

Railbelt Reliability Council Implementation Committee - Meeting
September 7, 2021
Final Minutes (Approved by IC 9/13/21)

1) Roll-call

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

Primary		Alternate		Organization
Brian Hickey (BH)	Y	Jeff Warner (JWR)	Y	Chugach Electric Association
Frank Perkins (FP)	Y	John Burns (JB)	Y1	Golden Valley Electric Association
Rick Baldwin (RB)	Y	Dave Thomas (DT)	Y	Homer Electric Association
Julie Estey (JE)	n	Ed Jenkin (EJ)	Y2	Matanuska Electric Association
Lou Florence (LF)	Y	Shayne Coiley (SC)	n	Doyon Utilities
Dave Burlingame (DB)	Y	Rob Montgomery (RM)	Y	City of Seward
Kirk Warren (KW)	Y	David Lockard (DL)	n	Alaska Energy Authority
Suzanne Settle (SS)	Y	Sam Dennis (SD)	Y3	Cook Inlet Regional Inc.
Joel Groves (JG)	Y	Mike Craft (MC)	Y4	Alaska Environmental Power, LLC
Veri di Suvero (VDS)	Y5	Alyssa Sappenfield (ASF)	Y6	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>	n	<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

Y1: JB left at 2:10 PM.

Y2: EJ left at 3:42 PM.

Y3: SD left at 3:15 PM.

Y4: MC joined at 2:12 PM.

Y5: VDS joined at 1:34 PM, left at 2:00 PM, and rejoined at 3:01 PM.

Y6: ASF left at 3:03 PM.

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

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

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, 2EJ.

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, 1BH, 2JG.

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

4) ExCom – End of Meeting Protocol

JG clarified end of meeting protocol. He noted issues were raised due to his motion last week. Proper protocol for bringing matters for IC discussion is to:

- 1) Advise ExCom of matters by Thursday morning so they can be incorporated into agenda.
- 2) If matter is emergent and time sensitive, request to amend agenda at beginning of meeting. If not time sensitive, wait until following week.

SS also pointed out that members can request additions to next meeting in member comments.

5) TA'd Documents Protocol

BH explained need to clarify and proactively agree on a process for revisiting TA'd materials prior to getting to final approval process. Draft process offered for consideration is based on prior labor agreement negotiations, and also used and worked well for utilities' prior standards development. Omitted from packet, but will circulate. BH read through and briefly explained the proposed process document.

SD asked, as we TA stuff, who has responsibility for compiling those documents as they get TA'd. BH clarified BO would be doing that. BO confirmed yes, there's a Sharepoint folder where TA'd things are filed. SD sought clarity that Sapere or AppCom does this, so committees don't have the ball anymore. BO clarified Chairs need to submit the final doc or PDF following TA at IC. After transmittal of TA'd doc is received BO will take the ball and upload to Sharepoint.

JG commented with regards to the proposed process (1) ERO governance is more complex than a reliability standard so incremental approval is probably not viable, (2) majority threshold for reconsideration of TA'd materials doesn't make sense as 4 or 5 votes can block adoption under IC rules, and (3) need to respect members' expectations for revisiting matters when they voted to TA matters. Agree a protocol is needed, like the template and direction to standardize.

SS, LF agreed with JG on points. Would have been nice to have discussed this at the outset to clarify what TA means. Likely that with interdependencies there will be lots of reconciliation required.

[VDS joined at 1:34 PM, 12 of 12 members present.]

HK asked BH to clarify if he is proposing 2, 3 reads and then close the door? BH clarified no, but this is a starting place for rules. We can choose to do whatever we want, and agree with JG this is more complicated than a reliability standard.

RB reminded that the IC shouldn't be finding surprises if all members are following duties of care to stay in close contact with our organizations and disclose issues promptly. Expect we can do this aside from reconciliation requirements.

SS advised we're learning as we go, and as we all learn more our positions evolve. Offered as an example she is reconsidering her support for some StanCom material she had voted to TA.

HK commented that his understanding has been TA would allow for review of the entire package prior to a final approval due to all the interdependencies.

6) BudCom Update

a) Budget Reporting Update

JG provided brief update on budget matters:

- July Expense Report is waiting on July invoices from M&B, David Hilt, Dana Zentz, GDS.

