

NOTES
STANDARDS LANGUAGE MEETING
10/17/97

ATTENDEES

1. Kelly Daly	Arizona Public Service	End User
2. Joel Greene, Diane M	SRP	End User
3. Terry Fitch	Transco	Pipe
4. Angie Buckspan	Williams Energy Service	Services
5. Christine Mespelli	New England Power	End User
6. Rick Ishikawa	SOCAL	LDC
7. Kim Van Pelt	Trunkline	Pipe
8. Joyce Phillips	TETCO	Pipe
9. Betty Barnum	PEPL	Pipe
10. Tom Ehinger	Amoco	Producer
11. Bob Wallehorst	Exxon	Producer
12. Becky Cantrell	ECT	Services
13. Gary Payne	Enron Administrative Services	Services
14. Donna Scott	NNG	Pipe
15. Marian Hundt	BR	Producer
16. Mark Gracey	Tennessee	Pipe
17. Jay Story	PGT	Pipe
18. Paul Love	NGPL	Pipe
19. Julie Dennis	Mobile Bay	Pipe
20. Randy Young	Koch Gateway	Pipe
21. Tammy Jaquet	Transwestern	Pipe
22. Joe Cardos	National Fuel Supply	Pipe
23. Theresa Hess	Transwestern	Pipe
24. Lanyard Sledge	East Tennessee & MGT	Pipe

GENERAL

These notes are overly abbreviated as a function of not having an official scribe during the all day meeting. The end results of our discussions are all that is reflected here.

S.3 discussion:

By vote of dissent we accept (no dissents) newly crafted language;

NEW LANGUAGE:

TSP's that perform bumping do so by contractual terms and conditions and/or in accordance with their regulatory requirements. However, bumping that affects transactions multiple TSP's should occur at grid-wide synchronization times only. For such cases, TSP's should choose, through the TSP's tariff (or in the absence of tariff, a contract or operating statement), one or both of the two following intraday nomination cycles to perform bumping: <6pm nom cycle label> noms, <First Intraday nom cycle label> noms.

1.3.22 discussion:

Vote to accept additional language as follows:

Y=18

N=2

“With respect to the processing of requests for decreases during the intraday nomination/confirmation process, in the absence of agreement, the lesser of the confirmation quantities should be the new confirmed quantity, but in any event no less than the elapsed-prorated-scheduled quantity. If there is no response to a request for confirmation or an unsolicited confirmation response, the greater of the confirmation quantity or the elapsed-prorated-scheduled quantity should be the new confirmed quantity.”

Y=18

N=2

“With respect to the processing of requests for increases during the intraday nomination/confirmation process, in the absence of agreement, the lesser of the confirmation quantities should be the new confirmed quantity. If there is no response to a request for confirmation or an unsolicited confirmation response, the new confirmed quantity should be the previously scheduled quantity.”

Vote to accept CHANGES to CURRENT 1.3.22 language as follows:

Y=17

N=2

Replaces old paragraph:

“With respect to the timely nomination/confirmation process at a receipt or delivery point, in the absence of agreement, the lesser of the confirmation quantities should be the confirmed quantity. If there is no response to a request for confirmation or an unsolicited confirmation response, the lesser of the new nomination or the previously scheduled quantity should be the confirmed quantity.”

1.3.22.iii – definition of elapsed-prorated-scheduled:

Do not vote – let everyone mull this one over as proposed:

“Elapsed-prorated-scheduled quantity means that portion of the scheduled quantity that would have theoretically flowed up to the effective time of the intraday nomination being confirmed, assuming a linear proration of the cumulative scheduled quantities over a 24 hour period.”

NEXT MEETING:

We will have at least two more face to face Standards meetings before the November 10-11th Intraday meeting.

In the event Chuck Beaver is called for jury duty during that time, Paul Love has offered to chair the meetings, and Kim Van Pelt has offered to be back-up chair.

The next meeting should begin with discussion and a vote on the “elapsed-prorated-scheduled” definition (1.3.2.iv).