The National Resolutions Committee Report and 2017 Compendium of Proposed Resolutions

The National Resolutions Committee met on June 23, 2017, at NRECA in Arlington, Virginia. NRECA members were able to watch the meeting live on Cooperative.com as the Committee discussed proposals submitted by the membership.

Submissions were considered in light of the existing policy resolutions adopted by voting delegates at the 75th NRECA Annual Meeting in San Diego. The Committee voted to forward three new resolutions, amendments to four existing resolutions, a revised preamble statement for the member resolutions booklet, and a recommendation against the adoption of two existing resolutions for consideration at the 2017 Regional Meetings. Explanations of the Committee's actions follow the language of each proposal in the Compendium.

NRECA and the Committee continually strive to make the resolutions process open and accessible to the membership. Members were invited to call in and present their submissions to the Committee. These conference calls allowed for a dialogue and a better understanding of members' ideas. Together, the Committee and members were able to collaborate on the final language presented in the Compendium. It has been a great improvement to our annual summer meeting.

Proposals Not Advanced to the Regional Meetings

The Committee includes these brief explanations on why the following proposals are not included in the 2017 Compendium of Proposed Resolutions. These proposals, as submitted by members, are available for review on the Resolutions Committee page of Cooperative.com. As a reminder, any NRECA voting member may re-introduce these concepts (or new proposals) at a Regional Meeting. The Committee encourages members to work with regional resolutions committees in Regions 1 and 4 to insert proposals early in the process and allow for input from all Regions. Regional committee rosters are available on the member resolutions process section of Cooperative.com.

Retirement Security Defined Benefit Plan discussion topic, submitted by Runestone Electric Association, Minnesota. Based on additional information and clarification provided by Peter Baxter, Plan Administrator of the Retirement Security Plan, to both the Committee and Kristin Dolan of Runestone Electric, including a review of the language in the existing resolution, "Employee Retirement Benefits" (pp. 14 & 74), and the activities that NRECA already has underway in support of legislation (H.B. 1962 and S.B. 852) that will help reduce electric cooperative costs associated with participating in, and exiting, the NRECA defined benefit plan, the requesting member expressed satisfaction that the concern raised was adequately addressed in the current resolution and the Committee chose not to forward a proposal.

"Wholesale Power Contracts" (pp. 9 & 54), discussion topic from the National Resolutions Committee's January meeting. Following a robust discussion on wholesale power contracts and PURPA, the Committee agreed this resolution is adequate as it is currently written and no amendments are necessary at this time. The Committee suggested the best way to address any PURPA issues should be handled through an amendment to the existing PURPA resolution or through a new resolution. No further action was taken.

Proposed amendment to the existing resolution, "Development of a Plan to Meet the Fuel Requirements of the New Natural Gas Fleet and Comply with Environmental Regulations" (pp. 7 & 46), submitted by Tri-State G&T Association, Colorado. The Committee discussed Tri-State G&T Association's proposed amendment to the policy background of the resolution and incorporated it into the policy background of the "Tax-Exempt Financing" (pp. 4 & 30) resolution since the language addresses tax credits. Additionally, the Committee amended the name of "Tax-Exempt Financing" to "Energy Tax Policy" since the scope of the resolution encompasses more than financing. The revised policy background and proposed new title will be available for voting delegates and members to review prior to the 2018 NRECA Annual Business Meeting in Nashville.

Update to "Telecommunications Services for Rural America" policy background statement (p. 88), submitted by the Nebraska Rural Electric Association (NREA). NREA recommended amending the policy background to address the lack of cell coverage in rural areas. NREA explained that the resolution itself includes a reference to cell service; however the policy background does not. After discussion, the Committee approved adding "*and cell*" to the first sentence of the second paragraph of the policy background after "broadband." The revised policy background will be available for voting delegates and members to review prior to the 2018 NRECA Annual Business Meeting in Nashville.

"National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative Legislative Issues" (pp. 26 & 100), discussion topic from the National Resolutions Committee's January meeting. Following the Committee's discussion of a proposed new broadband resolution, "Broadband for Rural America," and discussion regarding existing resolution "Telecommunications Services for Rural America," the Committee felt that they sufficiently covered the topics initially slated for discussion and therefore took no action on this item.

Proposed amendment to the existing resolution, "Ensuring Adequate Federal Funds to Combat Wildfires" (pp. 22 & 89), submitted by Anza Electric Cooperative, California. The Committee felt the proposed language included very specific language for those regions and states impacted by wildfires. The Committee asked NRECA staff to discuss the issues raised in this proposal with affected members in regions and states with significant federal lands to address member concerns.

"Rural Home Protection Act," submitted by Anza Electric Cooperative, California. After discussion on this proposed new resolution, the Committee felt this is a local issue rather than a national issue that would merit an NRECA member resolution.

In Conclusion

The Committee hopes that the membership finds this report informative. We encourage you to discuss the proposed resolutions with your boards and state associations. We also encourage you to add your cooperative's input to these proposals and the member resolutions process by participating at your upcoming Regional Meeting. If you have not yet certified a voting delegate for the Regional Meeting, there's still time. Please contact NRECA Membership & Association Support Services at (703) 907-5868 or VotingDelegates@nreca.coop if you have questions.

Dave Wheelihan
Chair

Jack Reasor
Vice Chair

National Resolutions Committee

Chair: Dave Wheelihan, Region 9
Vice Chair: Jack Reasor, Region 1

Dave Wheelihan, CEO Montana Electric Cooperatives' Association	**Region 9**	**Legislative Chair**
Barry Hart, Exec. Vice President and CEO Assoc. of Missouri Electric Cooperatives	**Region 8**	**Legislative Vice Chair**
Jack Reasor, President and CEO Old Dominion Electric Cooperative, Virginia	**Region 1**	**Regulatory Chair**
David Crabtree, Vice President and General Counsel Deseret G&T, Utah	**Region 9**	**Regulatory Vice Chair**
Mark Stubbs, General Manager and CEO Farmers Electric Cooperative, Texas	**Region 10**	**CMEC Chair**
Markus Bryant, General Manager Lorain-Medina REC, Ohio	**Region 4**	**CMEC Vice Chair**
Mike Smith, President and CEO Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Georgia	**Region 2**	**Regional Representative Regulatory Member**
Mike Partin, President and CEO Sequachee Valley Electric Co-op, Tennessee	**Region 3**	**Regional Representative Legislative Member**
Gary Martin, Director Menard Electric Cooperative, Illinois	**Region 5**	**Regional Representative CMEC Member**
Rick Lancaster, Vice President and Chief Generation Officer Great River Energy, Minnesota	**Region 6**	**Regional Representative Regulatory Member**
Don Kaufman, President and Director Sangre De Cristo Electric Assn., Colorado	**Region 7**	**Regional Representative Legislative Member**

The Committee's current term runs until the conclusion of the 2018 NRECA Annual Meeting. The committee is comprised of the chairs and vice chairs of each of the three NRECA Member Standing Committees – Legislative; Regulatory; Cooperative Management, Employment and Community (CMEC). To ensure each Region is represented, the NRECA President appoints additional individuals from the Standing Committees. To contact the committee, please email resolutions@nreca.coop.

