Board Members (or Alternates) Present:  David James (AB), Alan Barber (BC), Janea Scott (CA), Chris Worley (CO), John Chatburn (ID), Jeff Blend (MT), Rebecca Wagner (NV), Dr. Laura Nelson (UT), Tony Usibelli (WA), and Governor Bill Ritter Jr. (US).

WIEB Staff Present:  Maury Galbraith, Thomas Carr, and Richard McAllister.

Others Attending:  Grace Anderson, California Energy Commission; David Clark, Utah Public Service Commission; Andy Ginsberg, Oregon Department of Energy; Larry Nordell, Montana Consumer Counsel; Brian Rounds, South Dakota Public Utility Commission; Bill Russell, Wyoming Public Service Commission; Marsha Smith, Idaho Public Utilities Commission; Jamie Stamatson, Montana Consumer Counsel; Keith White, California Energy Commission; Prasad Potturi; and Kate Maracas.

Board Actions:

1. Approved Motion to:
   a. Continue CREPC under its current structure;
   b. Continue SPSC under its current structure;
   c. Continue to hold joint CREPC/SPSC meetings;
   d. Explore options for reimbursing SPSC member travel to meetings and future housekeeping changes to the SPSC charter.

WIEB Staff Assignments:

1. Explore options for reimbursing SPSC member travel to meetings and future housekeeping changes to the SPSC charter.

Welcome and Introductions (August 28th 10:00 AM)
Board Chair John Chatburn (ID) provided the welcome and introductions.

CREPC Charter – Alternatives A & B
Maury Galbraith presented information to help inform the Board’s decision regarding CREPC and SPSC. CREPC has not had a written charter, fixed membership, or a formal voting rule. The stated objective of those seeking fixed membership and a formal voting rule is to make CREPC (and WIEB) more effective in shaping interstate electricity policy in the West by
clarifying the process by which CREPC (either on its own or jointly with WIEB) submits written comments to regional or federal entities (e.g., FERC, US DOE, CAISO, etc.).

**CREPC Charter – Alternative A** included the following features:

- **Formal Membership:**
  - States: One representative of the Governor and one representative of the state PUC;
  - Provinces: One representative of the Premier

- **Fixed Voting Rule:** Votes of at least 70% of Designated Members and at least 50% of the total electric system load.

**CREPC Charter – Alternative B** included the following features:

- **Formal Membership:**
  - States: One representative of the Governor, one representative of the state PUC, and one representative of consumer interests;
  - Provinces: One representative of the Premier

- **Fixed Voting Rule:** Unanimity and consensus vote.

Both alternatives included the same provisions to require CREPC to consult with WIEB prior to filing written comments.

**Discussion / Motion**

Dr. Laura Nelson (UT) observed that CREPC has served as an effective advisory group to the Board for years and there is no need to change CREPC’s structure; but if the structure is to be changed she supported the changes in Alternative B.

Grace Anderson supported Alternative A citing the experience of the SPSC structure and voting rules. The SPSC effectively provided input to transmission planning, represented both the governor’s office and the PUC office, and had a voting rule that avoided CREPC’s dysfunctional voting requirement that enabled a single dissent to veto CREPC from submitting comments.

Marsha Smith observed that it is important to ask what role we want CREPC to play in the future for the states and provinces.

David James (AB) noted that the joint SPSC/CREPC meetings had the benefits of bringing together CREPC participants with broad input and discussions, and SPSC as a formal decision
making body that could make decisions. David James was concerned that Alternative B would lead to too large of body and a unanimity decision rule would undermine the effectiveness to make decisions.

Prasad Potturi, as a former participant supported Alternative B to provide greater and more diverse input.

Larry Nordell stated that CREPC was created to exchange information and not to make decisions, and raised concern that Alternative A would lose the voice of consumer advocates.

Tony Usibelli (WA) felt it would be useful for CREPC to have a charter, he was leaning not to have a formal voting rule for CREPC, he liked the formal link to WIEB, and he did not want the CREPC charter to have a provision for closed meeting sessions.

Bill Russell supported Alternative B because he wanted consumer advocates engaged and preferred a consensus voting rule.

Jeff Blend (MT) expressed concern about the relative load requirement of Alternative A’s voting rule and raised the prospect that 2 or 3 states could amount to 50% of the load and block action. Maury Galbraith answered that it would take the 3 largest states to attain 50% of the load (CA 34.3%; WA 11.1%; and AZ with 9.6%).

Janea Scott (CA) liked a voting structure to give a voice to the West such as under Alternative A, noted the distinction between consensus and unanimity, and also wanted to preserve CREPC’s role for information sharing.

John Chatburn (ID), acknowledged his evolving thinking on the issue and proposed a third Alternative that would maintain both CREPC and SPSC in their current configurations, hold joint CREPC/SPSC meetings, and make minor SPSC charter adjustments accordingly.

Rebecca Wagner (NV) supported Chatburn’s proposal and noted the dual benefits of a hybrid CREPC and SPSC or effectively SPSC 2.0.

Andy Ginsburg assumed SPSC dissolution was based on the end of the ARRA funding, raised several observations, and asked if keeping the two organizations would add additional costs.

Maury Galbraith observed that maintaining SPSC in addition to CREPC would not add material operating costs or administrative burdens. Additionally, SPSC and CREPC exist under the status quo.

Jeff Blend (MT) offered a motion to: (1) maintain CREPC; (2) maintain SPSC; (3) direct staff to make SPSC charter adjustments for obsolete provisions, explore options to support state/provincial travel to meetings; and (4) continue to hold joint CREPC/SPSC meetings.

Laura Nelson (UT) seconded the motion.
Roll-Call Vote

The Board vote on the proposed motion was as follows:

- Alberta (David James) – Yes.
- British Columbia (Alan Barber) -- Yes
- California (Janea Scott) – Yes
- Colorado (Chris Worley) – Yes.
- Idaho (John Chatburn) – Yes.
- Montana (Jeff Blend) – Yes.
- Nevada (Rebecca Wagner) – Yes.
- Utah (Laura Nelson) – Yes.
- Washington (Tony Usibelli) – Yes.

The representatives of AB, BC, CA, CO, ID, MT, NV, UT, and WA supported the motion. The seven party states all cast votes in favor of the proposed motion. Therefore, pursuant to Article I, Section B of the WIEB Bylaws, the action of the Board is binding.

Adjourn

Board Chair John Chatburn adjourned the meeting at 11:05 AM.