

**Railbelt Reliability Council Implementation Committee - Meeting**  
**November 8, 2021**  
**Final Minutes**

**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)	Y1	Chugach Electric Association
Frank Perkins (FP)	Y	John Burns (JB)	n	Golden Valley Electric Association
Rick Baldwin (RB)	Y	Dave Thomas (DT)	Y	Homer Electric Association
Julie Estey (JE)	Y2	Ed Jenkin (EJ)	n	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)	Y3	Cook Inlet Regional Inc.
Joel Groves (JG)	Y	Mike Craft (MC)	Y	Alaska Environmental Power, LLC
Veri di Suvero (VDS)	Y	Alyssa Sappenfield (ASF)	n	Alaska Public Interest Research Group
Chris Rose (CR)	Y4	Greg Stiegel (GS)	n	Renewable Energy Alaska Project (REAP)
Paul Morrison (PM)	Y5	Dustin Madden (DM)	Y	Large Consumer
Hank Koegel (HK)	Y	David Newman (DN)	n	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

Y1: JWR joined at 1:20 PM

Y2: JE left at 1:28 PM, rejoined at 2:30 PM, left at 3:57 PM.

Y3: SD joined at 1:20 PM

Y4: CR joined at 1:20 PM

Y5: PM joined at 1:28 PM

Steve Mahoney (SM) present; Tom Lovas (TL) present through 1:31 PM; Rena Miller (RMR) present.

Bayunt Ollek (BO) and Sebastian Orillac (SO) with Sapere present.

12 of 13 voting members are initially present, one ex-officio member is initially present.

**2) Approval of IC Agenda**

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

**PASSED** as amended with no objections. [12-0-1].

**3) Consent Agenda**

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

**MOTION** to approve consent agenda, 1JG, 2BH.

**PASSED** with no objections. [12-0-1]

*[JWR, CR, and SD joined at 1:20 PM, 13 of 13 voting members present.]*

#### 4) ExCom

a) Regulatory Attorney Recommendation

JE provided update. MEA and Perkins Coie (PC) working through details of engagement, principally conflict management language. Should have contract squared away soon.

b) RCA Update

SS provided update. Been reaching out to RCA / AG contacts, no new information learned. This week's RCA meeting has some related material on the agenda, not directly related to SB123 docket though.

c) Process for Today's Session

JE provided process context for today's agenda items. Start with roundtable for members to articulate their goal and understanding of fundamental problems. Then go into proposals via motions, work through those with RRO. If that protocol becomes problematic can consider a differently structured dialog separately. BO will facilitate this process.

JG asked how voting would be handled. BO clarified that normal roll-call vote process would be used unless otherwise directed by IC. *[No such alternative direction offered.]*

DB asked if we need contractors to remain in the meeting. TL volunteered to bow out. JE advocated that SM and RMR should remain on the call.

*[PM joined at 1:28 PM, 13 of 13 voting members present.]*

*[JE transferred Chair to SS and left the meeting at 1:28 PM, 12 of 13 voting members present.]*

RB and BH commented that it would be helpful for SM to remain in the meeting as a resource.

TL advised he has some responsibilities regarding the application but can coordinate directly with RMR after the fact.

*[TL left the meeting at 1:31 PM].*

SS opened floor to round table, summarized that last week's advisory screening votes on suggested motions set the stage for IC votes on proposals today.

FP asked to clarify SS comments on voting. FP wondered if this is just another exercise? SS clarified, 'advisory' does not refer to all prior IC votes, just the screening vote exercise that occurred last week. We're trying to nail down the carpet corners so there are no surprises at the end. That said, there will be a vote at the end with board seating and actual incorporation to finally affirm everything we're doing.

DT informed that any vote on these governance models as being 'final' is wrong. If nine members wish to revise something there is nothing more sacred to this meeting and its decisions than to any other. No nine-vote action today is uniquely binding.

SS concurred, apologized for poor choice of words.

HK commented to agree with DT, until the entire package is up for approval, no single element is final. And that notion extends post-incorporation as well, this whole organization must be dynamic and adaptive to be viable.