2017 Compendium of Proposed Resolutions

Proposed New Resolutions – Forwarded with Recommendation for Adoption

(1) Broadband for Rural America

(2) Promoting the Benefits of End-Use Electrification

Proposed Amendments – Forwarded with Recommendation for Adoption

*Deletions are shown as **~~strikethroughs~~**, and new language is **underlined**. Page numbers refer to the 2017 Member Resolutions booklet.*

(3) Federal Clean Air Regulation (pp. 11 & 64)

(4) Greenhouse Gas Emissions (pp. 10 & 58)

(5) Development of a Plan to Meet the Fuel Requirements of the New Natural Gas Fleet and Comply with Environmental Regulations (pp. 7 & 46)

(6) Protection of Federal Hydropower Customers Through Proper Allocation of Dam Repair Costs *(split from existing resolution Protection of Dams and Allocation of Dam Repair Costs (pp. 5 & 38))*

(7) Protection of Federal Dams *(split from existing resolution Protection of Dams and Allocation of Dam Repair Costs (pp. 5 & 38))*

Proposed Courtesy Resolutions – Forwarded with Recommendation for Adoption

(8) Honoring Electric Cooperative Workers' Roles as First Responders

(9) NRECA and America's Electric Cooperatives

Existing Resolutions – Forwarded with Recommendation against Adoption

(10) Overhead Charges for Mutual Aid Assistance (pp. 19 & 83)

(11) Keystone XL Pipeline (pp. 27 & 104)

(12) Existing Preambles to the Member Resolutions *(Electric Cooperative Principles; Electric Cooperative Platform for Our Energy Future; and Electric Energy Consumer Bill of Rights (pp. 1-3))*

Please note, policy background statements accompany each resolution and are intended to provide additional information to educate voting delegates and the membership. Only the resolutions are voted upon.

(1) Proposed New Resolution – Forwarded with Recommendation for Adoption
Submitted by the Michigan Electric Cooperative Association, Michigan

Broadband for Rural America

We urge NRECA to take a prominent leadership and advocacy role in the U.S. Congress, with the Administration, and at the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to ensure cooperatives have the ability to provide broadband voluntarily, on their own or in partnership with other local providers, in rural America.

Leadership from NRECA is critical to present a unified voice for America's electric cooperatives by working together with other rural/industry advocates such as the Utilities Technology Council; the National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative and other groups who share electric co-op interests in rural America.

Policy Background

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 directs the FCC to ensure that communications services and rates in rural areas are reasonably comparable to services and rates in urban areas. The FCC has fallen short of this mandate for too many of our rural communities. Without broadband, our communities are falling further behind.

Specifically, NRECA's leadership is needed to advocate for federal funding via the FCC's universal service fund (including the Connect America Fund) and any other federal grant/lending sources such as the Rural Utilities Service (RUS) for electric cooperatives. Electric cooperatives have not historically provided communications services and Members of Congress and regulators need to understand how electric cooperatives are able to leverage their existing infrastructure to deploy broadband and, in so doing, transform their communities.

Electric cooperatives have been leaders in rural America for nearly a century – dating back to the 1930s when committed leaders in rural America formed rural electric cooperatives to bring electricity to areas that were being left behind by private utilities whose motive was profit—not service. In many rural areas, we face a similar critical divide today with respect to access to quality, reliable broadband.

Large, typically investor-owned, broadband providers are deploying high-speed broadband services in the more populated areas of the country but are bypassing too many of our communities for the same reason investor-owned utilities chose to ignore rural America in the 1930s—sparsely populated areas = nominal or negative profit. Yet, without broadband, our communities cannot survive.

Today, like the 1930s, electric cooperatives are answering the call of their communities by bringing light to rural areas that have been left in digital darkness. According to the National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative, there are currently more than 250+ electric cooperatives throughout the country either deploying or studying deployment of broadband in rural America.

Access to broadband brings world-class educational opportunities for our children, enhanced health care, and, most importantly, turns economic development initiatives into reality. In short, rural America and its residents receive broadband services on a level consistent with their urban and suburban counterparts as Congress envisioned when it created the universal service program.

National Resolutions Committee Action: The Committee recommends for the adoption of this resolution as presented. The Committee moved the proposed second paragraph to the policy background as supporting language and included the word “voluntarily” since cooperatives should be able to determine whether or not to provide broadband services.

Region Actions:

(2) Proposed New Resolution – Forwarded with Recommendation for Adoption
Submitted by Golden Spread Electric Cooperative

Promoting the Benefits of End-Use Electrification

We urge NRECA to engage the membership, industry stakeholders, policymakers and regulators on the economic and environmental benefits of electrification. We further urge NRECA to support analysis to quantify and communicate the benefits of increased electrification of the economy. Promoting electrification throughout the economy has the potential to provide a wide variety of economic and environmental benefits to local communities and the nation while increasing electricity sales for electric cooperatives.

Policy Background

With advances in electric end-use technology and transitions to lower-emitting technologies, there is an opportunity to substitute electricity for other energy sources in many sectors of our economy. For example, further electrification of the transportation sector will result in decreased carbon, nitrogen oxide and carbon dioxide levels. There is increasing recognition that policy goals focused on mandating the reduction of kWh sales can be counterproductive to national economic and environmental goals. NRECA should develop analysis and work to communicate the benefits of electrification to support electricity as a beneficial end-use option in end-uses such as agricultural pumping, space and water heating, transportation, industrial processes and other sectors that currently rely on direct combustion of fossil fuels.

National Resolutions Committee Action: The Committee recommends for the adoption of this resolution as presented. The Committee made a minor wording edit in the last sentence of the resolution for clarity.

