

Railbelt Reliability Council Implementation Committee - Meeting

August 16, 2021

Final Minutes (Approved by IC 8/23/21)

1) Roll-call

The meeting was held via Zoom, was called to order at 1:15 pm, and was chaired by JE/SS.

Primary		Alternate		Organization
Brian Hickey (BH)	Y	Jeff Warner (JWR)	Y	Chugach Electric Association
John Burns (JB)	Y	Frank Perkins (FP)	Y	Golden Valley Electric Association
Rick Baldwin (RB)	Y	Dave Thomas (DT)	Y	Homer Electric Association
Julie Estey (JE)	Y	Ed Jenkin (EJ)	Y	Matanuska Electric Association
Lou Florence (LF)	Y	Shayne Coiley (SC)	n	Doyon Utilities
Dave Burlingame (DB)	Y	Rob Montgomery (RM)	n	City of Seward
Kirk Warren (KW)	n	David Lockard (DL)	Y	Alaska Energy Authority
Suzanne Settle (SS)	Y	Sam Dennis (SD)	Y	Cook Inlet Regional Inc.
Joel Groves (JG)	Y	Mike Craft (MC)	Y	Alaska Environmental Power, LLC
Veri di Suvero (VDS)	Y	Alyssa Sappenfield (ASF)	Y	Alaska Public Interest Research Group
Chris Rose (CR)	Y	Greg Stiegel (GS)	n	Renewable Energy Alaska Project (REAP)
Hank Koegel (HK)	Y	David Newman (DN)	Y	Unaffiliated seat
<i>Jeff Waller (JWL)</i>	Y	<i>James "Jay" Layne (JL)</i>	Y	<i>Regulatory Affairs and Public Advocacy</i>
<i>Bob Pickett (BP)</i>	n	<i>Antony Scott (AS)</i>	n	<i>Regulatory Commission of Alaska</i>

Y: Attending n: Not attending v: seat is vacant

Rebecca Sexton-Kelly (RSK) and Bayunt Ollek (BO) with Sapere present.

Steve Mahoney (SM) present; Tom Lovas (TL) present; Rena Miller (RMR) present.

Rachel Wilson (RW), Divita Bhandari (DBH) with Synapse present

Dana Zentz (DZ) with Fishbay Resources joined at 3:40 PM.

12 of 12 voting members are initially present, one ex-officio member is initially present.

2) Approval of IC Agenda

MOTION to approve today's agenda, 1BH, 2SS.

MOTION to AMEND to move MEA matter to after IRP presentation. 1SS, 2BH

AMENDED with no objections.

PASSED with no objections. [12-0-0].

3) Consent Agenda

Chair asked for requests to remove items from consent agenda, none raised.

MOTION to approve consent agenda, 1JG, 2HK.

PASSED with no objections. [12-0-0].

4) Workplan Update

JE started update. Sapere and Rena have been leading this. RSK continued, critical path is getting budget items to BudCom and their completion. First draft of all deliverables is completed around 9/27. All deliverables in for integration by 10/12. Then in review/integration mode for the next month or so for submittal end of October.

JE added part of the issue is the surcharge and how the transition phase funding will work. Filings needed to support/approve an RRC-led transition funding process are still open questions.

If the RCA issued the ERO order today, the Application would be due 11/14. So this schedule works.

RSK highlighted that all the IC meeting agenda between now and then are jam packed. So don't let things slip in committees because things will get stacked up and problems will result.

LF, SD, RB, DB, and FP thanked team for the very helpful workplan update and presentation. Still feel there is high likelihood of further slip, interested in contingencies. Doubt work pace can accelerate given current level of effort or that increased effort is warranted as RCA is giving us more time.

RSK flagged the new Sharepoint folder for TA'd deliverables to live so that Rena / AppCom can easily find and grab them.

RMR added that some documents have a supplemental review requirement and don't necessarily go into the application directly with final approval only at the final document. Need to delineate which deliverables have a separate final approval need / step.

JE clarified AppCom will take that up and provide guidance on detailed approval processes.

5) IRP Process Presentation

DB introduced IRP process presentation. 7-9 people on IRPcom, diverse representation. Twice-weekly meetings, several hours each. Robust participation from different stakeholder interests. Lucky to have RW working on this. Goal for today is to get through the presentation, field questions at the end.

RW introduced Synapse team and relevant experience, and presented the draft report.

