

Reliability Standards Tracking

Detailed Ballot Voting Results

02/03/2009 8:38 am

SAR-001-TRE-02 Provision for the ERCOT ISO to Participate and Have a Vote in the Processes

Ballot Period: **1**

Voting Period: **01/19/2009 thru 02/02/2009**

Certified Date: **02/03/2009**

Certified Outcome: **PASSED**

Consumer - Commercial	Yes	No	Abstain	Total Eligible Votes
	3	0	0	3
Yes Voters CHRIS LBREWSTER Nikolaus KFehrenbach Phillip LBoyd		City of Eastland City of Dallas City of Lewisville		
Consumer - Industrial	Yes	No	Abstain	Total Eligible Votes
	3	0	0	3
Yes Voters Anthony Gabba Joe DMatranga Raborn LReader		Dow Chemical Company Occidental Chemical Corp. EPCO Holdings		
Consumer - Residential	Yes	No	Abstain	Total Eligible Votes
	1	0	0	1
Yes Voters Danny EBivens		Office of Public Utility Counsel		
Cooperative	Yes	No	Abstain	Total Eligible Votes
	3	2	0	5
Yes Voters Jim Clawson Richard AMcLeon Robert MKelly		Lower Colorado River Authority South Texas Electric Co-op Brazos Co-op		
No Voters Brian DBartos Don Roberts		Bandera Co-op San Bernard Co-op		
Non-Voters Kahanek, William B Reece Jr., Eddy P		Bluebonnet Electric Cooperative Rayburn Country Co-op		
Independent Generator	Yes	No	Abstain	Total Eligible Votes
	7	0	0	7
Yes Voters Amanda Stevenson Billy SShaw Carlos HBenavides Cesar Seymour Darrell Scruggs Pamela CZdenek Robert Bailey		E.ON Climate & Renewables NA Inc. International Power America Services Topaz Power Group Suez Energy Marketing NA Calpine BP Alternative Energy NRG Texas		
Non-Voters lin, david t		Formosa Plastics Corp.		

Reliability Standards Tracking Detailed Ballot Voting Results

02/03/2009 8:38 am

SAR-001-TRE-02 Provision for the ERCOT ISO to Participate and Have a Vote in the Processes

Ballot Period: **1**

Voting Period: **01/19/2009 thru 02/02/2009**

Certified Date: **02/03/2009**

Certified Outcome: **PASSED**

Independent Power Marketer	Yes	No	Abstain	Total Eligible Votes
	4	1	0	5
Yes Voters				
Carolina MPrice			Tenaska Power Services	
Rick AKeetch			Reliant Energy	
Robin Boehnemann			Exelon Generation	
Stephen CKnapp			Constellation Energy Commodities Group	
No Voters				
Jeff Brown			Shell Energy North America (US), L.P.	
Independent Retail Electric Provider	Yes	No	Abstain	Total Eligible Votes
	2	0	1	3
Yes Voters				
David Chase			New Mexico Natural Gas dba Texas Power	
Joel BFirestone			Direct Energy	
Abstentions				
David LCook			Cirro Group	
Investor-Owned Utility	Yes	No	Abstain	Total Eligible Votes
	5	0	0	5
Yes Voters				
Dwight LYarbrough			Sharyland Utilities	
John Brockhan			CenterPoint	
Rex PMcDaniel			Texas-New Mexico Power Company	
Thad KNess			American Electric Power Service Corp.	
Timothy MQuinn			Oncor Electric Delivery Company	
Municipally Owned Utility	Yes	No	Abstain	Total Eligible Votes
	2	3	0	5
Yes Voters				
Frank JOwens			Texas Municipal Power Agency	
Jimmy LSikes			City of Georgetown	
No Voters				
David LGrubbs			Garland Power & Light	
Edwin LBarrow			CPS Energy	
Mark Dreyfus			Austin Energy	
Non-Voters				
morris, william j			Denton Municipal Electric	

Reliability Standards Tracking

Detailed Ballot Voting Results

02/03/2009 8:38 am

SAR-001-TRE-02 Provision for the ERCOT ISO to Participate and Have a Vote in the Processes

Ballot Period: **1**

Voting Period: **01/19/2009 thru 02/02/2009**

Certified Date: **02/03/2009**

Certified Outcome: **PASSED**

Voter Comments

Name: **Dwight LYarbrough**

Organization: **Sharyland Utilities**

Voted **YES**

Comment

1/4 Vote

Response

A majority of the SAR-001 Standard Drafting Team (SDT) believes that giving the ERCOT ISO a one-fourth segment vote allows it a voice in the regional reliability standards processes with as much of a segment vote as any single other ERCOT member company, considering there are, on average, about four member companies per segment that usually vote.

A minority of the SAR-001 SDT believes that creating an ISO segment with a fractional vote is inconsistent with all existing NERC processes, and is inconsistent with the voting weights other ISOs receive in their respective regions.

Name: **Rick AKeetch**

Organization: **Reliant Energy**

Voted **YES**

Comment

This SAR will allow the ERCOT ISO to have a "seat at the table" and actively participate in RSC processes.

Response

A majority of the SAR-001 Standard Drafting Team (SDT) believes that giving the ERCOT ISO a one-fourth segment vote allows it a voice in the regional reliability standards processes with as much of a segment vote as any single other ERCOT member company, considering there are, on average, about four member companies per segment that usually vote.

A minority of the SAR-001 SDT believes that creating an ISO segment with a fractional vote is inconsistent with all existing NERC processes, and is inconsistent with the voting weights other ISOs receive in their respective regions.