Region Actions:

(3) Proposed Amendment to Existing Resolution – Forwarded with Recommendation for Adoption

Submitted by Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Texas; Minnkota Power Cooperative, North Dakota; Old Dominion Electric Cooperative, Virginia; and Tri-State G&T Association, Colorado

Federal Clean Air Regulation

We urge NRECA to take all appropriate actions to protect the interests of the cooperative member-owner to ensure that EPA's Clean Air Act (CAA) regulations are legal, cost-effective, sensible, and address conflicting emissions reduction requirements, and address scientifically demonstrable and significant environmental impacts.

We ~~**oppose use of the CAA to regulate greenhouse gas emissions**~~ **urge NRECA to work with the Administration to protect the interests of electric cooperatives in any effort to revise or repeal the Clean Power Plan**.

Additionally, we urge NRECA to examine programs incorporating financial incentives to reduce the costs of compliance with mitigating air emissions and to recommend changes or additions to ensure that these incentives would be equally beneficial to the cooperatives as compared to the other utility sectors.

Policy Background

NRECA should advocate regulatory programs that incorporate the following principles:

- *All regulations should meet their environmental goals in a most cost-effective manner, should incorporate provisions that minimize economic impacts on the electric consumer, allow utilities as much flexibility and local control as possible, recognize the need to provide economic and reliable electric power, and consider the regulatory effects on emerging competitive electricity markets.*
- *Specific programs to address pollutants commonly associated with coal-based electric generation such as sulfur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen oxides (NOx), fine particulate matter (PM2.5), and mercury should avoid overlapping and potentially conflicting requirements and should include provisions that provide adequate timelines and reasonable certainty regarding the installation of additional pollution controls and the imposition of other mandates.*
- *The New Source Review Program should make clear that physical and operational changes at existing generating facilities to maintain reliability or increase efficiency are excluded from new source review requirements.*
- ***Regulation of existing sources for CO2 and other GHGs should fall within the limited authority given in the enabling regulatory statute, and should not usurp the role of Congress in setting policy.***
- *The program to mitigate mercury air emissions (Utility Mercury and Air Toxics Standards Rule) should initially evaluate and consider the extent to which regulations that address non-toxic pollutants over the next decade will mitigate mercury emissions as well as public health and environmental concerns, and should then evaluate and consider the effects that additional specific mercury reduction requirements would have on improving the public health or environment before imposing such additional requirements. If the Clean Power Plan and other regulations on coal plants reduce mercury emissions, those reductions should be taken into account in conducting the cost benefit analysis for mercury reductions under UMATS.*

- *EPA should not be permitted to double count environmental and health benefits arising from different environmental regulations.*
- *Programs to address regional ozone non-attainment and regional haze visibility impairment should fully recognize state flexibilities inherent in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) process by allowing states the options to define and enact programs to achieve "reasonable progress" and "best available retrofit technologies" for regional haze. States that comply with the Cross State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) should be given full credit for regional haze compliance.*
- *Programs and policies of the Federal Land Managers (FLMs) to "protect air quality related values" (AQRVs) as required under the CAA should be revised to be consistent with CAA provisions, including the limited FLM authorities to regulate and the specified burdens of the regulated to demonstrate CAA compliance.*
- *Programs or plant projects required to reduce traditional criteria pollutants (NOx, SOx, PM) that increase plant heat rates and drive up CO2 emission rates and/or trigger New Source Review should be reconciled to accommodate the conflicting goals of each rule. Each EPA program should account for the impacts of one rule on another when issuing compliance guidance.*

National Resolutions Committee Action: The Committee recommends for the adoption of this proposed amendment as presented. The Committee considered three different versions of amendments and ultimately supports this version which urges NRECA to work with the new Administration to protect the interests of electric cooperatives "in any effort to revise or repeal the Clean Power Plan."

Region Actions:

(4) Proposed Amendment to Existing Resolution – Forwarded with Recommendation for Adoption

Submitted by Minnkota Power Cooperative, North Dakota; Old Dominion Electric Cooperative, Virginia; Seminole Electric Cooperative, Florida; and Tri-State G&T Association, Colorado

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

We urge NRECA to be informed and actively engaged to ensure that any government action (executive, legislative or regulatory) to address greenhouse gas emissions protects the interests of, and minimizes the economic impacts to, electric cooperatives and our member-owners, and allows cooperatives to continue to provide affordable, reliable, and safe electric power.

We also urge NRECA to support research and technology development for projects that can help to economically mitigate carbon dioxide emissions. Furthermore, we **support an open dialogue and** encourage other organizations' continued research efforts to determine the validity and extent of human-caused climate change, and also efforts to determine the cost effectiveness of **carbon mitigation proposals** ~~the EPA's Clean Power Plan~~ on future world climate conditions. We urge NRECA to continue educating member-owners of electric cooperatives, policy-makers and the general public of the cost and consequences of government action on greenhouse gas emissions.

Policy Background

Many national and international policymakers, industries and environmental groups focus on and continue to work to develop policies intended to mitigate human contributions of greenhouse gas to the atmosphere in order to address climate change concerns. Because approximately half of the nation's overall electric production, and more than two-thirds of the electric cooperatives' generation is from coal, the NRECA membership has a keen interest in proposals to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions.

Policies to address climate change can have substantial impacts on electric cooperative member-owners; therefore, it is in the interest of all cooperatives to be actively engaged in the debate over climate change. If fully implemented, EPA's CPP has the potential to significantly and adversely impact many rural electric cooperative systems through higher rates and the potential of reduced reliability of electrical service. NRECA supports the goal of reducing carbon emissions in the United States, but believes the goals and approaches taken should rely on accurate assumptions and analysis. There are a number of government and non-government organizations addressing research and development efforts, and the effectiveness of different approaches to reduce carbon emissions world-wide. We urge NRECA staff to monitor these efforts as appropriate, to educate through forums, to encourage fair debate on the merits of different approaches to potential adverse effects of electric generation, to protect the interests of, and to minimize the economic impacts of government action on electric cooperatives.

During the debates of cap-and-trade legislation in Congress, NRECA's members adopted detailed resolutions urging NRECA to ensure that such plans included certain elements that would reduce the economic impact on member-owners when compared with other alternatives. The text of the resolutions' guidelines is immediately below for historical purposes.