SS asked what 'host' means in Section 6, regarding LSE determinations of whether they will 'host' new projects identified in the preferred portfolio. DB clarified 'host' means sponsor, so LSE will take lead in making project happen, in a manner that achieves least cost, greatest value etc.

BH flagged intro describes Railbelt without portion north of Anchorage, should be revised. Suggest expanding definition of reserves.

DN, CR, HK and EJ thanked RW and DBH for their great work. Synapse was a pleasure to work with.

DL asked if the costs and technical aspects of integrating non-dispatchable resources included under the idea of interconnection planning? DB and RW responded yes, can address those at multiple points in the process.

EJ can we discuss IRP timelines? DB replied current thought is first one will be 2-3 years, thereafter 1-2 years. Lag in first is because there is a lot of stuff to coordinate on. Subsequent updates should be far easier.

EJ evaluation of lost load good way to evaluate reliability projects. IRP does look like a 2-year process once we get good at it. So 2 year lag from load to plan, then more time to fulfill needs.

SS asked at 3.2, IRPcom provided key planning parameters. Would Synapse include any others? RW replied no, Synapse thought it was a good and comprehensive list. DB clarified, Synapse did make some modifications. RW concurred.

RMR advised that the master definition list should be pulled into this document and revised accordingly. Need to stay ahead of definition diversity.

SS asked for preferred format / process for comments edits etc. DB requested they be sent to him, he will distribute to IRPcom to get them addressed.

JE asked for desired timeframe for comments. DB deferred to the Workplan schedule. Next up for IRPcom is IRP process, schedule, budget. DB asked what level of detail is needed for IRP narratives? JE clarified, very open, recommended DB coordinate directly with RMR on that. DB clarified view is the regs require the process, not a higher-level discussion. RMR agreed, process. Then budget and schedule are other deliverables.

RSK advised schedule does have approval of this next week, so comments by Wednesday 8/18 for IRPcom meeting on Thursday can address all comments and queue final for Monday 8/23.

DB advised that RW is a cost simulation genius, something to keep in mind for the future.

JE suggested we pick her brain on how to manage things pre-IRP while she is still under contract.

RW committee was a pleasure to work with, been both fun and productive!

6) MEA Letter to Attorney General's Office

JE transferred chair to SS for this agenda item.

SS introduced matter, CR requested time on today's agenda to address letter that went out on 7/29, was copied to most of the LSEs, circulated to IC 10 days later. Opened floor to comments.

CR expressed two concerns. 1. The letter MEA wrote was not what JE represented it would be. JE said would be a simple request to go through regs very carefully, but actual letter was basically a rehash of comments / advocacy, claiming there were deficiencies and advocating that the AG remand the regs back to the RCA for a redo. This would be a profound delay and change to outcome. 2. Concerned that the letter took so long to be openly circulated. Same issue as prior LSE actions. Why did it take 10 days to circulate this to the IC when most LSEs were copied immediately? Disheartening to see this behavior when the IC is so far along and working so hard to get the job done. MEA just trying to get a 2nd, 3rd bite at the apple to try and change an outcome they don't like.

HK commented all the utilities and everyone has the right to contact anyone and advocate for whatever. His issue is not the content of the letter, but the gross misrepresentation to the IC of what the letter would say. Feel that was improper representation, he is deeply concerned about the operation of this committee.

SS concur with HK. Misrepresentations that we would be copied on it, but that we weren't, and no one shared the letter even though multiple parties on the committee saw the letter.

BH advised, the first time he personally saw the letter is when JE distributed it to the IC.

JE thanked all for a candid conversation. Would have preferred more proactive engagement of these issues. No one reached out to talk to her at the time, that would have been simpler. Apologized for not opening the door for dialog sooner.

Regarding letter content, when she disclosed the letter, her representation was accurate. The attachment was an internal document that was not going to circulate. The letter evolved to include the attachment after the fact. There were lots of discussions within MEA to more formally appeal the outcome. JE / EJ advocated against this and the final letter was the outcome of the discussions at MEA management. JE / EJ worked hard internally to tone things down and for MEA to not initiate a hard appeal process that management favored.

JE apologized, one of her ongoing professional development goals is to be better at delivering hard messages faithfully. She has a tendency to soften the edges on contentious matters. She apologized for the delays in distribution, she was on leave when the letter went out, and failed to distribute it in a timely manner. She emphasized she had no incentive to delay.

JE continued, trust goes both ways, she owns a lot of this. Seeing how it played out is concerning to her. Could have been dealt with more proactively.

FP asked if the AG's office has responded? JE advised MEA has not received a response.

MC commented he understands why MEA did what it did, that's fine. Emphasized that he doesn't have the luxury of resources to do these things, this is a fundamental concern of his and has been for the whole time. LSE answers to our problems is to take more time – volunteer time. This is an inherently unequal dynamic.

JWL offered his knowledge of the letter's status within the AG's office. Shortly after the letter was received, one of the attorneys reached out to a deputy AG who reached out to JWl and Stuart Goering. JWl forwarded the letter to the deputy AG and attorney doing the review upon receipt.

DT apologized. Last week when aspersions were being cast and motives being attributed, he should have raised a point of order as the discussion was contrary to RRO and divisive to the IC. He hopes the acting chair would have agreed.

SS responded as chair she didn't recall the meeting being of hand. Apologized if things were somehow out of order.

JE offered EJ an opportunity to talk. Clarified that EJ was on vacation last week so had a very limited role in the distribution end of all this.

EJ not much to add. JE is a careful guarder of her integrity.

SS closed matter and returned chair to JE.

7) TAC Charter / Narrative

JG introduced draft TAC Charter and gave brief intro to how it fits into overall Application narrative with regard to governance, technical competence of organization, and staffing / budgeting needs.

DB emphasized objection to the anti-revolving door provision at 5.2 as it will eliminate all potential talent that worked in Alaska the past two years.

ASF commented on the importance of anti-revolving door provision with regards to independence.

RMR advised that ERO independence in the regs is principally focused on directors. If we can adequately address director independence, then the need to worry about the TAC is reduced.

FP asked whether a TAC charter is needed for application. JG replied it is, principally regarding establishing the technical competence of the organization. JE added it is also core to our governance so is necessary internally for the IC / RRC to move forward. Explicit charter is not Application requirement but need to outline TAC function somehow. Other consideration is, if filing under Safe Harbor, TAC structure may not fit within Safe Harbor regulations so may need to request a waiver for this. Understanding detailed TAC function will help inform on waiver necessity.

FP commented the document as drafted is far too detailed. He suggested much of the detail be reformatted as an advisory document from the Board to the CEO. He felt the anti-revolving door provision is too restrictive and not realistic.

SS thanked BudCom for the work product. Concurred the draft is very prescriptive. It goes beyond lanes of what TAC will do, and gets into CEO and Board duties. Also commented on process. TAC is the group that puts together strawmans and does or oversees the work. WG members review, critique, etc. This draft suggests the TAC presides over the WGs and they do the work. TAC's job is to create deliverables and gain feedback from the WGs.

JWR advised he hasn't been in the loop at BudCom but agrees the anti-revolving door provision should be deleted. Let CEO hire local or outside talent. Knowledge of Railbelt would be beneficial in some cases, outside knowledge is also useful in other cases. Agree the draft is somewhat over-prescriptive, but many of the things the RRC needs to do are founded in the detail. The RRC will need to hit ground running, so detail is useful.

BH commented the anti-revolving door provision would ensure TAC would lack access to necessary talent and would be a recipe for disaster. Suggested a disclosure process may be a better way. Agreed the detail is good to have, but perhaps it would be more appropriate to include in some sort of CEO guidance document rather than in the application or TAC charter.

RB challenged the assumption behind the anti-revolving door provision. In his experience since the 1980s people, especially engineers, are very good at realigning their loyalties and perspectives.

CR agreed with comments on detail being important. The IC hasn't discussed what TAC will do. Agree may not all belong in the charter or the Application, but it should be somewhere. on the anti-revolving door provision, expressed opinion that continuing to presume no one outside can understand the Railbelt is false. Physics doesn't change. There are very competent engineers in Alaska that don't work on the Railbelt. Concurred with RMR, the board should be independent, not the TAC. All Directors are supposed to be acting independently of our parent entities and for the RRC interest. Expressed concern over the perception of lack of independence if the TAC is all Railbelt LSE alumni.

DL concurred with comments questioning the anti-revolving door provision. He has worked with many talented people on the Intertie Operating Committee and the System Studies Subcommittee for many years. Very talented and experienced. In his opinion their experience is critical, and their

motives are to keep the lights on. Anyone that is hired for the TAC could have ulterior motives, leave that to the CEO.

EJ commented that any CEO will be very cognizant of board makeup when hiring TAC engineers. He highlighted the compliance engineer as a position that may need additional distance from the board stakeholders because that engineer may be leading standards violation enforcement actions against entities represented on the board.

DB concurred with SS' description of WG work flow – good and accurate. WG's don't set the schedule or budget, the TAC engineer does. TAC engineer would set up other working groups that may support that. The TAC charter was drafted with extreme detail to help make sure the IC has a common understanding of how TAC will work. Also, prior IC member statements have indicated an expectation that there is little work for the TAC to do. The detail was provided to make sure everyone understands the necessary level of effort. Agree this doesn't all belong in the charter, but it is fundamental to understanding the charter.

DN concurred with CR comments regarding the anti-revolving door provision. There are a lot of completely external engineers who could rapidly learn the situation or utilize the WGs (who can have members with utility affiliation) to do so. Completely disagreed this would have an apocalyptic outcome. Makes it look like there aren't conflicts of interest. Continued to agree with DB comments. The details don't go in the final charter, but they're very useful to make folks understand the actual job.

JE asked for schedule of next steps. JG requested comments by EOB Wednesday 8/18. LF, SS objected and requested a full week. JG revised, comments due by COB Monday 8/23.

8) BySub

a) Draft Bylaws Review

SD introduced new and revised elements of the bylaws for TA.

2.1.2.5. seat rotation language

TA'd as presented.

2.2.1.4.4 Annual Meeting scheduling

JG asked if year-end budget approval was OK per RCA budget approval requirements/timeframes.

EJ commented with budget approval and new members happening at the same meeting, new members should be seated at the end of the meeting so they are not in the position of voting on a budget they haven't seen. This is contrary to typical sequence where new members are seated at the beginning of the meeting. SD confirmed the language does have them seated at the end of the meeting.

TA'd as presented.

6.3.2 director recusal on matters of their own alleged RS violations

TA'd as presented.

Article IX

New language to sync RRC rules with RCA rule overrides under AS 42.05.767.

RMR offered two editorial comments which were adopted.

SM cautioned he would not accept this language were he a board member.

SD drafted alternate language mandating consideration of RCA overrides, but not dictating an outcome.

JG concur with SD comments, we must consider revision, but are free to act on it.

[Dana Zentz joined at 3:40pm, 12 of 12 voting members present]

RB disagree with language, stated his opinion is that RRC should not cave on the RCA's definition of rule. SB 123 references them as tariff rules. We should not be a vassal of the RCA.

HK, EJ, and RB questioned whether this needs to be in the Bylaws at all. ~767 is state law and we must adhere to it regardless of what is in the Bylaws. Recommend deletion of new clause.

SD deleted language.

Article XII

New definition of diverse. TA'd as presented.

New definition of IPP.

LF observed UAF acts like an IPP.

JG concurred, UAF is IPP by merit of electricity sales to GVEA.

FP offered the FERC definition of an IPP to adhere to standard language. SD clarified that had been considered but doesn't work because IPPs are electric utilities under Alaska statutory definitions. FP offered the non-utility generator language as an alternative. SD will review with BySub.

TL requested statutory language that establishes an IPP as a utility. JG will send language.

RMR confirmed the issue raised by JG is why SB 123 language was crafted as it was. TL agreed. CPCN is what sets utilities apart.

Remanded to BySub for revision.

b) Introduce Code of Conduct

SD withdrew from agenda due to time.

c) Introduce Discrimination and Harassment Policy

SD withdrew from agenda due to time.

9) PubSub – Introduce Public Comment Policy

VDS informed policy in the packet is draft for first look and comment. Still working on a couple of things. Not going to read through the policy at the meeting today, but please review and provide comments.

VDS gave confidentiality update. Working with Seth Blumsack. He has agreed to pro bono help in defining confidentiality in other jurisdictions. Mostly defined by NERC but we're special so just a framework.

JE added she talked to them today as well.

10) StanCom – Introduce Open Access Transmission Standard Framework

JWR introduced the Open Access Transmission Standard Framework. This is a framework, not the standard. It sets the stage for the eventual standard. Completion of these will have a date certain established by the RCA upon ERO certification. He introduced DZ as standards framework, both for open access transmission and for open access interconnection.