## 5) Member Positions Roundtable

CR prefaced he has respect for all the people here, comments are not aimed at them but at institutions they represent. REAP has been clear throughout that they believe that the board structure is not balanced. As events have developed, they have reconsidered their prior vote based on further reflection and developments. Initial structure was developed by LSEs, not by this group. Feel this group would have developed a different structure and we need to explore that. Hybrid construct in regs is flawed. If LSEs were looking out for consumer interests it would not have taken 40 years to get something like SB 123 in motion. When developing MOU a few years ago, there was discussion of a transition process to an independent board. That did not make it into MOU and hasn't been discussed again. Disturbing for LSEs to oppose the revolving door safeguard on the TAC. Also disturbing was the LSE power move to unilaterally install DU when MLP was bought. Direct advocacy to RCA on regulations was also concerning.

LSEs have financial advantages over rest of the board, they can leverage ratepayer funds to hire consultants and pay themselves to advocate, rest of board does not have that ability. Consumers will be morphing into producers in the coming years and need to reflect that.

MC commented to agree with CR on all his points.

DT added that utilities are a minority of seats and rejected idea that representational democracy is a bad governance model. LSEs represent ratepayers, who are diverse. Some wish for renewables, all wish for reliable power and lower rates. Co-ops and municipalities (munis) are democratic organizations. Democracy is messy but better than alternatives. They represent ratepayers and are funding this effort and will fund the ERO and new assets.

LF clarified he doesn't represent DU in interactions with this body. Nothing is agreed to until everything is agreed to is valid. Any idea someone wants to advance is fine and should be heard. Willing to listen to ideas. Bright line is where utilities or non-utilities can be cut out of a decision, which is a problem. Need to have 2 of each side required for a decision to be approved. Anything that violates that concept fails balance.

HK echoed CR, respects people on this committee. All have given their judgment and HK respects that. Agreed with LF. Doesn't think the IC should be talking about giving up, too much time and money has been invested. HK does not think system is balanced but doesn't think it should crash and burn. Do think provider / consumer axis is valid metric for balance. Must haves: Independent CEO, unless unanimous agreement for otherwise, like the opt out clause if board is unanimous. Majority of TAC engineers should be independent, don't think all of them should be as having some Railbelt experience is also good. Think we need to set aside funding for non-utility directors. Give confidence to them that they will have resources to fully understand issues.

DB commented, reiterated expressions of respect. Enjoyed working on this committee. Plenty of discussion on subcommittees, good discussions sometimes hard but often productive with good outcomes. Letter from non-utilities was surprising. Reviewed mediation notes from Sapere. What bothered DB is not fact that we're revisiting things but the manner we were told about revisiting it. In mediation notes it says that within 3 years of certification, ERO's governance committee would revisit things and make recommendations for reform. Sounds awfully like some of the proposals

that were in the proposal packet. Surprised that one of the demands was something we agreed on. We went through the board structure, added a seat, and unanimously approved it. That was hard to get to and seems unlikely we could repeat that process in the time we have left. Utilities refusing to fund non-utility consultants is just untrue. The two proposals brought forward were for blank-check authorizations. DB can't approve such vague requests. Told JG would support a specific request, but nothing ever came back. DB added hope for IC to move forward and work things out.

BH reiterated what HK said. We are each here with own constituencies and agenda, and all are working for the best interest of the Railbelt. Sometimes we just must agree to disagree. A few points. To characterize this process as inflexible a mischaracterization. We added a seat to comply with draft regulations. We have been flexible and generally unanimous, just a few out of 100s of votes have been contested. Letter from non-utilities is an exercise of power by that block and concerning for the same reasons. To produce 23 different governance proposals after 18 months is deeply concerning.

With regards to hiring and TAC independence, we need to let the board decide and course correct based on performance. This is what we mediated. Have enough flexibility in mediated structure to revisit and adapt. In the mediated settlement we all moved to center position, prohibited any group from blocking progress. That was a good outcome. We should move forward and work on things we have yet to accomplish rather than rejigger items we have already solved. Doubt there would even be enough time left to do it. On approval of funding resources, cannot support a vague proposal.

RB spoke only to issue of governance. Other issues are matters we still have room to work through. Governance is most important. Back in May we made it a project to resolve governance before we did anything else. We all approved that resolution. We can say that everything was tentative, doesn't think you can say the whole structure, including foundation, is tentative and can be moved at any time. Only means to resolution I see is the way we did it. Section 11 of duties of care is key here. We will all agree with each other to keep our organization informed and notify the group of any issues. After we adopted this governance model, RB assumed that this issued had been resolved. Until it popped up recently. Another provision is that we operate in good faith. No new information that has arisen since we agreed on governance.