- BudCom has no contracts or Not to Exceed amounts (NTE)s for David Hilt, Dana Zentz, GDS.
- Billings are near NTEs for Miller and M&B; believe these are being worked through for change orders to come back to IC for approval.

b) TAC Charter – TAC / Working Group (WG) Relationships

JG sought IC input and TA of key tenets of WGs under TAC.

WG Membership

CR asked to confirm director designee is not the subject matter expert? JG confirmed these are two separate positions.

SS asked how the WGs would facilitate public participation? SS also stated her view that WG does not do the work, just reviews it. TAC develops primary work products. VDS clarified the process is in previously TA'd Public Member on a Committee Policy. JG added that WG chair role is to curate the WG membership per the policy's objectives, and also that the charter has an appeal process for the WG chair's decisions. That process is not defined, just referenced.

BH suggest reviewing regs on authority here, recall lots of latitude to selectively engage on interested members of public. He asked SS to clarify comment on WG / TAC. Someone drafts a doc, others review... what is distinction. SS clarified TAC owns the document, does not delegate to WG. BH noted his understanding was a similar process, but WG can produce drafts. TAC still owns document and recommendations to Board.

FP commented on the number of WGs and size of WGs. RRC will need to consider meeting space requirements and also cost of this structure. It seems quite costly. IRP may have up to 20 WGs. If WG's are developing work products and have large membership funded by ERO then will get prohibitively expensive quickly.

[VDS left at 2:00 PM, 12 of 12 members present.]

LF raised a question: have we defined the function of a WG? VDS offered that the regs define committees. RMR clarified the regulations don't require WGs per se. If you do have one, there are some participation requirements. Other docs stipulate that WGs and TAC focus on IRP, standards, not on tariff and rules. LF commented that it seems peculiar to have directors and alternates involved in developing a product that they will ultimately approve when it comes to the Board. Seems the development process should be insulated from the Board somehow.

DB stated his opinion is that WGs need to be the ones developing work products, not limited to comment process. Public involvement with IRP process is needed on 14 to 20 different subject matters that will be in the form of WGs to get public input / comment. Can't do it within TAC as that fails to meet public participation requirements. Public shouldn't be in the TAC as they represent stakeholder interests and TAC needs to be independent. So only input is through the WGs, if they are just review draft deliverables and not developing them, it is unclear that meets the intent defined in regulations. We can do either way, but need to build schedule and budget accordingly.

SD two WG views here – comment body, or development body. Haven't heard which way we're going. Agree with LF really strange to have directors as WG members.

EJ commented that regulations state a director is allowed to have a designee on a committee, but not necessarily the director.

WG Voting

EJ commented we are required to describe voting procedures for all committees.

SD commented consensus is desirable, but what of lack of consensus.

BH observed it may be worthwhile to flesh out ownership of process by TAC. If TAC feels they've run into a wall, TAC should move forward with the recommended deliverable and document the dissents. SS agreed with BH.

EJ commented it may prove difficult to identify dissenting opinions if no voting method is defined. NERC has huge committees that come together and make a decision and move it out.

Deliverables Developed by WG / TAC

DB commented that regardless of other items being debated, the TAC owns the deliverable. WG has deliverable also, as defined by the TAC, but TAC is only entity that delivers anything to the Board.

JWR commented that the standards process delineated the work for RRC staff, vs WGs. Look at standards flow, the doc is out there.

BH commented it is also worthwhile to look at how ERCOT does this, or other ISOs. Generally the organization provides a base doc, WGs revise and resubmit, org then gives it yes/no, and they iterate to a consensus.

SS agreed with DB comment, need to consider resources, staffing implications.

[JB left at 2:10 PM, 12 of 12 members present.]

c) TAC Charter Path Forward

JG introduced potential transfer of TAC Charter to BySub or broader group (BudCom + BySub) to continue development. BudCom will retain development for time being, but will also engage with BySub to draw more views into the committee work. SS commented this seems like a good approach.

7) Standards Workplan and Budget

JWR introduced additional standards workplan and budget elements. Budget is for RRC TAC consultants, not Board participation.

[MC joined at 2:12 PM, 12 of 12 members present.]

SS asked whether budget included 8 stakeholder consultants? JWR clarified it did not.