The framework format follows a railbelt reliability standard format, which is the same as NERC template. Definitions lead until it is adopted at which time they go to the back.

JWR presented draft standard framework.

JWL thanked for the process. Understand CEA, GVEA, MEA, HEA have OATs. Required to provide OA, but don't need an OAT per se. There are other means to do this, has the IC decided to use an OAT or did it consider other mechanisms to accomplish this?

JWR clarified regs reference FERC Order 1000 as basis for using an OAT. JWL so does that dictate OAT? JWR comments in drafting suggested other paths might be better, but would need to be justified. Went down this road for simplicity and clarity to conform with regs.

JWL so are we deciding to go with the regs, or do we want to consider other options. Need to be able to defend our decision, whatever the rationale may be.

CR appreciate all the work. Have same high-level concern. This is pretty far down the road of standards, what the ERO will do, and not what we need to do for application. Also appreciate JWL comments, is this how we want to do it.

MC thank you for developing this. Agree with you and CR. Similar concern as with BudCom, this got deep quick.

JWR similar to TAC, like the detail as it helps to flesh out and trying to meet RCA requirements.

BH curious if StanCom pulled down RM 13-2-000 so folks can see ~46.440(b)(3) based on pro forma. Then could adjust to reflect the size etc. JWR advised he can provide that info to the IC.

SS JWL, curious what the other options are? Not familiar with what the other options might be?

JG concurred with SS, not aware of a broader universe beyond an OAT to frame open access. Wholly ignorant but curious about the other options.

JWL suggested look at U-13-007, where CEA developed their OAT, lots of testimony in there. Other models are license plate model. Get your plate, you're allowed on. Similar alternatives – more of a free highway model – ability to get on are not so prescribed. Reg says you can use this or something else. Not clear we made the decision to follow regs. Also cited U14-001, U15-007.

JWR requested written comments by COB Thursday.

Interconnection standard, first look next week. OK with approving both of these two weeks out.

StanCom felt this was the right direction to go, didn't formally consider it.

CR observed this is a good example of where the non-utilities could use assistance. We don't know what we don't know. Great example of what that consultant could have done.

11) RRC Public Meetings Update

JG introduced issue. Paul Morrison, ANTHC candidate for large consumer seat, requested to attend our 8/30 meeting where the IC will select the interim large consumer director. First person to ask to attend an IC meeting. ExCom told him would consult IC and advise. IC existing policy recap: (1) Motion 5, approved 8/10/2020, "hold open meetings, post prior notice of meetings, included persons to be heard in accordance with RRO". (2) Open Meeting Policy, passed 8/31/2020, "...members of the public wishing to attend the open session portion of IC meetings shall register... members of the public will not attend the closed session portion of these meetings."

MOTION that the debate and vote for the interim director for the large consumer seat be in open session. 1JG, 2BH.

LF observed public notice requirements. Asked if IC has posted notice of the meeting?

JG advised that we are now posting agenda of the meetings, effective this meeting, on the website on Fridays prior. That includes the meeting time and date.

FP asked if there are any other restrictions or definitions of open or closed sessions that we should consider?

JG advised the IC has not to his knowledge adopted any guidance on what constitutes open or closed sessions.

Objection by LF.

PASSED by roll call vote, with DU voting against [11-1-0].

12) Updates / Member Comments

JE large consumer selection update. ExCom held a Q&A session for candidates last Wednesday. Applications are due next Wednesday.

Working to schedule a transition funding plan meeting sometime. Maybe Th AM.

Recapped recent conversation with academic researchers - they have a few requests from us. NSF grant wasn't funded, so still working form their current funding source. Towards end of our process (post Application) they may reach out for interviews. Also possible they could be 2nd set of eyes on limited items. Emphasized they would just be providing information on what they know from their research, not advising or consulting.

FP asked to clarify that the IC requires that external resources, such as the academic researchers, gain IC approval regardless of funding? JE clarified we do have a scope with them that was approved. Trying to make that more organized and solidified.

JWL commented regarding transition funding he looked for recent CPCN applications that were filed prior to the applicant being a formal entity. Did not find any instances so no precedents thus far for that particular option.

JG disclosed chat with Antony Scott last week regarding LSE definitions and applicability to UAF.

13) Set August 23rd Agenda

JWR informed CMEP, Penalty Matrix may need to push out a bit. Also, based on IC direction at today's meeting, Open Access Transmission Standard Framework won't be coming back for approval next week.

