which the Confirmation Response corresponds.

With respect to the Ending Date/Time in a Confirmation Response, when transaction(s) in a Request for Confirmation are responded to with a Confirmation Response, the Ending Date/Time for such transaction(s) in such Confirmation Response should be no later than the Ending Date/Time in the associated transaction(s) in the Request for Confirmation to which the Confirmation Response corresponds.

Standard C:

With respect to the confirmations and scheduling process: 1) the beginning Date/Time in any of the Request for Confirmation, unsolicited Confirmation Response, Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity, and Scheduled Quantity for Operator documents should not be earlier than the Beginning Date/Time in the corresponding nomination(s) document(s); and 2) the Ending Date/Time in any of the Request for Confirmation, unsolicited Confirmation Response, Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity, and Scheduled Quantity for Operator documents should not extend beyond the Ending Date/Time in a corresponding nomination(s) document(s).

Standard D:

With respect to the confirmations and scheduling process, if a Service Requester nominates a zero quantity, the Transportation Service Provider should seek (via a Request for Confirmation or unsolicited Confirmation Response) to confirm the nomination with a zero quantity. When the Transportation Service Provider provides a Scheduled Quantity document consistent with Standards 1.3.2 and 1.3.3, and where the result of the confirmations and scheduling process is a zero quantity, then a corresponding zero should appear in a Scheduled Quantity document.

If no nomination is made by a Service Requester,; or, the subject gas day for which confirmations are being sought is beyond the Ending Date/Time of a nomination, then there is no nomination to confirm, and no Request for Confirmation or unsolicited Confirmation Response should be sent. When the Transportation Service Provider provides a Scheduled Quantity document consistent with Standards 1.3.2 and 1.3.3, no corresponding line item should appear in a Scheduled Quantity document.

Standard E:

When a previously confirmed and scheduled quantity is altered, notification of such alteration should be provided to the affected: 1) Confirmation requester in a Confirmation Response (or unsolicited Confirmation Response as applicable) document by the Confirming Party; 2) Confirming Party in a Request for Confirmation document by the Confirmation Requester; and/or 3) Service Requester(s) in a Scheduled Quantity document by the applicable Confirming Party or Confirmation Requester on whose system the Service Requester(s) nomination(s) were made.

Applicable notification(s) of such alterations should be provided to the affected parties reasonably proximate in time to the time during which the event causing the alteration was acted upon by the Confirmation Requester or Confirming Party, respectively. With respect to the implementation of this process via the 1.4.X standards, Confirming Parties should send the applicable document(s) to the applicable party(ies) no later than the next time they are slated to communicate confirmations or scheduled quantities (as applicable.)

Corcoran: Is zero an intelligent number for nomination purposes?

Lander: Yes.

Lander: The last issue concerns Notification of Change to anyone (upstream, downstream or service requester) of an unsolicited intraday change (decrease). The Confirmation document is too late. A Scheduled Quantity document could be sent to a shipper.

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 24

Hahn: Is there a second to Lander's motion?

Buccigross: Second

Munson: The preamble to A) should apply to B) and C)

Lander: I don't think that works but A) sets up B) and C).

Beaver: Standard A to D is before the EC. They are here to be approved as consistent with intraday.
What about Standard E?

Lander : This needs to be approved here to be sent to the EC.

Young: All of these standards were refined and approved by BPS. No need to change or rewrite just determine if consistent with intraday.

Hahn: These are BPS standards out for comment and will be put to EC. I think A-D sync up with intraday. But standard E, what do you want us to do?

Lander: Consider A through D, then E separately.

Hahn: Let's vote A through D as an endorsement that the BPS issues out for comment mesh well with the Intraday Nominations Task Force. This is not a standards vote.

Griffith: For B), let's follow Munson's proposal that the preamble to A) to B)

Vote on endorsement of A) through D)

Yes 14 No 3 Abstain 17

| <i>Segment Check</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | <i>Abstain</i> |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|----------------|
| EU | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| LDC | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Prod | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| P/L | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| Services | 7 | 0 | 0 |

Griffith: On the variable bump issue, we think that bumping at 9AM is inappropriate given the notice time and the fact that interconnecting parties can be affected, only a 5PM effective bump is appropriate.