In any climate change policy debate, electric cooperatives support policy that includes the following principles:

- *Any plan should cover emissions from all sectors of the economy, not simply electricity generation, and should include provisions to ensure that other nations, including both*

developed and developing, are enacting policies to address this issue within their own borders. Such provisions should ensure a level playing field with respect to carbon costs or taxes for international trade and not result in disadvantages for U.S. manufacturers or businesses.

- *Any plan should recognize the need to construct new generation to preserve electric reliability, replace aging generation plants and to meet increasing demand. Cooperatives are committed to take steps to implement cost-effective energy efficiency and to look at reasonable alternatives. Even so, new generation will be needed to meet load growth reliably.*
- *Any climate change proposal should maintain fuel diversity, allowing a variety of fuel sources to meet the energy and economic needs of the country. Provisions to encourage new nuclear generation should eliminate barriers to cooperatives participating in new projects with non-cooperative partners and should grant cooperatives a right to participate in new nuclear projects.*
- *Any plan should recognize that regional differences in generation fuel mix, demographics, natural resources, climate, and geology will cause one-size-fits-all mandates to have disproportionate cost impacts across the country.*
- *Any proposal should include provisions, such as an economic safety-valve, to protect the U.S. economy from significant impacts. Additionally, Congress should work to protect both urban and rural consumers from any significant economic impacts from climate change legislation.*
- *Any plan should recognize that in the short term, terrestrial sequestration, conservation, and energy efficiency appear to be among the most cost-effective methods of mitigating greenhouse gas emissions at this time. Additionally, it should be recognized that sequestration can provide benefits to rural areas and agricultural- and forestry-based economies. Any plan should incentivize long-term improvements in cost-effective energy efficiency and conservation by end-use consumers.*
- *Any plan should recognize that in the long term, new technologies including the capture and sequestration of carbon dioxide from power plants will be critical to addressing this issue, but cost-effective, commercially available technologies are still in development and are years or decades away from large-scale commercial applications. Every effort must be made, and appropriate funding provided, to accelerate the research, development, demonstration, and commercialization of these technologies.*
- *Any plan should encourage cost-effective reductions and should provide incentives available to all segments of the utility industry including cooperatives to develop and deploy advanced electric generation, transmission, and distribution technologies.*
- *Any plan should recognize that climate change policy and energy policy are inextricably linked, and that these policies can have a significant impact on our nation's economic and energy security.*
- *Any plan should remove regulatory and other impediments to increasing the efficiency of existing generating units.*
- *Any climate change or energy legislation with climate change provisions should include a nuclear title with a cooperative nuclear incentive comparable to IOU and municipal incentives. Further, any plan should recognize nuclear (existing, new, and incremental) as a critical non-CO2-emitting source of generation.*
- *Any plan should establish a responsible legal, regulatory, and liability framework to allow for geologic sequestration of CO2, including provisions that allow for siting of pipelines to transport CO2 to injection locations.*

- *Any plan should establish a single, integrated program establishing the sole legal and regulatory requirements for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and should pre-empt existing federal laws (including the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act) and state laws that could be used to require emission reductions absent such pre-emption.*
- ***Any plan should consider the marginal cost of replacing fossil-fuel generation with renewable generation and very high-cost backup generation as the percentage of renewables in the generation mix increases. The plan should support the mix of resources that is the lowest cost option, while still protecting the reliability and resiliency of the grid, and while still providing competitive and low-cost electricity that will allow us to compete in a global market where the cost of electricity is one of the crucial factors that will allow us to remain competitive.***
- *Any revenues derived from climate change legislation should be dedicated to fund research, development and deployment of low-carbon, carbon-neutral or carbon-free technologies, energy efficiency, and/or to assist electric consumers in paying for increased costs resulting from the legislation.*

CCS and CCU Technologies. Developing cost-effective technologies to capture and sequester carbon dioxide from power plants has been identified as a critical research and development need to address concerns about climate change. Electric cooperatives are actively engaged with efforts to make carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) and carbon capture and utilization (CCU) technology a viable choice. In order to solve the technological challenges that prevent CCS and CCU from becoming a reality, we must ensure that cooperatives can effectively mitigate their financial risks along a lengthy and complex transaction chain and a stable regulatory environment. Needed measures include:

- *A federal structure for liability.*
- *Federal support for Enhanced Oil Recovery.*
- *The Rural Utilities Service (RUS) to be allowed to finance CCS and CCU projects, including support for associated base load energy projects.*
- *Continuation of the federal Clean Coal Power Initiative (CCPI).*
- *States to increase monetary support for CCS and CCU projects.*
- *Elimination of federal or state limitations on CCS and CCU projects that require international cooperation.*
- *Enhancements to the tax credits at Section 45Q of the Internal Revenue Code, including:*
  - *Enabling their effective use by not-for-profit cooperatives or not-for-profit research and development organizations.*
  - *Allowing developers to take the credit in the form of a grant.*
  - *Making credits available to projects without geographic limitations.*
- *Research and development funding for CCS in a manner that will bring this needed technology to commercial availability as rapidly as is practical without imposing unnecessary burdens on consumers.*

Various legislative proposals to constrain CO2 emissions have included consideration of CCS and CCU issues. Any such legislation should:

- *Include bonus and early action credit for CCS and CCU developers.*
- *Ensure that any reverse auction provide some certainty as to project support prior to project approval.*

Carbon Allowance Allocation. As preference customers of the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), electric cooperatives in the Northwest have long relied upon ways of

meeting electrical demand without generating CO2 emissions, specifically through renewable hydroelectric power, conservation and nuclear energy. However, electric cooperatives in the Northwest are not immune to changes in federal carbon policy, and they are susceptible to federal salmon recovery initiatives that reduce the amount of preference power available from BPA which dramatically increases electric rates paid by Northwest cooperative members.

In addition to the loss of preference power from salmon recovery initiatives, the new BPA post-2011 power contracts have introduced marginal pricing for load growth which may limit BPA's involvement in meeting the load growth of many of its preference customers. As a result, many electric cooperatives will need to invest in new resources to meet their load growth. In order to meet base-load requirements of load growth, and replace hydropower lost because of salmon recovery initiatives, it is probable that many of the new resources will be fossil-fired. In the near future, Northwest cooperatives may be adding carbon based resources, rather than eliminating them.