CR cost seems low. Do you have a formula to multiply # of hours a consultant may need to include Board / WG time to get the work done? As an example, for the Open Access Transmission Standard, 12 months of work, what does 60 hours of consulting work translates to for meetings etc. JWR acknowledged that the answer is unclear, pointed out that WG may have more meetings than the consultants do. This will change as we have more discussion on related matters.

CR continued, timelines seem to assume you start immediately post certification. Can we do these before we have final reliability standards? Are they independent? JWR agreed this is a concern, but it is incumbent on the RRC to hit the ground running. As a preview, recently sent a document to BudCom as part of the ongoing transition plan scoping outlining a process for beginning standards development during ERO application review before the RCA. JWR also flagged that the RCA ERO certification order will dictate a timeframe for standards completion.

SS pointed out that we have to prioritize certain standards to start the IRP process. JWR agreed, those were flagged as such in the BudCom deliverable. CR also concurred on expediting things to accelerate the IRP.

JG also flagged the RRC's startup process as an additional block of time. Post certification, we will need to hire a CEO, the TAC engineers, support staff, etc. Asked if the schedule is from certification or from functional RRC. JWR confirmed this is from certification so it intrinsically includes the startup process. But that is something we have yet to fully scope out.

EJ commented the schedule also assumes existing models are adequate, which they may not be, that could also introduce a schedule wrinkle. JWR concurred, and added that 3 or 4 modeling standards are on the early development list that was sent to BudCom.

DB advised the RRC may not get the existing models as early as you'd expect, sometimes simple things like model transfer drag out. Added that the table isn't obvious that 1 engineer, say the TAC standards engineer, is going to manage all of these standards concurrently by themselves.

[DZ joined at 2:23 PM].

8) BySub

SD provided update. Bylaws went out to IC members for circulation to parent organizations on 9/3, with comments due back by 9/16. Nothing new today, consent agenda stuff. This week BySub will work on the governance committee charter and address RMR comments on consistency review.

SS as we do a fresh read, should written comments go to SD? SD yes, turn on tracking mode in the native doc and send your comments / revision to BySub for consideration.

9) TarCom

EJ transferred to TL for presentation of sections 1 and 2 of tariff.

TL introduced revised sections 1+2.

EJ introduced definitions and interdependencies of them. IC needs to agree on these in order to allow progress to continue. Intent of TarCom was to craft definitions such as they align with regulations.

CR agree with concept, asked why we want to define REs so broadly, problematic to manage. ERO jurisdiction ends at 69 kV, but what could the RCA do with this? Opens door for headache. Easier to limit RE to just 69 kV+ entities.

DB commented on a missing definition. The key term is do you affect the reliable operation of the BES. This is defined in statute. Interconnection voltage is fine, but doesn't speak to the reliable operation part of the definition. That needs to be included here.

BH concur with DB. Not 1,000s of entities that do that, more like a dozen. Can they move frequency around or not, etc. What should be included is description of how LSEs interact with REs below 69 kV. Probably needs RCA approved clause in contract that passed through to the RE – such as modeling standards sometimes require entities to provide models. If required to provide an accurate model and it is found to be inaccurate then you are in violation of the standard. LSE needs contractual path to force compliance. Needs to be clearly articulated either in tariff or in accompanying narrative.

EJ commented UOO and RE definitions in tariff is straight from definitions in regulations

JG back at 1.3, suggested a reference be added in the tariff to AS 42.05.765(d) that, in the instance of conflicts between standards and prior agreements, gives precedence to prior agreements, until decided otherwise by RCA.

SS shared definitions comparison document. Observed our job is to follow regulations, not interpret them.

BH thanks for compiling this, asked her to distribute to members.

DB pointed out that the problem is that regulations and statute were written by people who don't understand the nuances of the grid. Agree with the conflict SS is navigating. Don't necessarily agree with her interpretation. Issue is that LSEs are responsible for behavior of their customer's load characteristics. Not captured in SS solution or in regulations. RRC needs to decide how it wants to regulate the system. Conflict between reality and law, RRC should decide how to deal with it. He stated that his opinion is that the RRC develops standards, LSEs are responsible for enforcing against their customers.