Motion: *If bumping is allowed by the TSP and in the event a party will be bumped, flow will be effective time at 5PM on day 2. (the following sentence in the model would then be deleted)*

Bianchi: Second

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
FINAL MINUTES
PAGE 25

Scott: Isn't NGC presenting this as a minority position at the EC.

Hahn: Yes

Bianchi: And if there is no bump, then flow would be at 9AM?

Hahn: Yes

Vote:

Yes 10 No 16 Abstain 9

| <i>Segment</i> | <i>Check</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | <i>Abstain</i> |
|----------------|--------------|------------|-----------|----------------|
| EU | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| LDC | | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Prod | | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| P/L | | 8 | 4 | 6 |
| Services | | 0 | 4 | 2 |

Griffith: Process of computing gas that has already flowed. We should recognize the reduction be based on 24th of a day (one hour). We are dealing with full day quantities.

Keeler: We can get where Griffith wants to go by stating all nominations are prospective, so:

All scheduling changes shall be prospective only.

This is in lieu of 1.3.22.iv

There was no second.

Griffith: We should base modify 1.3.22.iv to say

Elapsed-prorated-scheduled... based upon a cumulative uniform hourly quantity with respect to full day quantity.

Munson: Second

Lander: This works for gas that starts at 9AM but what if for a 9PM cut gas had started at 5PM?

Griffith: It wouldn't make a difference.

Novak: I disagree, you could commit to half a day's gas when you've only flowed 4 hours of gas (even though you are flowing at a higher rate). On a continuous TSP this could be as little a 1 hour of flow.

Lander: Either methodology can achieve a workable result.

Griffith: I'll withdraw the proposal

Munson: As seconder, I agree with the withdrawal.

Discussion of Lander E)

Standard E:

*When a previously confirmed and scheduled quantity is altered, notification of such alteration should be provided to the affected: 1) Confirmation requester in a Confirmation Response (or unsolicited Confirmation Response as applicable) document by the Confirming Party; 2) Confirming Party in a Request for Confirmation document by the Confirmation Requester; and/or 3) Service Requester(s) in a Scheduled Quantity document **indicating that the document contains such alterations made** by the applicable Confirming Party or Confirmation Requester on whose system the Service Requester(s) nomination(s) were made.*

Applicable notification(s) of such alterations should be provided to the affected parties reasonably proximate in time to the time during which the event causing the alteration was acted upon by the Confirmation Requester or Confirming Party, respectively. With respect to the implementation of this process via the 1.4.X standards, Confirming Parties should send the applicable document(s) to the applicable party(ies) no later than the next time they are slated to communicate confirmations or scheduled quantities (as applicable.)

As between Confirming Parties, this alteration notification process is not intended to replace the confirmation process nor is it intended to permit unilateral, retroactive scheduling by one of the Confirming Parties without the consent of the other party.

Lander: Based upon comments by Love, instead of inserting **indicating that the document contains such alterations made**

As instructions to IR:

change usage of reduction reason in SQ & SQOP to C; mandatory when there is a reduction from a nominated or previously scheduled quantity.

Davis: Does this change just pertain to Intraday?

Lander: Yes

Young: This proposal is under consideration by the Business Practices Subcommittee (BPS). It has not been approved by the BPS. It is appropriate for the Intraday Task Force to review this proposal **only** to determine if it is consistent with the Intraday group's work. This proposal has not been noticed on the Intraday agenda or work papers prior to the meeting and approval of this standard should be handles within BPS.

Novak: We have to wrap up.

Lander: I make a motion to vote E) as a standard without the insert

Buccigross: Second

Standard E:

When a previously confirmed and scheduled quantity is altered, notification of such alteration should be provided to the affected: 1) Confirmation requester in a Confirmation Response (or unsolicited Confirmation Response as applicable) document by the Confirming Party; 2) Confirming Party in a Request for Confirmation document by the Confirmation Requester; and/or 3) Service Requester(s) in a Scheduled Quantity document by the applicable Confirming Party or Confirmation Requester on whose system the Service Requester(s) nomination(s) were made.

Applicable notification(s) of such alterations should be provided to the affected parties reasonably proximate in time to the time during which the event causing the alteration was acted upon by the Confirmation Requester or Confirming Party, respectively. With respect to the implementation of this process via the 1.4.X standards, Confirming Parties should send the applicable document(s) to the applicable party(ies) no later than the next time they are slated to communicate confirmations or scheduled quantities (as applicable.)

Vote:

Yes 12 No 3 Abstain 14

| <i>Segment Check</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | <i>Abstain</i> |
|----------------------|------------|-----------|----------------|
| EU | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| LDC | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Prod | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| P/L | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| Services | 6 | 0 | 2 |

Lander: We don't need to discuss the 8 nomenclature items issue I had raised.

Hahn: This will be added to the Standards Group Document. This may be the last meeting.

Changes to meeting minutes will be due by December 5.

Meeting Adjourned.

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
 ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
 FINAL MINUTES
 PAGE 28

| INTRADAY TASK FORCE | ATTENDANCE LIST | | | 11/11/97 |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| NAME | COMPANY | PHONE | FAX | EMAIL |
| Brian White | AGA | (703)841-8496 | (703)841-8697 | bwhite@aga.com |
| Cynthia Corcoran | Algonquin Gas | (713)627-5262 | (713)627-8241 | ccorcora@duke-energy.com |
| Marcy McCain | Algonquin Gas | (713)627-4738 | (713)627-5041 | mlmccain@duke-energy.com |
| Sylvia Munson | Altra | (713)210-8169 | (713)210-8008 | sylviam@altranet.com |
| Tom Ehinger | Amoco | (281)366-4559 | (281)366-5090 | Thomas_G_Ehinger@amoco.com |
| Joe Bianchi | ANR Pipeline | (313)496-2177 | (313)496-2126 | |
| Joe Pollard | ANR Pipeline | (313)496-7190 | (313)496-2227 | |
| Kelly A. Daly | Arizona Public Service | (202)785-9100 | (202)785-9163 | kellyadaly@aol.com |
| Dolores Chezdar | Brooklyn Union | (718)403-2987 | (718)246-2927 | dchezdar@bug.com |
| Marian Hundt | Burlington Resources | (713)624-9061 | (713)624-9630 | mhundt@br-inc.com |
| Paul Keeler | Burlington Resources | (713)624-9268 | (713)624-9624 | pkeeler@br-inc.com |
| Bill Griffith | Colorado Interstate | (719)520-4334 | (719)520-4318 | |
| Carl Caldwell | Deloitte & Touche | (713)868-5537 | (281)360-4902 | cpccaldwell@aol.com |
| Laverne Tillson | DFSC | (703)767-8562 | (703)767-8575 | ltillson@dfsc.dla.mil |
| Norm Walker | El Paso | (915)496-3052 | (915)496-2865 | Walkerne@epenergy.com |
| Lanyard Sledge | El Paso/E. Tennessee | (713)757-8828 | (713)757-2827 | sledgel@epenergy.com |
| Mark Gracey | El Paso/TGP | (713)757-2644 | (713)757-5505 | gracym@epenergy.com |
| Gary Payne | Enron Admin. Services | (713)853-7148 | (713)646-2372 | gpayne@ect.enron.com |
| Donna Scott | Enron C&T | (713)853-6316 | (713)646-8000 | dscott2@enron.com |
| Shelly Corman | Enron/NB | (713)853-7083 | (713)646-2738 | scorman@enron.com |
| Tammy Lee Jaquet | Enron/NNG | (713)853-5375 | (713)646-8000 | tlea@enron.com |
| Teresa Hess | Enron/TW | (713)853-4895 | (713)646-2551 | thess@enron.com |
| Bob Wallenhorst | Exxon | (713)656-5230 | (713)656-4144 | Robert.P.Wallenhorst@Exxon.Sprint.com |
| Nancy Holloway | Florida Gas Utility | (352)334-0770 | (352)334-0789 | floridagas@aol.com |
| Veronica Thomason | GISB | (713)757-4175 | (713)757-2491 | gisb@aol.com |
| Randall Young | Koch Gateway | (713)229-4715 | (713)229-5112 | young0r@kochind.com |
| Brian O'Hara | Mid American Energy | (712)277-7528 | (712)252-7343 | |
| Lee Smith | Midland Cogeneration | (517)839-6008 | (517)839-6793 | Lesmith41@aol.com |
| Rhett D. Workman | Missouri Gas Energy | (202)939-7965 | (202)265-5706 | rworkman@fw-law.com |
| Randy Flowers | Missouri PSC | (573)751-1119 | (573)751-1847 | rflowers@mail.state.mo.us |
| Sandra Barnett | Mobile Bay P/L Co. | (713)229-5732 | (713)229-4990 | barnetts@kochind.com |
| Mike Novak | National Fuel Distr. | (716)857-7884 | (716)857-7415 | novakm@natfuel.com |
| Joe Kardas | National Fuel Supply | (716)857-7984 | (716)857-7823 | kardasj@natfuel.com |
| Jim Buccigross | National Registry | (508)535-7500 | (508)535-7744 | legaljb@tcapserv.com |
| Paul Love | NGPL | (713)963-3710 | (713)963-3085 | Paul_D_Love@oxy.com |
| Betty Barnum | PEPL | (713)627-5618 | (713)627-5769 | babarnum@duke-energy.com |
| Jay Story | PGT | (503)833-4309 | (503)833-4395 | jstory@pgt.net |
| Joel L. Greene | Salt River Project | (202)638-3307 | (202)783-6947 | jgreene@bjllp.com |
| Rick Ishikawa | SoCal Gas | (213)244-2844 | (213)244-8449 | rishikawa@pacent.com |
| Jerry Hahn | Texaco | (713)752-7769 | (713)752-4026 | hahnge@texaco.com |
| Joyce Phillips | Texas Eastern | (713)627-5242 | (713)989-3190 | jephillips@duke-energy.com |
| Greg Lander | Trans Capacity | (508)535-7500 | (508)535-7744 | exec@tcapserv.com |
| Chuck Beaver | TransEnergy | (713)624-9058 | (713)624-9604 | cbeaver@transenergy.com |
| Kim VanPelt | Trunkline | (713)627-5566 | (713)627-4066 | kvanpelt@duke-energy.com |
| Angie Buckspan | WESCO | (918)588-4605 | (918)594-1530 | Buckspan_angie@wes.twc.com |
| Dale Davis | Williams | (713)215-2396 | (713)215-3124 | tdeldmd@transco.twc.com |