Name: **Brian DBartos**

Organization: **Bandera Co-op**

Voted **NO**

Comment

Bandera Electric Cooperative believes ERCOT ISO should participate as a standing member in the Regional Standards Committee (RSC) and have a full vote. The RSC has a different function from market governance and therefore a different approach should be taken.

Response

A majority of the SAR-001 Standard Drafting Team (SDT) believes that giving the ERCOT ISO a one-fourth segment vote allows it a voice in the regional reliability standards processes with as much of a segment vote as any single other ERCOT member company, considering there are, on average, about four member companies per segment that usually vote.

Reliability Standards Tracking

Detailed Ballot Voting Results

02/03/2009 8:38 am

SAR-001-TRE-02 Provision for the ERCOT ISO to Participate and Have a Vote in the Processes

Ballot Period: **1**

Voting Period: **01/19/2009 thru 02/02/2009**

Certified Date: **02/03/2009**

Certified Outcome: **PASSED**

A minority of the SAR-001 SDT believes that creating an ISO segment with a fractional vote is inconsistent with all existing NERC processes, and is inconsistent with the voting weights other ISOs receive in their respective regions.

Name: **David LGrubbs**

Organization: **Garland Power & Light**

Voted **NO**

Comment

I have cast my vote in the negative. I do not believe ERCOT should have a vote in the Regional Stands process. I believe that ERCOT's opinion or vote should reflect the combined views of its members. The best indicator of that combined view is the vote cast by the membership. I acknowledge that many of the Standards will impact the ERCOT organization significantly and some standards may directly apply only to ERCOT (although the cost impact and operational issues will be felt by the membership). Therefore, ERCOT staff should be encouraged to participate in the development of Regional Standards and submit comments that would be considered by the standard drafting committees and the membership. I believe, however, the vote of the membership should stand independently regardless of the ERCOT staff opinion or vote.

Response

A majority of the SAR-001 Standard Drafting Team (SDT) believes that giving the ERCOT ISO a one-fourth segment vote allows it a voice in the regional reliability standards processes with as much of a segment vote as any single other ERCOT member company, considering there are, on average, about four member companies per segment that usually vote.

A minority of the SAR-001 SDT believes that creating an ISO segment with a fractional vote is inconsistent with all existing NERC processes, and is inconsistent with the voting weights other ISOs receive in their respective regions.

Name: **Don Roberts**

Organization: **San Bernard Co-op**

Voted **NO**

Comment

The proposed 1/4 ERCOT ISO voting weight is inadequate. SBEC feels the ERCOT ISO should be set at 1 complete vote.

Response

A majority of the SAR-001 Standard Drafting Team (SDT) believes that giving the ERCOT ISO a one-fourth segment vote allows it a voice in the regional reliability standards processes with as much of a segment vote as any single other ERCOT member company, considering there are, on average, about four member companies per segment that usually vote.

A minority of the SAR-001 SDT believes that creating an ISO segment with a fractional vote is inconsistent with all existing NERC processes, and is inconsistent with the voting weights other ISOs receive in their respective regions.

Name: **Edwin LBarrow**

Organization: **CPS Energy**

Voted **NO**

Comment

Response

Reliability Standards Tracking

Detailed Ballot Voting Results

02/03/2009 8:38 am

SAR-001-TRE-02 Provision for the ERCOT ISO to Participate and Have a Vote in the Processes

Ballot Period: **1**

Voting Period: **01/19/2009 thru 02/02/2009**

Certified Date: **02/03/2009**

Certified Outcome: **PASSED**

CPS Energy agrees that ERCOT needs a seat at the table. We agree that following a structure similar to NERC's and placing the ISO in its own segment makes sense. However, it defies all logic to create a new segment and give it less voting strength than the other segments, which in all cases get one vote. Thus, we cannot support the SAR as written.

A majority of the SAR-001 Standard Drafting Team (SDT) believes that giving the ERCOT ISO a one-fourth segment vote allows it a voice in the regional reliability standards processes with as much of a segment vote as any single other ERCOT member company, considering there are, on average, about four member companies per segment that usually vote.

A minority of the SAR-001 SDT believes that creating an ISO segment with a fractional vote is inconsistent with all existing NERC processes, and is inconsistent with the voting weights other ISOs receive in their respective regions.

Name: **Jeff Brown**

Organization: **Shell Energy North America (US), L.P.**

Voted **NO**

Comment

We believe that ERCOT needs to remain fair and independent in all of their activities and therefore it is not in the best interest of the market or the standards setting process to allow ERCOT to have vote.

Response

A majority of the SAR-001 Standard Drafting Team (SDT) believes that giving the ERCOT ISO a one-fourth segment vote allows it a voice in the regional reliability standards processes with as much of a segment vote as any single other ERCOT member company, considering there are, on average, about four member companies per segment that usually vote.

A minority of the SAR-001 SDT believes that creating an ISO segment with a fractional vote is inconsistent with all existing NERC processes, and is inconsistent with the voting weights other ISOs receive in their respective regions.

Name: **Mark Dreyfus**

Organization: **Austin Energy**

Voted **NO**

Comment

I do not understand the logic of creating a separate market segment for ERCOT, but limiting the weight of its vote to one-quarter the weight of other segments. ERCOT must be an equal partner with the market participants in compliance processes and decision-making. I would instead support giving ERCOT a full vote.

Response

A majority of the SAR-001 Standard Drafting Team (SDT) believes that giving the ERCOT ISO a one-fourth segment vote allows it a voice in the regional reliability standards processes with as much of a segment vote as any single other ERCOT member company, considering there are, on average, about four member companies per segment that usually vote.

A minority of the SAR-001 SDT believes that creating an ISO segment with a fractional vote is inconsistent with all existing NERC processes, and is inconsistent with the voting weights other ISOs receive in their respective regions.