

**MULTISTATE MEETING AGENDA**  
**December 13, 2001, 9 am -12 noon**  
**Video-conference rooms at Stoel Rives in Portland and Salt Lake City**  
11<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room at Utah One Building in Salt Lake City  
Contact: Nina Pitzel 503/813-5245.

**Purpose of Meeting**

On November 20, 2001, a technical conference on PacifiCorp's SRP initiative was held in Utah. One issue raised at this meeting was whether a multistate forum could address at least two of the problems identified by PacifiCorp in its filing: 1) interstate issues arising from implementation of Oregon's SB 1149 rules and, 2) cost allocation of new plant investment. George Galloway indicated PacifiCorp's interest if the following could be answered: Who would be involved, how would it work, what would be its objectives, what would be its timeframe, and what durable results could be achieved. At the request of the Utah Commission, a subsequent meeting was held on November 28, 2001 by interested parties to discuss the viability of such a multistate forum.

It was agreed at this subsequent meeting that Utah participants cannot answer the questions posed by Mr. Galloway unilaterally and must find out if there is interest in such a forum by other states. PacifiCorp offered to link such a meeting with the upcoming IRP meeting. Therefore, PacifiCorp, in conjunction with Utah parties, proposes a meeting with the following agenda, to be held earlier in the day of the interstate meeting on IRP scheduled for December 13, 2001.

**Proposed Agenda**

- I. Identify Threshold Issues
  1. Interest of other states in exploring the use of a multistate forum to address some problems identified in PacifiCorp's SRP proposal.
  2. Identify Objectives of Forum: What issues could be expected to be addressed or resolved?
    - a) Interstate issues arising from implementation of Oregon's SB 1149 rules
    - b) Cost allocation of new plant investment
    - c) Others
  3. Discuss the relationship of the Forum with other multistate processes (IRP, PITA).
  4. Objective of IRP going forward: Do states expect that IRP will be performed on an integrated system planning basis or on a non-integrated state planning basis?
  5. Ramifications of the fact that SRP is a docketed issue in states.
  6. Others.

*If there is interest, and as time permits, discuss the following or defer to future meetings.*

**II. Forum Process and Structural Issues**

1. How would it work? Discuss possible Forum structure to achieve durable results.
  - a) Information exchange
  - b) Formal technical conference with court reporter
  - c) Information sharing and Commission controlled gathering like ROC (telephone model)
  - d) Consensus building
  - e) What are the legal constraints on state commission processes?
  - f) Others
  
2. Participants: Who should attend? What people are necessary to assure durable results?
  - a) Commissioners
  - b) Commission staff
  - c) Company
  - d) Other regulatory staff
  - e) Large customer representatives
  - f) Small customer representatives
  - g) Environmental groups
  - h) Other
  
3. Who moderates/mediates?
  - a) State representative
  - b) Revolving
  - c) Professional mediator
  - d) Company
  - e) Other
  
4. Who provides technical assistance?
  - a) Company
  - b) State staffs
  - c) Revolving constituent groups
  - d) Neutral consultant hired by multistate group?
  - e) Other
  
5. What timeline could be established for achieving durable results?
  
6. Where would meetings be held?
  - a) Portland
  - b) Other States
  - c) Revolving
  
7. Who pays for meeting expenses?
  
8. Other issues?