FP commented directors on RRC in 5 or 10 years will wonder why there are so many weird rules. FP clarified that though it's very cumbersome right now, eventually RRC will morph into a really good process. Won't be perfect, but we'll get there. Current headaches will provide dividends. Enormous effort invested in this and a shame to lose that. Hope we can pick a path and move forward. Resources totally fine for non-utilities, but they need to be resources for the whole IC. FP hoped that personal agendas wouldn't get in the way. Mediation was costly, if we don't adhere to that, what will we agree to? Once done I think all will be happy. RRC will have to evolve.

JG commented to respond on his additional external resource's proposal. His proposal did offer specific resources, and specific issues that would be addressed. It allowed for any group of a given number of IC members to raise a matter to be assigned, subject to the unanimous approval of ExCom. It was developed based upon three robust rounds of IC debate. The specificity of scope and contractors was comparable to many other funding authorizations the IC has approved. JG's view is

after three rounds of debate and consideration before the IC, the proposal was defeated and done. Others are welcome to advance the proposal again.

JG continued to state that one of the consequences of volunteering on this committee has been extremely high time commitments that interfere with members' other obligations. Members' ability to adequately deliberate on matters in a timely matter is compromised. This is a direct tradeoff that needs to be acknowledged. The IC is doing new and complicated things, and it is not trivial to immediately understand and fully accept or recognize the consequences of these decisions. JG regretted not voicing opposition to elements of the marathon mediation that occurred in May. JG explained he was not able to fully reflect on matters and adequately articulate his reservations until later in the summer. That is unfortunate, but again it is a direct consequence of the volunteer nature of this group and the extreme time commitments that have been imposed on individuals. That is the tradeoff.

VDS appreciated conversation. Not ideal road to take to have time to discuss things but appreciated those that are articulating their concerns with this process. It feels sad that the process is so difficult but also very true. Lack of shared assumptions across the board. It showed up in many different places. VDS referenced BH's comments on compromise. Every constituency feels they have compromised, not quantifiable and hard, but it puts a chip on everyone's shoulder. Biggest priority is that the IC continue. This effort is important, timely, and needs to be seen to completion. VDS explained that with the pause they've been able to, to JG's point, identify and better understand missing resources and start to develop specific needs. The resource and power imbalance tends not to be recognized. When it is, there is no collaborative effort to address it. Some un-resourced members asked for resources from the resourced members. DB and BH asked for more detail, but that put the burden back on the un-resourced folks to do another lift. Remains an adversarial relationship. I do trust all of you, and that you have the interests of the Railbelt at heart and think we can get there. In my view the non-utility letter was fundamentally a plea for more time. The only time we discussed balance was in the very rushed mediation, where I was never contacted by the mediator, and others expressed reservations about.

PM added this discussion is highly informative, as he did not participate in most of this. Have reviewed statute and regulations. Feel a large part of the struggle here lies in the regulations. The IC doesn't meet the provider / consumer balance. The safe harbor contortions do let us get there. From professional experience with MLP, doesn't feel they ever had the consumer's interest in mind. Personal view is route to balance is more consumer interests on the board. Thanks.

SD aired a few thoughts. Good alignment with these people, fundamentally. Want reliable, low-cost, sustainable power. SD is an IPP, but high cost doesn't make our business sustainable. Board issue is a must have for SD. Two thoughts there. 1) not really balanced, could make that case, SD has done so previously. Draft regs say we're balanced, they were written to reach that outcome. We took it up in May, as we should of, and we solved the problem. Need 9 votes, so no group could approve or block anything. Stall is mitigated with the mediation process. Not perfect, but reasonable. 2) compromise is doable, we're doing it on bylaws. See going forward, maybe a compromise is to stick with the board, but add other alterations like CEO / TAC independence. Build in resources for RRC board members to solve that issue. Support for concept, need to

hammer out language. Doesn't want IC to fail. SD capped discussion with mention there would be mad people if we let the IC crash and burn.

