

**I-937 Washington Conservation Working Group**  
**Facilitator's Strawman Process Proposal**  
**2/17/11**

**I. Goal**

The goal of the I-937 Washington Conservation Working Group (“Conservation Working Group”) is to reach consensus on matters relating to I-937 conservation requirements. Specifically, the parties hope to achieve clarity, certainty and, to the degree appropriate, consistency with respect to the requirements. Many parties have also expressed an interest in outcomes that would streamline the regulatory/compliance process and reduce the “process” workload.

**II. Scope**

*[To be filled in after 2.17.11 Working Group Meeting] Recommendation – Need to develop a realistic scope in order to increase likelihood of success.*

**III. Process**

**Parties.** The process is open to all interested parties. To date, the following parties are actively involved: Avista, ICNU, NEEA, NEEC, NW Energy Coalition, NWPCC, Pacific Power, Public Counsel, PSE, The Energy Project, and WUTC Staff.

**Working Group.** A Working Group will be principally responsible for identifying, discussing and determining the process’s scope, the issues that will be addressed, consensus, and targeted work products/outcomes.

**Subgroups.** As deemed appropriate, the Working Group will create and charge subgroups with assignments. These subgroups may meet during the time set aside for regularly scheduled Working Group meetings. Membership in subgroups will be dependent upon the nature of the charge and the capacity of parties to take on and complete assignments. At the direction of the Working Group, subgroup members may develop draft products and make recommendations to the Working Group. A subgroup will not make decisions on behalf of the Working Group.

**Commitment of Resources.** Working Group members have committed to participating actively in the Working Group. Many have also expressed support for participating in subgroup activities to the extent resources allow. If questions about sufficiency of resources arise, they will be discussed and addressed by the subset of Working Group representatives who attended the February 2, 2011 “Steering Committee” meeting.

#### **IV. Issues**

*[To be filled in after 2.17.11 Working Group Meeting] Recommendation – issues should be clearly identified and commonly understood; group should consider limiting number of issues up front to increase chances of success (if progress is made quickly could add additional issues later in process)*

#### **V. Work Products/Process Outcomes**

*[To be filled in after 2.17.11 Working Group Meeting] Recommendation - desired work product/outcomes should be identified up front, and may vary based upon the underlying issues.*

#### **VI. Decision-Making Model**

The parties will strive for consensus. Consensus is when all of the parties can live with the decision being made. Parties may be asked to “live with” something that is not their preferred ideal but recognize that it is a fair decision considering the many participating interests (consensus does not mean that everyone gets everything they want or that the decision is necessarily “unanimous”).

The facilitator, in consultation with the parties, will document areas of consensus as they are reached. The parties will be given an opportunity to ratify the language or, if it does not conform with the consensus, to modify it as appropriate.

#### **VII. Meetings**

Each party commits to making its best effort to having representation at all Working Group meetings. Meeting agendas for the next meeting will be established at the end of a Working Group meeting and will clearly identify what decisions, if any, will be made at a meeting.

The Working Group will proceed with its work, including calling for consensus, even if some parties cannot attend a Working Group session. If a party must miss a meeting, its representative is responsible for informing the facilitator, and: 1) asking a fellow Working Group member to communicate its interests and positions or 2) asking the facilitator to communicate those interests. The parties may also submit written comments that will be distributed to the other parties. Whoever communicated the interests and positions of the absent party or the facilitator will contact such party to discuss what took place at the meeting.

If a Party feels that a specific decision should not be made in its absence, it can request that the decision be rescheduled. The facilitator, in consultation with the Working Group, will determine whether the timing of the decision should be rescheduled.

## **VI. Schedule**

The Working Group schedule is:

Thursday - 2/17

Wednesday - 3/16

Thursday - 4/21

Wednesday - 5/18

Thursday - 6/2

Wednesday - 6/29

All meetings will take place at the WUTC, Room 206, from 9:30 to 5:00. The process will end on June 30, 2011.