

Montana Public Service Commission

41



Greg Jergeson, Chairman
Brad Molnar, Vice-Chairman
Doug Mood
Bob Raney
Thomas J. Schneider

1701 Prospect Avenue
PO Box 202601
Helena, MT 59620-2601
Telephone: (406) 444-6199
FAX#: (406) 444-7618
<http://www.psc.mt.gov>

PSC
Survey Response
To: Casey Barnes (majority)
FAX: 444 3036
RE: SJR 39 survey

Casey - Here is the PSC response
to the survey.
Approved by PSC 4-1.
Brad Molnar may submit
his own responses.

Kate Whitney

Energy & Telecommunications Committee Meeting
November 22, 2005

Exhibit #9

Survey: An Energy Planning and Coordinating Entity for Montana?

November 31, 2005

You have been sent this brief survey because of the interest you have shown in matters facing the Montana Legislature's Energy and Telecommunications Interim Committee (ETIC).

The Legislature tasked ETIC to pursue two detailed studies this interim. One of them, Senate Joint Resolution 39, requested the study of the possible creation of an ongoing energy planning and coordinating entity in Montana.

SJR 39 asserted the following points: The cost and development of energy resources is critical to all Montanans; there is a large and uncoordinated complex of local, state, federal, non-profit and for-profit bodies all working on energy issues; there is no single Montana-based entity specifically dedicated to broad planning, analysis, and evaluation of energy issues; without such an entity it is almost impossible to have a vision for developing the energy resources and meeting future energy needs of Montana.

As you know, energy issues are dominating the headlines. The proposition that there be a singular entity created to address these many challenges could have great import for our state, economy, and citizens. Your thoughts about the following questions would be appreciated.

Casey A. Barrs
Legislative Researcher
Legislative Services Division

* * *

Survey Questions

You may respond directly on this document and then either e-mail, fax, or mail it back as indicated at the end.

(1) SJR 36 states that "the lack of a singular Montana-based entity specifically dedicated to broad planning, analysis, and evaluation of energy issues" makes it "impossible for us to have a vision for developing the energy resources and meeting future energy needs of Montana." What do you think of this statement?

- a. Strongly Disagree
- b. Disagree
- c. No Opinion
- d. Agree
- e. Strongly Agree

(2) There would be substantial benefits in creating an energy planning and coordinating entity for Montana. (If agree, please state them)

- a. Strongly Disagree
- b. Disagree
- c. No Opinion
- d. Agree
- e. Strongly Agree

(3) *There would be substantial challenges in creating an energy planning and coordinating entity for Montana. (If agree, please state them)*

- a. Strongly Disagree
- b. Disagree
- c. No Opinion
- d. Agree
- e. Strongly Agree (turf/jurisdictional/separation of powers disputes, such as state vs. federal, local vs. state, private industry vs. governmental entities, executive branch vs. legislative, etc.)

(4) *Indicate the degree to which you feel such an entity should engage in the following:*

Plan Policy?

- a. Should play no role
- b.
- c. Opinion in between / No opinion
- d.
- e. Should play key role

Coordinate stakeholders?

- a. Should play no role
- b.
- c. Opinion in between / No opinion
- d.
- e. Should play key role

Foster generation & infrastructure?

- a. Should play no role
- b.
- c. Opinion in between / No opinion
- d.
- e. Should play key role

Information clearinghouse?

- a. Should play no role
- b.
- c. Opinion in between / No opinion
- d.
- e. Should play key role

Other?

- a. Should play no role
- b.
- c. Opinion in between / No opinion
- d.
- e. Should play key role

(5) If this entity is to have a mandate to plan energy policy, then our state legislative and executive bodies should consider its recommended plans to be:

- a. Merely one source of advice for them to consider
- b.
- c.
- d.
- e. Their paramount source of advice to consider

(6) If this entity is to have a mandate to coordinate energy stakeholders, then those stakeholders should consider it to be:

- a. Merely a clearinghouse of information and optional guidance
- b.
- c.
- d.
- e. A critical way station to pass through in the pursuit of policies and promotion of their interests

(7) I would be much assured about such an entity if it were structured to ensure equal voice for stakeholders from federal, tribal, state and local government, as well as electric utilities, natural gas and electricity suppliers, non-profits, and parties involved in potential energy generation and transmission.

- a. Strongly Disagree
- b. Disagree
- c. No Opinion
- d. Agree (only if citizens & ratepayers and parties involved in conservation and energy efficiency are added to the stakeholder list)



c. Strongly Agree

(8) SJR suggests an "ongoing" entity. Would you recommend an entity that is:

- a. Permanent
- b. Temporary
- c. Temporary & Renewable
- d. No entity at all

(9) Do you feel other states have successful energy planning and coordinating entities that might be useful models for Montana? (This question is being pursued in separate research, but you are welcome to comment if you have knowledge of practices in other states.)

(10) Are there any other thoughts you would like to offer us?

No.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

Name: Montana Public Service Commission
 Telephone: 406 444 3556
 Email: kwhitney@mt.gov
 Employer: _____

Please return by **November 15** to:

Carcy A. Barrs
 (406) 444-3957
 Legislative Researcher
 Legislative Services Division

PSC Survey Response (Minority)

Phone: _____

Brad Molnar, PSC
E-mail: _____

(1) SJR 36 states that "the lack of a singular Montana-based entity specific dedicated to broad planning, analysis, and evaluation of energy issues" make it "impossible for us to have a vision for developing the energy resources and meeting future energy needs of Montana." What do you think of this statement

Strongly Disagree Disagree No Opinion Agree Strongly Agree

(2) There would be substantial benefits in creating an energy planning and coordinating entity for Montana. (If agree, please state them)

Strongly Disagree Disagree No Opinion Agree Strongly Agree
benefits:

Depends on mission & how
set up.

(3) There would be substantial challenges in creating an energy planning and coordinating entity for Montana. (If agree, please state them)

Strongly Disagree Disagree No Opinion Agree Strongly Agree
challenges:

(4) Indicate the degree to which you feel such an entity should engage in the following: (1 = 'Should Play No Role', 5 = 'Should play a key role')

Plan policy - 1 2 3 4 5

Coordinate stakeholders - 1 2 3 4 5

Foster generation & infrastructure - 1 2 3 4 5

Information clearinghouse - 1 2 3 4 5

Other: _____ - 1 2 3 4 5

(5) If this entity is to have a mandate to plan energy policy, then our state legislative and executive bodies should consider its recommended plans to:

Merely one

Their

source of
advice for
them to
consider.

1 2 3 4 5

paramount
source of
advice.

(6) If this entity is to have a mandate to coordinate energy stakeholders, then those stakeholders should consider it to be:

Merely a
clearinghouse
of information
and optional
guidance for
them.

1 2 3 4 5

A critical
way station to
pass through
in the pursuit
of policies
and
promotion of
their
interests.

(7) I would be much assured about such an entity if it were structured to ensure equal voice for stakeholders from federal, tribal, state and local government, as well as electric utilities, natural gas and electricity suppliers, non-profits, and parties involved in potential energy generation and transmission.

non equal state holders should not have equal

Strongly Disagree Disagree No Opinion Agree Strongly Agree

(8) SJR suggests an "ongoing" entity. Would you recommend an entity that *is*

(9) Do you feel other states have successful energy planning and coordination entities that might be useful models for Montana? (This question is being pursued in separate research, but you are welcome to comment if you have knowledge of practices in other states.)

comments: No Dak Energy Council.
(North Dakota)

(10) Are there any other thoughts you would like to offer us?

comments: Have a nice day 😊

Thank you for your participation in this survey. The results of the survey will be used to identify areas of concern for the study.

Submit