*[JE rejoined at approximately 2:30PM 13 of 13 voting members present.]*

SS commented she respects everyone, believe all are here in good faith. With 20+ people will not have total agreement on things. Need to respect limited resources and tentative approval tenets. Cannot shame people for raising concerns within this venue and at this phase of our development. Hearing more agreement than non. SS has no lines in the sand. That includes the existing governance structure. RB asked what changed since the mediation. One thing is the draft regulations that were issued at the end of July. The 10 pages dedicated to fitting the RRC board into the provider / consumer concept are a good example of this. Concerns raised are in line with meeting the regulations outside of the safe harbor – can't have undue amplification or attenuation of interests, and if you do you need to revisit it. That is precisely what is happening here, and folks are raising that very concern. What do we do about it? We can't ignore it, we can't point at a prior agreement and force the matter to stay closed. Resources are not just about the money. Totally understand where BH is coming from regarding accountability. Not just about money, it is also time. More money won't solve the problem. Find a way to move forward, all have wiggle room. Need independent CEO unless unanimous vote can be made. Need to consider reasonable amount of time we can expect of a volunteer to participate in this. Need to pay attention to attenuation.

JE thanked SS and apologized for being absent. JE confirmed MEA's commitment to this endeavor. JE was comfortable with the mediation outcome. JE posited that the mentioned issues are based in fear. We have a good board structure. No matter what we do with board structure, blocks will form. Going to have to deal with it. Structure that that we got to in mediation is good. JE further added that solutions with minimal LSE (1 or 2) support are deeply problematic for MEA.

JG appreciated all efforts and expressed profound respect for all the parties here. Everyone has made exceptional contributions of their time and resources to this effort, and that needs to be acknowledged. JG supported this group moving forward to a successful conclusion as the best outcome for the overall ERO process and remains committed to finding a solution. JG agreed with SS that personal time limitations need to be addressed by adjusting the IC pace or something. Something JG failed to mention in his earlier comments is that generating more consultant reports for JG to review, internalize, and accept or not is not a solution to his problem. JG's limiting resource is time, and he cannot offer a higher rate of time to this process. Failure of this effort means loss of the substantial ratepayer funds spent and committed to date, and substantial time investments of everyone here, and that is an unacceptable result. We need to keep working to an amicable conclusion.

BH reinforced what JE said with this being a fear-based situation and trying to engineer against all possible outcomes. An organization that doesn't understand the reliability standards and the business it is overseeing will create a space where people can shut the organization down. Need a modicum of relevant experience in the organization to make sure ERO is defended. Worried that with independent TAC and CEO it might become a target for those who want to see this project fail. BH has been working on this since 2013. On resources, there is nothing in his job description that says to do this. BH does this effort on nights and weekends. All have made a great sacrifice here. No one else is doing our jobs while we are doing this effort. It is all extra. Encourage everyone to

reach out to resources we have and ask them for help. It is not within the scope of BH's authority to take members money and assign it to just anyone or anything. Maybe should have been more collaborative on what was needed. CEA has been and is committed to seeing this through. There is much angst in where we are going. Two utilities, could be <5% of Railbelt load, could make \$1B decisions on transmission and so on.

MC thanked everyone. Pointed out some similarities to this and other experiences. Was on Title 17 rewrite committee, subdivision develop regulations for Fairbanks-Northstar Borough. Long process. All were there to protect their interests. Near end of process, counter-intuitive suggestions started coming up. For example, a developer wanted higher road standards. Contrary to their own interest but better long term so the community does not have to deal with substandard pioneer roads in the future. Same process here. We know we need to act collectively to solve some of these bigger problems. Communication issues. If someone doesn't understand something need to figure it out and fix it. MC wanted to understand what happened to himself under an OATT. We all must bring some things to the table and leave some things behind.

DB responded that the way regs were crafted it is difficult for IC to move forward with a single purpose. No other organization like this. In a typical ERO, only transmission providers and no one else is at the table. We have a planning function added in. That brings in generation interests which muddles things. We have no market capability or structure to complement the planning function. I am a big advocate for Railbelt planning – it is long overdue. All players have different perspectives. Utilities look at it as how does this affect my operation. IPP/non-utilities view it as how does an IRP affect my market possibilities. Coming at this from two very different goals.

SS spoke to BH comments about competency, she things everyone here is competent. RCA did us a huge disservice by setting the bar for the ERO application so incredibly high. The amount of preparation IC has to complete to apply is so huge that it becomes hard for the board to do everything. It is hard for a board to focus on board matters when it must also manage everything a staff would normally be doing. SS suggested a petition to the RCA to waive some of the application requirements.

SS transferred Chair to JE. JE asked for further comments before moving on to the screened proposals.

**MOTION** for five-minute break. 1FP, 2VDS.

JG called the question.

Chair called a recess until 3:05 PM.

## 6) Discuss Member Proposals

Chair called the meeting back to order at 3:06 PM.

MC asked to make one more comment on the previous agenda item. On the borough Title 17 committee, one thing that came up was an educational opportunity in West Virginia covering environmental issues. It was a whole new perspective and participation made me a better developer. Even the trainings we did at the IC earlier were very helpful to me. That may be a valuable tool for us to work around and through these issues.

JE yielded the floor to BO for facilitation. BO verified all parties are represented, confirmed that HEA, AEA, and AKPIRG representatives are present, and recapped process. Multiple proposals were tendered, a screening vote was held last week, and ExCom deemed 12 proposals to have sufficient support to warrant full IC discussion. Four of these pertaining to governance are up for discussion today. Three governance strawmen – status quo, 13 members with no interest fractionalization, and 9 members with no interest fractionalization. If there is time, there is a fourth proposal that eliminates hybrid classification for stakeholders, but this proposal may become irrelevant based on the outcome of other motions.

MC asked to put the motions on the screen. BO did.

**MOTION** that the currently proposed RRC board composition, stakeholder class assignments, and voting procedures remain unchanged. 1JG, 2HK.

RB commented that the motion is not out of order, but it is meaningless. A motion must change the status quo, not just restate it. A more appropriate motion here would be to rescind the status quo. If this motion fails to pass the status quo will still hold. So, the motion is functionally out of order.

SS commented to agree with RB and requested an amendment from RB. RB declined to offer one.

LF raised a point of order, is BO the chair? JE clarified she is still the chair. LF clarified that the chair needs to rule on whether the motion is out of order. JE deferred to SM for counsel. SM concurred with RB's analysis.

**MOTION REJECTED** as out of order by Chair, JE then returned the floor to BO.

**MOTION** that balance for the ERO stakeholder board be defined as between providers and consumers but with no fractionalization of stakeholder classes for each director. The RRC board will include six providers (including utilities, IPPs, state), six consumers (including large, small, and environmental) and one independent director. Specific types of providers and consumers are to be determined later. 1JG, 2VDS.

CR posed a question. Motion just says six providers, but not specific on how this is allocated amongst LSEs, IPPs, state. How comfortable are folks voting on this or does the detail get figured out subsequently?

LF repeated CR 1<sup>st</sup> question, and asked a 2<sup>nd</sup> question, do the proponents feel this meets the safe harbor provision of the regulations?

SS replied to CR's question, the last sentence of the motion makes it clear the detail would be determined later. To LF's question, this meets regulatory balance, but not necessarily the safe harbor provisions.

JWL commented that rather than us opining on whether any of this meets regulations, which is what we are hiring attorneys for. Us guessing risks a setup for further problems later. JWL suggested having attorney issue an opinion that a structure conforms with regulations rather than IC members guess.

CR commented that he sees value in readjusting board this way, but feel it is a non-starter for many as some individuals may be in or out because of this vote. Think this would be more useful with more stakeholder specificity within the provider / consumer baskets.



PM commented that it appears to be a balanced stakeholder board under 3 AAC 46.060. Agreed it is vague, would like to see more specificity within the groups.

RB commented trying to understand what this does with the existing bylaws. Doesn't see how this can stand as an amendment to the bylaws. This is more of a resolution that would provide direction to amend bylaws. Trying to figure out what this is and what we do with it if it passed. Amendment to bylaws, direction to attorney to draft something we can review and vote on.

BO provided clarity on the motion based on RB comments.

DT raised a point of order. The facilitator cannot spin a motion, do not concur with BO's interpretations. The motion needs to stand as stated or be amended. Also commented against the motion because the ratepayers' representation on the board would be reduced.

BH also commented to speak against the motion because it is vague and provides no action to be taken. Also, as a coop representative expressed opposition to changes in governance model that would reduce those members' voices at the table in turn for more representation by special interest groups.

VDS added they would vote on this motion. Also emphasized that ratepayers are represented by consumer advocate seats on this board and not just coops, so reject the notion that more consumer representatives equate to less consumer representation.