If allowance allocation issues are considered, Northwest electric cooperatives are not advocating for a disproportionate share of allowances. No utility should be provided a disproportionate share of allowances. Northwest cooperatives support a fair, equitable allowance allocation proposal that protects our ability to meet future load growth and addresses replacement of lost renewable hydropower, while mitigating the impact on electric cooperatives that have a heavier reliance on coal. However, it would be unfair for the Northwest to be disadvantaged on carbon allocations, and then forced to build carbon based facilities because of shifting federal policies on hydropower generation.

<u>Support for Domestic and International Offsets</u>. An "offset" component of cap-and-trade climate change legislation allows utilities to satisfy a portion of their compliance obligation with government-certified, emissions-reducing, or sequestration-increasing activities in areas not covered by the cap. Offset activities can occur domestically or internationally. Much of this sequestration would occur in areas served by electric cooperatives and provide a revenue stream to rural landowners.

Offsets are a lower cost means of achieving real greenhouse gas emission reductions. Land management techniques can be much less costly than acquiring new, lower-emission generation sources. Eliminating or severely curtailing the use of offsets could result in significant increases in the price of emission allowances. An effective, sustainable offset program should adhere to the following principles:

- *An offset program must be voluntary and should include emission-reducing agriculture and forestry activities. It should give agriculture and forestry producers the flexibility needed to accommodate the wide range of ecological and economic circumstances found throughout the country.*
- *Offsets should be unlimited. The number of voluntary participants and the verification process itself will limit the size of the domestic offset program. If the goal of climate change legislation is to reduce CO2 in the atmosphere, there is no reason to limit the use of carbon offsets that can be measured, monitored, and verified.*
- *Offsets should be real, additional, verified, registered, and of an acceptable duration. A measurement protocol must be developed that allows for a practical, workable system that will result in real emission reductions and a robust offset market. USDA should perform verification services, rather than EPA or other agencies.*
- *Qualifying international offset credits should be awarded based on methods, protocols, and standards as stringent as the methods, protocols, and standards applied to domestic offsets.*

- *One offset credit should be equivalent to one allowance, thereby fully protecting a buyer from any project-specific offset risk.*

National Resolutions Committee Action: The Committee recommends for the adoption of this proposed amendment as presented. The Committee considered four different versions of amendments and ultimately supports this version which removes references to the Clean Power Plan (given EPA's intent to repeal or revise the regulation). Language was also added to "support an open dialogue" regarding climate change.

Region Actions:

(5) Proposed Amendment to Existing Resolution – Forwarded with Recommendation for Adoption

Submitted by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Florida; Minnkota Power Cooperative, North Dakota

Development of a Plan to Meet the Fuel Requirements of the New Natural Gas Fleet and Comply with Environmental Regulations

We urge NRECA to work with the EPA, FERC, DOE, the natural gas industry, and other industry stakeholders to develop a plan that adequately considers the time required to implement the infrastructure necessary to meet the fuel requirements of the new fleet of natural gas generation, ~~**as well as**~~ **while continuing to** meet **environmental regulations** ~~**the desired level of carbon dioxide emission reduction in the Clean Power Plan or other regulations**~~.

Policy Background

Between 2015 and 2019, retirements of coal-fired generation will outpace the installation of new natural gas-fired generation capacity. Some of these retirements of older, less efficient coal plants were expected. However, the early retirement of coal units resulting from Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations ***or market forces*** *may create reliability risk if operationally flexible natural gas infrastructure cannot be constructed prior to the early plant retirements or conversions to natural gas.*

~~***Clean Power Plan (CPP), the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS) rule, and other regulations***~~ ***Several EPA regulations*** *will accelerate a comprehensive shift in the U.S. electric generation resource mix. The power industry's reliance on natural gas for generation will increase significantly due to the low cost of natural gas, coal plant retirements, and the intermittent nature of wind and solar generation which requires gas for back-up.* ~~***However, under the EPA's proposed carbon dioxide reduction deadlines, there is not sufficient time to adequately plan, design, and build new generation, transmission, and natural gas infrastructure required to maintain reliability.***~~

Lead times to construct new facilities are longer than ever, and continue to face siting and construction challenges. According to the Energy Information Administration (EIA), an interstate natural gas construction project will take approximately three years from the time it is first announced until the new pipeline is placed in service and large, complex projects can take even longer to complete. The timeline to identify a generation need, receive regulatory approval, and place the new generation in service can take between six and eight years (Figure 1). In addition, NERC has estimated that it can take up to 15 years to build a new 500 kV electric transmission line.

~~***In order to accomplish the goal of reduced carbon dioxide emissions of the CPP while maintaining national grid reliability,***~~ *NRECA should work with industry stakeholders, legislators, and regulators to develop a plan that realistically considers the time required to install the necessary new natural gas-fired generation and associated pipeline infrastructure.*

Figure 1 Courtesy of ACES®

	Milestones in the Construction of a New Natural Gas Fired Generator	Approximate Timing
Site Development Timeline	Internal Analysis to Determine Capacity Needs	Months 1 – 6
	Site Analysis: Permitting, Fuel Capabilities, Grid Interaction, Environmental Issues	Months 6 – 12
	Send RFP to Determine market Costs to Provide vs. Self-Build Alternative	Months 6 – 12
	RTO Study	Months 6 – 24
	Selection of Generator Manufacturer	Months 6 – 24
	Certificate of Public Need and Convenience Process	Months 12 – 30
	State and Local Permitting Process	Months 12 – 30
Pipeline Construction Timeline	Develop Pipeline Design and Services	Months 12 – 27
	Conduct Pipeline Open Season	Month 26
	Execute Binding Pipeline Service Agreements	Month 26
	Initiate FERC Pre-Filing	Month 27
	File FERC Application	Month 33
	Purchase Pipe/Compression	Month 35
	Receive FERC Certificate	Month 35
	Commence Construction	Month 36
	Targeted In Service Date	Months 72 – 96
	Total Project Time	**6 to 8 Years**

National Resolutions Committee Action: The Committee recommends for the adoption of this proposed amendment as presented. The Committee considered four different versions of amendments and ultimately supports this version which removes references to the Clean Power Plan and broadens the resolution by clarifying that new electric cooperative generation will continue to meet environmental regulations in general.