INTRADAY TASK FORCE MEETING - NOVEMBER 11-12, 1997 -
 ARLINGTON, VA/WASHINGTON, DC
 FINAL MINUTES
 PAGE 29

| INTRADAY TASK FORCE | | ATTENDANCE LIST | | 11/12/97 |
|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| NAME | COMPANY | PHONE | FAX | EMAIL |
| Cynthia Corcoran | Algonquin Gas | (713)627-5262 | (713)627-8241 | ccorcora@duke-energy.com |
| Marcy McCain | Algonquin Gas | (713)627-4738 | (713)627-5041 | mlmccain@duke-energy.com |
| Sylvia Munson | Altra | (713)210-8169 | (713)210-8008 | sylviam@altranet.com |
| Tom Ehinger | Amoco | (281)366-4559 | (281)366-5090 | Thomas_G_Ehinger@amoco.com |
| Joe Bianchi | ANR Pipeline | (313)496-2177 | (313)496-2126 | |
| Joe Pollard | ANR Pipeline | (313)496-7190 | (313)496-2227 | |
| Kelly A. Daly | Arizona Public Service | (202)785-9100 | (202)785-9163 | kellyadaly@aol.com |
| Marian Hundt | Burlington Resources | (713)624-9061 | (713)624-9630 | mhundt@br-inc.com |
| Paul Keeler | Burlington Resources | (713)624-9268 | (713)624-9624 | pkeeler@br-inc.com |
| Bill Griffith | Colorado Interstate | (719)520-4334 | (719)520-4318 | |
| Carl Caldwell | Deloitte & Touche | (713)868-5537 | (281)360-4902 | cpaldwe@aol.com |
| Laverne Tillson | DFSC | (703)767-8562 | (703)767-8575 | ltillson@dfsc.dla.mil |
| Norm Walker | El Paso | (915)496-3052 | (915)496-2865 | Walkerne@epenergy.com |
| Lanyard Sledge | El Paso/E. Tennessee | (713)757-8828 | (713)757-2827 | sledgel@epenergy.com |
| Mark Gracey | El Paso/TGP | (713)757-2644 | (713)757-5505 | graceym@epenergy.com |
| Gary Payne | Enron Admin. Services | (713)853-7148 | (713)646-2372 | gpayne@ect.enron.com |
| Donna Scott | Enron C&T | (713)853-6316 | (713)646-8000 | dscott2@enron.com |
| Tammy Hopkins | Enron/NBPL | (713)853-5818 | | thopkins@enron.com |
| Tammy Lee Jaquet | Enron/NGG | (713)853-5375 | (713)646-8000 | tleee@enron.com |
| Teresa Hess | Enron/TW | (713)853-4895 | (713)646-2551 | thess@enron.com |
| Bob Wallenhorst | Exxon | (713)656-5230 | (713)656-4144 | Robert.P.Wallenhorst@Exxon.Sprint.com |
| Nancy Holloway | Florida Gas Utility | (352)334-0770 | (352)334-0789 | floridagas@aol.com |
| Veronica Thomason | GISB | (713)757-4175 | (713)757-2491 | gisb@aol.com |
| Randall Young | Koch Gateway | (713)229-4715 | (713)229-5112 | young0r@kochind.com |
| Rhett D. Workman | Missouri Gas Energy | (202)939-7965 | (202)265-5706 | rworkman@fw-law.com |
| Randy Flowers | Missouri PSC | (573)751-1119 | (573)751-1847 | rflowers@mail.state.mo.us |
| Sandra Barnett | Mobile Bay P/L Co. | (713)229-5732 | (713)229-4990 | barnetts@kochind.com |
| Mike Novak | National Fuel Distr. | (716)857-7884 | (716)857-7415 | novakm@natfuel.com |
| Joe Kardas | National Fuel Supply | (716)857-7984 | (716)857-7823 | kardasj@natfuel.com |
| Jim Buccigross | National Registry | (508)535-7500 | (508)535-7744 | legaljb@tcapserv.com |
| Kristine Mispelli | NE Power | (508)389-2835 | (508)898-3952 | mespel@neesnet.com |
| Paul Love | NGPL | (713)963-3710 | (713)963-3085 | Paul_D_Love@oxy.com |
| Sharon Eady | NorAm | (713)654-5818 | (713)654-5268 | seady@noram.com |
| Betty Barnum | PEPL | (713)627-5618 | (713)627-5769 | babarnum@duke-energy.com |
| Jay Story | PGT | (503)833-4309 | (503)833-4395 | jstory@pgt.net |
| Joel L. Greene | Salt River Project | (202)638-3307 | (202)783-6947 | jgreene@bjllp.com |
| Rick Ishikawa | SoCal Gas | (213)244-2844 | (213)244-8449 | rishikawa@pacent.com |
| Jerry Hahn | Texaco | (713)752-7769 | (713)752-4026 | hahnge@texaco.com |
| Joyce Phillips | Texas Eastern | (713)627-5242 | (713)989-3190 | jephillips@duke-energy.com |
| Greg Lander | Trans Capacity | (508)535-7500 | (508)535-7744 | exec@tcapserv.com |
| Chuck Beaver | TransEnergy | (713)624-9058 | (713)624-9604 | cbeaver@transenergy.com |
| Kim VanPelt | Trunkline | (713)627-5566 | (713)627-4066 | kvanpelt@duke-energy.com |
| Angie Buckspan | WESCO | (918)588-4605 | (918)594-1530 | Buckspan_angie@wes.twc.com |
| Dale Davis | Williams | (713)215-2396 | (713)215-3124 | tdeldmd@transco.twc.com |