DB commented against this motion because it amplifies what we have been talking about. It is a one-sided motion notion that a 'customer' is only in IRP sense, but per SB 123 customer is also a UOO of the BES. So, this fails to consider those two separate elements of an Alaska ERO.

JE called the question.

**MOTION FAILS** by roll call vote [4-8-1]. With CIRI, AEP, ANTHC and Independent voting in favor and AEA abstaining.

**MOTION** that the IC's regulatory attorney, as their first priority, advise on which of these shortlist motions (meeting packet motions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3) conform with the regulations 1VDS, 2CR.

DT asked for clarification whether this would be for the ExCom shortlist or all proposals? VDS clarified for the shortlist, not full pre-screened list.

HK objected, requested the motion be restated. VDS restated motion.

RB commented during roll call vote to oppose the motion because it doesn't specify conformance with the safe harbor provisions of the regulations.

**MOTION FAILS** by roll call vote [7-4-2] with GVEA, HEA, DU, SES voting against and AEA and Independent abstaining.

LF commented to clarify he is not voting against these motions as direct opposition. He supported this dialog, but it is extremely hard to craft viable, polished motions in real-time. LF suggested need to draft the motions ahead of time and circulate them for feedback so polished motions can be brought to the meeting. LF added condolences if they created more of burden but said he thinks it is necessary.

## 7) Next Steps

ExCom will revisit approach and will advise when next meeting will be.

## 8) Committee Updates

StanCom: JWR introduced funding request. Issues have become more difficult than expected and committee is not done. Purpose of this request is for additional funds to complete the work we have started. Have many draft docs in progress, close but not finalized.

Goal is to have GDS training in mid-December. Additionally, to bring someone in to develop cost recovery framework, this can only be done after training is complete.

Acknowledged this came into the packet Friday. StanCom has approved this. Clarified this is not a blank check, StanCom will be overseeing expenditures.

**MOTION** to approve change request funding to StanCom from \$50k to \$100k to complete work already started, and for transmission cost allocation training and transmission cost allocation framework development. 1JWR, 2BH.

JG spoke against motion. Introduced on short notice and concerned about size of increase with doubling of the budget. Also expressed concern that the IC needs, to the extent practical and for resource limitation reasons previously discussed today, limit its efforts to the minimum required to tender a complete application to the RCA. JG agreed this is important work and he supported it but felt it should be done post certification.

CR commented unclear about need to do transmission cost recovery, thought that needs to happen later. What do we need to do now? Have similar concerns as JG.

JWR commented that open access is the main thing. Request from IC that was approved [*StanCom's charter*] is that we develop these documents. This is an overview of what standards will look like – these are frameworks, not the standards themselves. That is the intent.

JG and CR objected.

**MOTION FAILS** by roll call vote [7-4-2] with CIRI, AEP, REAP, and ANTHC voting against and AEA and AKPIRG abstaining.

DB raised a point of order to ask whether an abstention goes with the majority. SM and DT clarified it does not – to pass motions an affirmative vote is required and an abstention is not one.

IRPcom: DB gave update. Great process working through divergent views to consensus. Have changes done from Synapse, will be distributing to IC in near future. JG commented successes of IRPcom are surely due to its amazing chair and amazing name.

BudCom: JG gave update. Continuing to meet at weekly cadence to review IC expenses, also working through RRC chart of accounts (COA). Solicited LSE reps on IC to engage with LSE financial folks to collaborate on chart of accounts development. Goal is to align COA with LSE needs so itemized expenses on the ERO's surcharge invoices will be consistent with the internal expense tracking needs of the LSEs. Have only heard from CEA to date, so encouraged other LSEs to engage if they have an interest in this.

PubSub: VDS gave update. PubSub still needs the confidentiality survey from members so it can advance that matter. Thanked those that have submitted already.

## 9) Member Comments

HK advised he is going on vacation (vacation from retirement!) from 11/11 to 11/22. Will try to participate in meetings during that time. Get to meet grandson!

*[JE transferred chair to SS and left meeting at 3:57PM, 12 of 13 voting members present].*

SS voiced appreciation for everyone's comments and said that she thought this was a very productive meeting.

PM asked whether we are meeting next week. SS advised depends on timing for regulatory attorney to get on board, solicited input from members.

JG, DT, CR commented should meet next week. CR added possible agenda item to consider more governance proposals.

## 10) Adjourn

**CHAIR ADJOURNED at 4:00 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