Region Actions:

(6) Proposed Amendment to Existing Resolution – Forwarded with Recommendation for Adoption

Submitted by the National Resolutions Committee

~~Protection of Dams and~~ Protection of Federal Hydropower Customers Through Proper Allocation of Dam Repair Costs

We urge NRECA to urge Congress and the Administration to direct the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to follow the directives of the Dam Safety Act of 1986 in allocating **the** costs associated with dam safety repairs **among multiple project purposes**. ~~**We also urge NRECA to oppose dam breaching proposals.**~~

Policy Background

*In the Dam Safety Act of 1986 (Title XII of P.L. 99-662), Congress provided direction to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on how to allocate costs associated with structural repairs caused by dam safety concerns. The language reads, in part, that when "costs incurred in the modification … of dams and related facilities … the cause of which results from new hydrologic or seismic data or changes in state-of-the-art design or construction criteria deemed necessary for safety purposes … 15 percent of the modification costs shall be assigned to project purposes in accordance with the cost allocation in effect for the project at the time work is initiated…" Congress recognized that cost-sharing **among sponsors that benefit from dam operations – such as water supply utilities, irrigators, hydropower facilities, etc. –** is required of many project purposes, and major expenses associated with safety repairs could have a crippling economic effect on those charged with recovering such costs.*

*Unfortunately, experience has shown that the Corps has not been following the directives of the Dam Safety Act of 1986. For example, **recently** the Corps determined that Wolf Creek Dam on the Cumberland River in Kentucky was in danger of failure because it was built on bedrock of water soluble limestone, which over time had deteriorated, threatening downstream communities. **While** ~~**It**~~he law is clear that only 15 percent of the costs associated with the very expensive repairs should **have been** ~~**be**~~ allocated to **hydropower** project purposes under the provisions of the Dam Safety Act of 1986~~**. However**~~, ~~the~~ the Corps allocated 100 percent of the costs to project purposes, which would have ~~**required**~~ **resulted in** a major increase in the rates charged for hydropower from the project to repay these costs.*

*Although **Southeastern Power Administration (**SEPA**)** was allowed to **reduce the allocation to PMA customers to 15 percent and to** implement a five-year rate using its determination of the proper application of the Dam Safety Act, there continues to be uncertainty over future application of the Act. In response to a December 2015 GAO report, the Corps agreed to clarify its applicable engineering regulation, but did not agree to change its position.*

In light of the Corps' disregard of statutory directives, Congress and the Administration should direct the Corps to follow the directives of the Act in allocating costs associated with dam safety repairs.

~~***Further, the removal of federal multipurpose dams or other navigational and impoundment facilities is a shortsighted and irresponsible proposal that would create potentially disastrous economic impacts, new environmental issues and imperil the reliability of the nation's entire hydropower system.***~~

~~***In addition to depriving the nation of clean, renewable hydropower generated by multipurpose dams, the breaching of multipurpose dams would wreak havoc on commerce***~~

~~*dependent on barges and other waterway navigation, threaten the potable water supplies of hundreds of towns and cities, unravel decades of wildlife mitigation efforts, and with regard to farmland irrigation, render large sections of the country dependent upon these impoundments barren and unproductive. In addition, at a time when the nation's electric utility industry is undergoing massive changes and concerns about reliability are paramount, breachings not only endanger the reliability of the power supply but could add millions of dollars to a region's power bills. The breadth and scope of the impacts are staggering.*~~

~~*Removing clean, renewable hydroelectric power from the nation's inventory of electric power resources, especially at a time when the demand for high-quality electricity is rising precipitously, would require the replacement of that electricity with less environmentally friendly combustion generation.*~~

National Resolutions Committee Action: The Committee recommends for the adoption of this proposed amendment which extracts language concerning the allocation of dam repair costs from existing resolution "Protection of Dams and Allocation of Dam Repair Costs." The Committee proposes adding additional language at the end of the resolution to broaden the scope; however, they do not wish to change the purpose or intent of the resolution. The Committee feels this issue is separate and distinct from the protection of dams issue and warrants an individual resolution.

Region Actions:

(7) Proposed Amendment to Existing Resolution – Forwarded with Recommendation for Adoption

Submitted by the National Resolutions Committee

Protection of Federal Dams ~~and Allocation of Dam Repair Costs~~

We urge NRECA ~~**to urge Congress and the Administration to direct the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to follow the directives of the Dam Safety Act of 1986 in allocating costs associated with dam safety repairs. We also urge NRECA**~~ to oppose dam breaching proposals.

Policy Background

~~***In the Dam Safety Act of 1986 (Title XII of P.L. 99-662), Congress provided direction to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on how to allocate costs associated with structural repairs caused by dam safety concerns. The language reads, in part, that when "costs incurred in the modification … of dams and related facilities … the cause of which results from new hydrologic or seismic data or changes in state-of-the-art design or construction criteria deemed necessary for safety purposes … 15 percent of the modification costs shall be assigned to project purposes in accordance with the cost allocation in effect for the project at the time work is initiated…" Congress recognized that cost-sharing is required of many project purposes, and major expenses associated with safety repairs could have a crippling economic effect on those charged with recovering such costs.***~~

~~***Unfortunately, experience has shown that the Corps has not been following the directives of the Dam Safety Act of 1986. For example, the Corps determined that Wolf Creek Dam on the Cumberland River in Kentucky was in danger of failure because it was built on bedrock of water soluble limestone, which over time had deteriorated, threatening downstream communities. The law is clear that only 15 percent of the costs associated with the very expensive repairs should be allocated to project purposes under the provisions of the Dam Safety Act of 1986. However, the Corps allocated 100 percent of the costs to project purposes, which would have required a major increase in the rates charged for hydropower from the project to repay these costs. Although SEPA was allowed to implement a five-year rate using its determination of the proper application of the Dam Safety Act, there continues to be uncertainty over future application of the Act. In response to a December 2015 GAO report, the Corps agreed to clarify its applicable engineering regulation, but did not agree to change its position.***~~

~~***In light of the Corps' disregard of statutory directives, Congress and the Administration should direct the Corps to follow the directives of the Act in allocating costs associated with dam safety repairs.***~~

~~***Further, t***~~*The removal of federal multipurpose dams or other navigational and impoundment facilities is a shortsighted and irresponsible proposal that would create potentially disastrous economic impacts, new environmental issues and imperil the reliability of the nation's entire hydropower system.*

In addition to depriving the nation of clean, renewable hydropower generated by multipurpose dams, the breaching of multipurpose dams would wreak havoc on commerce dependent on barges and other waterway navigation, threaten the potable water supplies of hundreds of towns and cities, unravel decades of wildlife mitigation efforts, and with regard to farmland irrigation, render large sections of the country dependent upon these impoundments

barren and unproductive. In addition, at a time when the nation's electric utility industry is undergoing massive changes and concerns about reliability are paramount, breachings not only endanger the reliability of the power supply but could add millions of dollars to a region's power bills. The breadth and scope of the impacts are staggering.