TL advised TarCom will have some, but not all of what is listed for them on the 8/23 agenda. Can try to bring something conceptual for Tariff workplan but waiting on elements from others before workplan can be drafted.

JG informed TAC Charter / Narrative comment window will still be open on 8/23, so will bring this back 8/30 instead. Hope to have CAM narrative, but not sure yet. Will know by mid-week whether we will be able to bring this.

VDS advised replace Public Access to Documents Policy with Public Notice Policy. Hoping to bring this for introduction next week.

JE advised large consumer applications will be distributed next week, vote to incorporate will push as Bylaws are not yet approved.

The August 23rd IC meeting agenda will include:

First Look

1. BySub – Governance committee charter to IC
2. BySub – Balance and stakeholders narrative to IC
3. BySub – Independence narrative to IC
4. BySub – Existing Board classification narrative to IC
- ~~5. StanCom – Penalty matrix to IC – Push~~
6. StanCom – Open access interconnection standard framework to IC
7. StanCom – Additional standards workplan and budget elements to IC
8. PubSub – Public notice policy
9. TarCom – First look at revised sections 3, 7, 8, 9.1, 9.2, 10 – May have some, but not all

For Tentative Approval*

10. IRPcom – IC approve final IRP process
- ~~11. BudCom – IC approve TAC charter/narrative – Push, comment window still open~~
12. BudCom – IC approve CAM narrative (FIRST LOOK AND APPROVAL) – Will know by mid-week whether BudCom will have this
- ~~13. BySub – IC approve anti-harassment policy – Push, not yet introduced~~
14. PubSub – IC approve public comment policy
- ~~15. StanCom – IC approve open access transmission standard framework – Push, based on IC direction~~
16. TarCom – IC approve Tariff workplan and budget conceptual framework (FIRST LOOK AND APPROVAL) – Subject to work from AppCom and others

Other Business

17. ExCom – Distribute large consumer applications to full IC
- ~~18. ExCom – Vote to incorporate~~ – Bylaws not approved, so not ready for this
19. PubSub – Confidentiality discussion
20. AppCom – RCA questions

14) Adjourn

MOTION to adjourn 1BH, 2DT.

ADJOURNED at 4:53 PM.

DEFINITION OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

All committee members and consultants are identified by their initials, as defined at the roll call table.

1JE, 2JG:	Shorthand designating which committee members proposed and seconded motions.
[~]:	Secretary's commentary provided for clarity / context as appropriate.
	Vote tally shorthand is Y-N-A, yea – nay – absent or abstain.
AAA:	American Arbitration Association
AOI:	articles of incorporation
AppCom:	ERO application subcommittee
BudCom:	budget subcommittee
BySub:	bylaws subcommittee
CEA:	Chugach Electric Association, Inc.
CEO:	chief executive officer
CIP:	critical infrastructure protection
CGC:	corporate governance committee
CME:	compliance / monitoring / enforcement (of reliability standards)
CPA:	certified public accountant
CPCN:	certificate of public convenience and necessity
DaveCom:	See IRPcom
DOL:	Department of Law
DU:	Doyon Utilities
ERO:	Electric Reliability Organization
ExCom:	executive committee
FAC:	finance and audit committee
IC:	Implementation Committee
IPP:	independent power producer
IRP:	integrated resource plan
IRPcom:	IRP process subcommittee
LSE:	load-serving entity
MEA:	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.
NDA:	non-disclosure agreement
NTE:	not to exceed
PAC:	public affairs committee
PM:	project management
PMP:	project management professional
Precious:	(1) A spreadsheet listing clauses in the implementing regulations for SB 123's ERO provisions, identifying associated ERO application deliverables, and assigning deliverable preparation responsibility to IC subcommittees. (2) A fancy gold ring.
RAPA:	Regulatory Affairs and Public Advocacy
RCA:	Regulatory Commission of Alaska

IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE
OF THE RAILBELT RELIABILITY COUNCIL

FINAL MINUTES FOR
AUGUST 16, 2021 MEETING

RRC:	Railbelt Reliability Council
SB:	Senate bill
SES:	Seward Electric System
SOW:	scope of work
StanCom:	standards subcommittee
TA:	tentatively approve, tentative approval
TAC:	technical advisory committee
TarCom:	tariff subcommittee
TIER:	times interest earned ratio
WG:	working group

ATTACHMENTS:

1. None.