

**Dockets UE-990473 and UG-990294
Electric/Gas Rule-making teams**

**May 4 meeting
Agenda**

ITEMS FROM APRIL 27, MEETING:

1. Issues list.

NEW ITEMS:

1. Tool kit - Graciela (3 min.)
2. Where do we go from here - Jim + A & Q (15 min,)
3. "Issues" documents: (? min.)
Questions vs wish list - Tani, Pam
Example: LCP.

ITEMS CARRIED FORWARD:

1. Issues list.

TIMELINE:

- 3/31-5/5 - Staff develops issues list. Staff analyzes rules in accord with Exec Order 97-02, re-writing only for clarity and reorganization. .**
- 5/5 - Initial comments due.**
- 5/6-16 - Staff incorporates initial comments into issues list.**
- 5/17 - Issues list sent to parties.**
- 6/3 - Initial Workshop!**
- 6/4-16 - Staff incorporates workshop comments into draft.**
- 6/17 - Drafts sent to parties for comment.**
- 7/15 - Commissioner Conference.**
- 7/28 - CR 102 Open meeting.**
- 8/18 - CR 102 Filed.**
- 9/17 - CR 102 Comments Due.**
- 10/11 - Commissioner Conference.**
- 10/27 - Final Open Meeting for Adoption.**

RMS

Gas & Electric Rulemaking 480 - 90 & 100
May 4, 1999
Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Mert Lott, Dennis Moss, Kim West, Mark Anderson, Joanna Huang, Ken Hua, Graciela Etchart, Jim Russell, Tom Schooley, Hank McIntosh, Pam Smith, Tani Thurston, Vicki Elliott, Roland Martin, Mike Parvinen, Dave Dittimore, Penny Hansen, Doug Kilpatrick & Sher L. Hadfield

Discussion:

Graciela brought the meeting to order by handing out the table of contents to the Quality Steering Committee's "Team Support Tool Kit". If you're interested in reviewing any part of the Tool Kit, highlight the item on your table of contents and return to Graciela or request a copy from Graciela, Jim, or Dora Cundy.

Jim Russell reviewed the process. Please continue to input your issues into the Document Database. There needs to be an issues document for every rule; if the only issue is to re-write for clarity, then be sure to include that in the document database.

Outside parties comments should be in by May 5th. A workshop agenda will be developed from all the issues and comments. The workshop is scheduled for June 3rd, and both gas and electric will meet together in the morning, and there will be separate workshops for each section in the afternoon.

Following the workshops, the group will start re-drafting the rule language to reflect the comments and input received. There may be more workshops to address questions or issues raised by the drafted rule language.

Tani and Pam found many issues related to various WAC's. They suggest grouping these issues by topic and developing a Q&A format.

Jim passed out the LCP issues 191/251 sheet to give an example of what an issue should look like in the database. Use the WAC number as the title, and put the description of the WAC in the description box. Do not use commas in the title, rather use the backslash key. For the category, choose only accounting, consumer, general, metering or safety. Cross reference this with the staffing sheet if you need to know which category to use. You can reference other WAC's if related to the one you're working. Use the "set up review cycle" button. Simply input the names of staff you think may be interested in reviewing or commenting on the issues.

Dennis M. stated it is not necessary to include LAPD, Bob Cedarbaum, Jim Russell, or Graciela on the review routing as they already have to look in the database to review everything.

Q&A

1) Tani - Who will input stuff from the database into the workshop issues list?

Jim - We don't know the best process on that right now, we'll keep you posted at our next weekly meetings or through E-mail.

2) Roland - What happens when comments received are totally opposed to the draft language we've developed?

Vicki - Whatever the comment, whether we agree or not, it needs to be on the list for discussion at the workshop. At some point before the workshop, we'll have to review the appropriate level of participation by staff. i.e.: do we sit and listen, or do we voice opinions?

Penny - Once draft language is written, you can respond with statements as to why or why not these ideas were accepted by staff. If we can't reach an ultimate agreement with all parties, the Commission will have to make a final decision on how the rule will read.

Dennis M. - Remember the idea is to work toward a consensus with others on how to get a final result. Go into the workshop with the attitude that interveners are part of your team, not an adversary. Try interspersing yourself among the parties rather than bunching up in agency groups.

Jim R. - We need to mention our issues and interests at the workshop so parties will hear them beforehand and won't be seeing them for the first time in the draft.

Dennis M. - Be cautious during the early stages in the way staff's ideas are presented. Should not be the only solution to the issue, but rather as one of many possibilities.

Dave D. - We should ask clarifying questions to find out why a person is proposing certain solutions. This may yield good information about what problems they're trying to solve and whether this creates other problems.

3) Tom S. - If we refer to the National statute or rule, do we have to go back every time they change to update these references.

Mert - Bob Cedarbaum says no.

4) Mark A. - What about changes in technology such as use of electronic versus mechanical meters?

Jim R. - All of these issues need to be incorporated into the database so we can track them all and make sure they're covered.

5) Kim W. - Concern that all parties needing to know about rules review have not been notified.

Jim R. - Will look into this