Removing clean, renewable hydroelectric power from the nation's inventory of electric power resources, especially at a time when the demand for high-quality electricity is rising precipitously, would require the replacement of that electricity with less environmentally friendly combustion generation. ***We urge NRECA to oppose proposals to breach dams where such proposals would have severe economic and community development impacts as described herein.***

National Resolutions Committee Action: The Committee recommends for the adoption of this proposed amendment which extracts language addressing the protection of dams from existing resolution "Protection of Dams and Allocation of Dam Repair Costs." The Committee does not wish to change the purpose or intent of the resolution, rather they feel this issue is separate and distinct from the allocation of dam repair costs issue and warrants an individual resolution.

Region Actions:

(8) Proposed New Courtesy Resolution – Forwarded with Recommendation for Adoption
Submitted by Victoria Electric Cooperative, Texas

Honoring Electric Cooperative Workers' Roles as First Responders

We honor the service provided by rural electric cooperative workers as they provide critical support to police, fire, sheriffs and other organizations in responding to emergencies.

Policy Background

NRECA and its members recognize and honor all electric utility workers who put their lives in harm's way daily to serve and protect the communities throughout the United States of America.

Electric utility workers risk their own safety and personal property in the execution of their duties to provide essential electricity to the public on a daily basis. Electric utility workers are always 'on call' and stand ready to come to the aid of the citizens of the United States of America 24 hours every day. The immediate response of electric utility workers is a necessity in protecting the health and safety of the public during almost every public emergency situation. Electric utility workers are a vital part of every community serving as volunteers in schools, churches, non-profits, and community organizations. Electric utility workers consistently join both career and volunteer first responders to aid the public in the event of an emergency.

National Resolutions Committee Action: The Committee recommends for the adoption of this resolution as submitted.

Region Actions:

(9) Proposed New Preamble for Member Resolutions – Forwarded with Recommendation for Adoption

Submitted by the National Resolutions Committee

NRECA and America's Electric Cooperatives

The NRECA Member Resolutions are a foundational document which informs the activity and advocacy of the national organization for America's Electric Cooperatives. The issues NRECA's members face are complex and can affect individual electric cooperatives differently. However, electric cooperatives are united in their mission to provide safe, reliable and affordable electric power to member-owners. They work together to maintain adequate energy capacity, meet member-owners needs for access to electricity, provide leadership in communities, and protect the environment. NRECA supports all of its members in their efforts to meet those objectives and works to establish commonsense priorities through enactment of balanced policies. NRECA's members speak with one voice through the Member Resolutions.

A crucial element of the electric cooperative model depends on an engaged relationship with energy consumers. By working cooperatively to meet member needs, America's Electric Cooperatives support consumers who join together to create and operate member-owned, not-for-profit utilities. We promote the concept of a consumer-centric utility. Furthermore, NRECA enables collaboration to occur among its membership in the interest of serving these communities of energy consumers. This activity may take the form of additional utility products or consumer services, community economic development, technology innovation, strong governance and strategic execution, or mutual support for other shared goals. The power of NRECA and America's Electric Cooperatives resides in the participatory, cooperative model and the engaged members who devote their time, effort and talent to these endeavors.

The Seven Cooperative Principles

- *Voluntary and Open Membership* – Cooperatives are voluntary organizations, open to all persons able to use their services and willing to accept the responsibilities of membership;

- *Democratic Member Control* – Cooperatives are democratic organizations controlled by their members, who actively participate in setting policies and making decisions;

- *Member Economic Participation* – Members contribute equitably to, and democratically control, the capital of their cooperative;

- *Autonomy and Independence* – Cooperatives are autonomous, self-help organizations controlled by their members;

- *Education, Training and Information* – Cooperatives provide education and training for members, elected representatives, managers, and employees so they can contribute effectively to the development of their cooperatives;

- *Cooperation Among Cooperatives* – Cooperatives serve members most effectively and strengthen the cooperative movement by working together; and

- *Concern for Community* – While focusing on member needs, cooperatives work for the sustainable development of their communities.

National Resolutions Committee Action: The Committee recommends for the adoption of this preamble statement to the Member Resolutions booklet. Language from the existing preamble statements, which were adopted several years ago, has been consolidated. This revision will replace those three existing statements, "Electric Cooperative Principles," "Electric Cooperative Platform for Our Energy Future," and "Electric Energy Consumer Bill of Rights" (pp. 1-3), listed at Proposed Resolution 12 below.

Region Actions:

(10) Existing Resolution – Forwarded with Recommendation against Adoption
Submitted by the National Resolutions Committee

Overhead Charges for Mutual Aid Assistance

We urge NRECA to create a working group to recommend guidelines for determining the components of overhead charges when sending crews to assist other cooperatives.

Policy Background

The components included in calculating overhead charges for personnel that assist other cooperatives during disasters and other situations vary from cooperative to cooperative. During Hurricane Sandy some co-ops charged more than 100 percent for overhead while others charged significantly less. FEMA has provided guidance on the components it considers eligible for inclusion in overhead charges. Overhead charges usually include retirement, insurance, social security, holiday, vacation, and other costs.

We urge NRECA to create a forum to help its members understand FEMA's formula for calculating overhead costs. NRECA and its members are committed to complying fully with all applicable federal and state antitrust laws, and forum activities, communications, and any resulting recommendations, must comply with those laws.

National Resolutions Committee Action: The Committee recommends against the adoption of this existing resolution. (Note: The Committee recommends that you vote "no" on this resolution. A "no" vote will delete the resolution.) This issue is generally addressed by cooperatives within a state or region and by utilizing FEMA guidance. The policy background language related to FEMA will be added to the policy background of existing resolution "Disaster Assistance" (pp. 23 & 93). The revised "Disaster Assistance" policy background will be available for voting delegates and members to review prior to the 2018 NRECA Annual Business Meeting in Nashville.