SD see 4 options here. (1) everyone is UOO and subject to standards. Other extreme (4) is just LSEs are subject to standards and they do all downstream enforcement. 2) if 69 kv+, then also RE, 3) if you can affect reliability, then you are an RE, this is 'squishier' as you've got to define 'affect reliability'. Probably picking between 1 and 4? Problem is statute in one spot says 69 kv+, other spot says affect reliability.

DZ observed the positions are not that far apart, folks are stuck on words. At first read, all UOOs are REs. Suggest clear your mind, sit down, and read the definitions. Don't change any, let them stand, then just implement them. UOO is pretty expansive, includes consumers and producers both. How do you avoid impact as a UOO? 1 become a RE, 2 below 69kV, not RE but can affect system. So have LSE make you comply. Through interconnection agreement etc. So LSE is responsible for this, and logically will protect itself from UOO actions by tripping them offline when violations occur.

SS thanks DZ, we're drafting CMEP so have some options here. We can avoid penalizing LSE for UOO actions and allow them latitude to take corrective actions against UOOs.

EJ observed not a big difference between SS and DB comments. Both say the LSE is responsible for enforcing standards on UOOs below 69 kV. This is how tariff is meant to be applied. ERO enforcement stops at 69 kV. Can still be an RE Below 69 KV, but enforcement is up to LSE. Hearing that the question is not whether LSEs have enforcement duty but whether the <69 kV UOOs are labeled REs.

BH offered some high level thoughts. Back to SD, squishiness on 'affect' is key and link to sub 69kV REs. Not really very squishy, it is a matter of physics and covered in reliability standards. To DZ's comments, what is the recourse available to the LSE if they have a problem UOO that can affect the system? Go to superior court? The RCA? The RRC? Say IPP won't do testing necessary to model a generator adequately, so the genset causes problems sometimes, or the model isn't accurate so the IRP isn't accurate. What is recourse in this scenario?

EJ point of order, do we want this question here or at committee?

SS yes, sounds like a subcommittee discussion. Great question but take it down.

TL advised, in section 3, LSE responsibilities addresses this point.

LF agreed with the theoretical framework that SS described. Problem lies at practical level. For 69+ kV REs, have a nuanced array of monitoring and enforcement options. At <69 kV, all LSEs can do to address problems is to flip a switch. So limited options for enforcement.

RB Can only impose a penalty on someone if statute says you can. Non LSEs can argue they are not subject to penalty. ~772 says all LSEs are subject to ERO tariff. Means everyone else is not. ~775 says ERO can impose penalty on UOO. But ERO is not a state agency that can impose a penalty. Enforcement problem, but solved by routing penalties through LSEs. ERO penalties go to LSE as subject to tariff. LSEs will deal with their subordinates through their tariff / contracts.

[VDS joined at 3:01 PM, 12 of 12 members present.]

JWR agree we're close here. Interconnection and transmission standards will come into this, need to consider how. For thought: as written, the tariff will allow penalties to flow down thru LSE to UOOs. May require each LSE to have its own compliance department. Not clear to me what legislature intended here, but reliable operation of grid, above and below 69 kV, is the bottom line. My view is 69 kV is additive to assets that can affect BES reliability. If we deviate from legislative intent, I don't want to go there.

[ASF left at 3:03 PM, 12 of 12 members present.]

DB agreed with RB. LSE as enforcer, hopefully done with EROs, and don't have individual enforcement entities on the system. Also UOO threshold will change as system evolves. If IRP does its job, the affect threshold will move up and fewer entities can affect the system. This threshold is dynamic.

SS great discussion, but lacking a path forward. TarCom and StanCom both need clarity here.

EJ if you're an RE, does that mean the ERO has jurisdiction to apply reliability standards to you? Seeking clarity on how we draw all this.

RMR for application, important that we have a clear course forward, narrate how the IC will move forward, could ask the RCA to provide clarity on this.

SS two schools of thought. 1 tie REs to system impacts, or 2 UOOs shall comply with tariff.

EJ Agree, this is the issue / decision. Functionally the same, but labels differ. Do we call them REs or not?

SS does RE label make them subject to tariff? Statute says no.

EJ if you are RE, by definition, you are subject to tariff.

BH raised a point of order, we're debating again.

SD need to define questions. 1 who enforces standards, ERO, LSE, both? 2 if both, what is split? 3 if defined as an RE does this mandate ERO compliance?

BH offered 4th question: what jurisdiction are these things resolved at? ERO, RCA, courts?

10) Master Definitions List

RMR introduced current Application definitions list. Goal is to standardize definitions and use uniformly throughout. RMR will review and append this list as items get TA'd so following work products can adopt and build. For items that are in progress and have lots of terms, flag them to RMR so we can anticipate those definitions and help standardize usage.

SS suggested to flag statutory / regulatory definitions so they are distinct. Perhaps in a different color.

SS another item on action list.

EJ asked if RMR only wanted agreed definitions? RMR clarified if still in flux no, but if a comm have accepted it, then yes.

[SD left at 3:15 PM, 12 of 12 voting members present]

11) Alternate Voting Structure Proposal

JG explained his concerns with supermajority thresholds in proposed Bylaws and proposed remedy of (1) changing supermajority threshold from 9 to 8 votes and (2) impose timeline on arbitration phase of deadlock mechanism.

JG continued to explain his rationale. Two coalitions exist at IC and proposed RRC. The 'incumbent powers coalition' is large enough, cohesive enough, and has sufficiently aligned interests to dictate board decision making in blocking approval of supermajority decisions. Further, such blocking actions can be interpreted as consistent with the aligned interests of this coalition. Expressed his personal view that this fails to meet the definition of a balanced board.

Deadlock provisions cause delay, incrementally preserving the status quo, which is also consistent with the aligned interests of this coalition. The other coalition could also have numbers necessary to engage in same blocking maneuvers, but is less cohesive, has less aligned interest, and is smaller.

Proposal to amend Supermajority approval threshold from 9 to 8 votes fixes both problems.

BH asked what the genesis of this is, and what of the whole mediation process? JG explained he has had concerns for some time, but the pace of IC matters had prevented him from being able to think through them and then articulate them until now. He explained that he viewed the mediation process as deeply flawed due to emphasis on uncontroversial matters, rapid pace of progress, and lack of equality in participation.

HK commented that he thinks this merits discussion.

KW thanked JG for compiling this, it is a good document. He was under the impression the IC TA'd this, didn't think or understand there were reservations with the mediation or that some felt important things were skimmed over or unimportant things were dwelled on.

MC commented that he thinks it is worth discussion, he felt the same way about how mediation went. The pace, ability to hear, rapidly shifting topics all made it very difficult to follow. Feel the issue is totally appropriate to raise.

RB expressed that if we do take it up, he has serious questions about the integrity of our process. We spent lots of time, money, effort to do the mediation. Don't know how you can make a deal like this and then go back on it many months later. Feel strongly about that.

CR thanked JG for preparing this. If JG has raised issues on board independence, that is relevant to all of us. The whole point of a tentative agreement is that it is tentative. JG has uncovered a potential pitfall, it warrants discussion.

LF commented that the bottom line is that nothing is agreed to until everything is agreed to, but cautioned that he thinks it's a bad idea to bring this up again.

FP commented JG is making a lot of assumptions that he doesn't have the right to make. JG is assuming there will be divisions that don't exist.

BH appreciate the effort here. But it is a divisive issue, we mediated it, agree with what FP said, the way it was written is not conducive. If the RCA has issues with Board balance, they will say so.

SS clarified Bylaws have not been approved, still out for member comment, so this matter is important.

VDS asked if this is a regulatory analysis? JG clarified it is not, this is his personal analysis. VDS expressed interest in what a straw poll shows. This issue has been at the core of a lot of tension within this group, so not sure anyone would be excited to open it back up. However, to the issue of trust, it is not a matter of trust not being violated by bringing up an issue like this. We all have a duty of care to consider these matters when they arise.

DN if a new issue is raised, that is appropriate to bring it up, same as in any other context. JG's analysis is entirely consistent with duties of care and his raising the issue is in fact mandated by the duties of care.

DB commented he doesn't mind JG raising the issue. Concurred much of mediation was repetitive and unproductive. Some outcomes I didn't agree with. Think JG's analysis is one stakeholder's view, with that stakeholder's interest of what happened with mediation. The issue should not be re-opened for IC consideration.

KW commented he doesn't question JG's sincerity or concern with issue. Recognize busy etc, and agree with DN, if you have issues, you have every right to raise them. However, these issues are not new. The IC did discuss whether AEA would vote with LSEs or had an affinity to the LSEs during mediation. That is what I have issues with – rehashing old ground.

BH concurred he is not critical of JG nor does he suspect his motivations. Just don't see anything new in here. Expressed view that you go to mediation, agree, and move on. We can discuss it but not sure how that is productive short of redoing mediation.

SS observed no motion currently on the table, can take strawman poll to see what support there is or can wait for a motion and defer action till then. We can also just wait for the Bylaws vote. SS stated preference to take a poll and then see what to do with it.

JG thanked all for hearing his concerns. Stated he didn't raise the matter lightly, and his duty is served by raising and articulating the issue.

[DZ left meeting at 3:40 PM].

12) PubSub

[EJ left at 3:42 PM, 11 of 12 voting members present]

a) Public Access to Documents

VDS gave brief update. Updated draft is in the packet again this week, welcome comments to PubSub.

b) Confidentiality Questionnaire

VDS requested results by 9/13. Excel file was distributed by RSK in weekly IC actions email.

VDS clarified PubSub is not drafting an appeals policy. The ones we need now are being done by StanCom, others not needed until post-certification.

13) Member Comments

CR question – voting on Bylaws on 9/17 – that's a Friday? SS clarified IC vote is 9/27, final version goes into packet on the 24th. Member comment period closes 9/16.

DB commented that he would like SM to comment on research that the ERO does not have statutory authority over anyone but the LSEs. If he agrees with RB then the path forward becomes clear. SM accepted that, but advised will need RB's help. SS interjected, ExCom has been talking about regulatory attorney for the IC, they would be ideal for this. SS continued no one has submitted names for a regulatory attorney. Would welcome someone who isn't conflicted. SM commented that the relationship between LSEs and RRC isn't necessarily a conflict. So may need to push back on that immediate opinion by prospective candidates.

JG asked if Bob Stoller was still practicing? SM said no he's been retired for several years.

FP cautioned potential monkey wrench, after Department of Law review there could be significant changes in regulations. Are we ready for that? SS concurred, that's definitely an issue, but the IC voted to move forward with the draft regulations. Will just have to deal with changes as they come.

14) Committee Updates

JWR gave StanCom update. Interconnection framework set aside until definitions are finalized. Also, will be out for two weeks starting Monday. StanCom will be run by one of the members or one of the consultants as interim chair until he returns.

DB gave IRPcom update. IRPcom met, working like well-oiled machine. Just about done with everything. Synapse is finishing budget / workplan / schedule. 1st IRP will take ~2-3 years, then < 2 years thereafter. Plan to review that at next meeting, then be done.

JG gave BudCom update. BudCom is focused on TAC. Talking about pulling BySub into a joint task force, but retaining TAC near-term to maintain momentum.

15) Set September 13th Agenda

The September 13th IC meeting agenda will include:

First Look

1. AppCom – Umbrella process (IRP, Tariff, Standards, Rules) to IC - YES
2. BySub – Governance committee charter to IC - YES
3. BySub – Balance and stakeholders narrative to IC - ?
4. BySub – Independence narrative to IC - ?
5. IRPcom – IRP workplan and budget to IC - YES
6. IRPcom – IRP workplan and process narrative to IC - YES
7. StanCom – Some sections of CMEP to IC - YES
8. StanCom – Penalty matrix to IC - NO
9. StanCom – Open access interconnection standard framework to IC - NO
10. StanCom – Standards development process narrative to IC - NO
11. StanCom – Open access transmission narrative to IC - NO
12. BudCom – Revised TAC charter to IC - YES
13. BudCom – ERO financial policy to IC - NO
14. PubSub – Revised public access to docs other than confidentiality to IC - YES

For Tentative Approval*

15. IRPcom – IC approve final IRP process – NO (first look at revised process, not yet for approval)
16. StanCom – IC approve standards workplan and budget - YES
17. TarCom – IC approve Tariff sections 1 and 2 - YES

16) Adjourn

MOTION to adjourn 1CR, 2KW.

ADJOURNED at 3:58 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
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.