Region Actions:

(11) Existing Resolution – Forwarded with Recommendation against Adoption
Submitted by the National Resolutions Committee

Keystone XL Pipeline

We urge NRECA to support development of the Keystone XL Pipeline, seeking continued congressional action as well as urging the U.S. Secretary of State and the President to approve this project.

Policy Background

The Keystone XL Pipeline, if constructed, would transport tar sands oil from Alberta, Canada, almost two thousand miles to the Texas Gulf Coast. NRECA members adopted this resolution supporting Keystone at the NRECA Annual Meeting in 2014. On February 24, 2015, President Obama vetoed legislation that would have authorized its construction; several weeks later, the Senate failed to override his veto. On November 6, 2015, the Administration officially rejected the proposal. In January 2016, TransCanada Corp., the company that would build Keystone, filed a lawsuit challenging its rejection, claiming that the president's veto was outside his constitutional authority and violated the North American Free Trade Agreement.

NRECA supports efforts to diversify the nation's energy supply. The Keystone XL Pipeline, if it is ever built, would provide the United States another energy resource and have a positive economic benefit to the nation by providing both temporary and permanent jobs and adding to the tax base.

If the pipeline is built, electric cooperatives throughout the Midwest would provide electricity to 22 of the 30 pumping stations that would be located along its proposed route in the United States. Importantly for electric cooperative member-owners, since the additional loads are high-quality, steady loads, the pipeline if built would also stabilize power rates and benefit all ratepayers, including tribal members, who are served by the rural electric cooperatives that would provide power for pipeline operations.

Other benefits include:

- *Bolstering and strengthening of ties between the United States and Canada; and*
- *Providing a proven means of safely transporting oil products to domestic refineries with minimal impacts on the environment.*

National Resolutions Committee Action: The Committee recommends against the adoption of this existing resolution. (Note: The Committee recommends that you vote "no" on this resolution. A "no" vote will delete the resolution.) The Trump Administration, earlier this year, approved the completion of the Keystone XL pipeline project. At this time, no further executive or federal action is needed related to this specific issue.

Region Actions:

(12) Existing Member Resolutions Preambles – Forwarded with Recommendation against Adoption

Submitted by the National Resolutions Committee

Electric Cooperative Principles

The issues confronting electric cooperatives and the electric utility industry continue to be complex, as demonstrated by the scope of issues addressed in the NRECA Resolutions. The resolutions each year reflect the challenges that electric cooperatives face as they strive to provide reliable and affordable electricity. Although the issues continue to shift, we affirm our dedication to address these issues, guided at all times by the Cooperative Principles:

- *Voluntary and Open Membership* – Cooperatives are voluntary organizations, open to all persons able to use their services and willing to accept the responsibilities of membership.

- *Democratic Member Control* – Cooperatives are democratic organizations controlled by their members, who actively participate in setting policies and making decisions.

- *Member Economic Participation* – Members contribute equitably to, and democratically control, the capital of their cooperative.

- *Autonomy and Independence* – Cooperatives are autonomous, self-help organizations controlled by their members.

- *Education, Training and Information* – Cooperatives provide education and training for members, elected representatives, managers, and employees so they can contribute effectively to the development of their cooperatives.

- *Cooperation Among Cooperatives* – Cooperatives serve members most effectively and strengthen the cooperative movement by working together.

- *Concern for Community* – While focusing on member needs, cooperatives work for the sustainable development of their communities.

Adopted at the 69th NRECA Annual Meeting 2011

Electric Cooperative Platform for Our Energy Future

Our nation faces severe challenges today. These include the need to maintain adequate energy capacity, provide consumers affordable access to electricity, provide leadership in community and economic development, and protect the environment. Electric cooperatives have worked and will continue to work for enactment of balanced policies that support these goals. To ensure our energy future:

- We believe all consumers should have access to affordable, reliable and safe electric power and that as electric cooperatives, we have a responsibility to advance consumer interests.

- We are consumer advocates and are fully committed to helping consumers save money and resources through greater efficiency and conservation measures. We also believe government programs must enable and encourage these advances.

- We are fully committed to working with government to achieve balanced solutions to our nation's energy and environmental policy goals that advance the interests of consumers.

- We are industry leaders in the development of renewable energy and are using the cooperative model to fully develop additional cost-effective sources of clean energy.

- We believe that fossil fuels and nuclear energy are an essential part of a reliable electric supply and that the development of new technologies will help use these fuels more cleanly.

- We believe that all levels of government must support the siting, construction and funding of adequate generation, transmission and distribution infrastructure to meet our 21st century needs for electricity.

- We believe the full portfolio of fuels and technologies must be available to produce the additional electric power our members and the country will need in the future.

- We believe a strong public private partnership for research and development is essential to guide and fund new technologies that improve the use of electricity and help meet public policy goals.

- We recognize the importance of community and economic development in the survival of rural places, towns, and cities that are the cornerstones of successful electric cooperatives.

- The Rural Utilities Service must continue providing the capital needed to assure adequate and affordable electricity for electric cooperative member-owners.

Adopted at the 67th NRECA Annual Meeting 2009
Amended 2011

Electric Energy Consumer Bill of Rights

We, the consumer-owned not-for-profit members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, endorse these rights for all consumers. We believe this Electric Energy Consumer Bill of Rights represents the standard against which state and federal legislative and regulatory policy should be measured:

1. The right to have access to reliable, affordable and safe electric power.

2. The right to join together to establish and operate a consumer-owned not-for-profit electric utility.

3. The right of consumer-owned not-for-profit systems to be treated fairly and recognized as a unique form of business.

4. The right to elect representatives to manage their consumer-owned form of business to best meet their needs.

5. The individual right to privacy that assures consumer information will be safeguarded against disclosure consistent with established, lawful data privacy principles.

6. The right to determine the scope of energy services to be furnished through their consumer-owned not-for-profit utilities.

7. The right to use consumer-owned not-for-profit utilities to provide additional services that meet the needs of their consumers and communities.

8. The right to work in cooperation with other consumer-owned entities with common goals.

Adopted at the 57th NRECA Annual Meeting 1999
Amended 2011

National Resolutions Committee Action: The Committee recommends against the adoption of the three existing preamble statements to the Member Resolutions booklet. (Note: The Committee recommends that you vote "no" on these existing preamble statements. A "no" vote will delete the statements.) As noted in the explanation accompanying Proposed Courtesy Resolution 9, the existing statements have been consolidated and revised into a single, standalone statement, while retaining the spirit of the three existing statements.

Region Actions: