

**Railbelt Reliability Council Implementation Committee - Meeting**  
**January 31, 2022**  
**FINAL Minutes**

**1) Roll-call**

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

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
Dave Thomas (DT)	Y	Rick Baldwin (RB)	n	Homer Electric Association
Julie Estey (JE)	Y2	Ed Jenkin (EJ)	Y	Matanuska Electric Association
Lou Florence (LF)	Y3	Shayne Coiley (SC)	n	Doyon Utilities
Dave Burlingame (DB)	Y	Rob Montgomery (RM)	n	City of Seward
Kirk Warren (KW)	n	David Lockard (DL)	n	Alaska Energy Authority
Suzanne Settle (SS)	Y	Sam Dennis (SD)	Y	Cook Inlet Regional Inc.
Joel Groves (JG)	Y	Mike Craft (MC)	Y4	Alaska Environmental Power, LLC
Veri di Suvero (VDS)	Y5	Alyssa Sappenfield (ASF)	n	Alaska Public Interest Research Group
Chris Rose (CR)	Y6	Greg Stiegel (GS)	Y7	Renewable Energy Alaska Project (REAP)
Paul Morrison (PM)	Y	Dustin Madden (DM)	Y	Large Consumer
Hank Koegel (HK)	Y	David Newman (DN)	Y8	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: JB joined meeting at 1:30 PM.

Y2: JE joined at 2:42 PM.

Y3: LF left meeting at 2:10 PM, rejoined meeting at 2:12 PM.

Y4: MC joined meeting at 1:30 PM.

Y5: VDS joined meeting at 1:30 PM.

Y6: CR left meeting at 4:10 PM

Y6: GS left meeting at 4:15 PM

Y7: DN left meeting at 2:08 PM

Steve Mahoney (SM) present; Tom Lovas (TL) present; Rena Miller (RMR) present; Elena Romerdahl (ER) present, Davit Hilt (DH) present left at 2:50 PM, and Dana Zentz (DZ) present left at 2:50 PM. Bayunt Ollek (BO) and Sebastian Orillac (SO) with Sapere present. Rachel Wilson (RW) not present.

11 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, 1BH, 2PM.

EJ commented on need to amend bylaws to accommodate TAC changes. Is that coming before this committee? SS asked SD to address. SD clarified bylaws TAC language was deleted, but the SME funding came back to bylaws along with some other minor clarification items. EJ asked if there is a concern if TAC can be changed by simple majority, would that affect the bylaws which require a supermajority. SD believed that TAC requires a supermajority based on bylaws supermajority language.

**PASSED** as amended with no objections. [11-0-2].

### 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. [11-0-2].

### 4) ExCom

#### a) Vote to Incorporate

SS provided background and introduction to the motion.

**MOTION** to direct SM to file for RRC incorporation. 1SD, 2BH.

DB commented when we file AOI, do we have to file bylaws? SM clarified no we do not approve bylaws until the organizational meeting.

**PASSED** with no objections. [11-0-2].

SM stated he will collect signatures, then will file with state. State will take 2-3 weeks to process the application, then we are real.

#### b) Determine who will run 1<sup>st</sup> Board Meeting

SM reviewed first board meeting agenda.

- Elect directors.
- Directors elect officers, they are seated.
- Newly elected chair runs meeting.
- Minutes for each item.
- Approve bylaws.
- Approve policies (can decide which ones).
- Authorize banking.
- Authorize IRS filing for non-profit.
- When agenda goes out, directors can request other items.
- At end, organized and certified.

SS continued, tentative plan is to hold the organizational meeting on 3/14 or 3/17. Depends on bylaws status. Also thinking that we will have SM run meeting so JE can participate as a director. SM confirmed it is common for counsel to run the first meeting for this reason.

FP asked if 1<sup>st</sup> meeting could be aligned with application working session. March 14/15 so it can be in person. SS confirmed that is the purpose of the 3/14 target date.

BH confirmed CEA is working on reserving room at place off Benson. Maybe for the 15<sup>th</sup> as well.

c) Determine Date of 1<sup>st</sup> Board Meeting

**MOTION** to hold first board meeting on 3/15. 1CR, 2BH.

EJ asked what the length of the incorporation meeting is? Do we want to have bylaws approved before the 15<sup>th</sup>? Expressed concern over losing application review time.

*[VDS joined at 1:30 PM, 12 of 13 voting members present.]*

*[JB joined at 1:30 PM, 12 of 13 voting members present.]*

*[MC joined at 1:30 PM, 12 of 13 voting members present.]*

SS confirmed bylaws should be done before the meeting. SM advised meeting should be straightforward, about an hour.

SS advised plan to schedule organizational meeting at 3:30 PM.

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

d) D&O Insurance

SS asked SM to advise on need to have this in place on day 1. SM stated someone needs standing to sue. We will be acting internally, so no external party should have standing to sue. So don't think it is necessary for day 1. Very minor risk, until at least we are certificated, and possibly until later than that.

HK queried if D&O would cover lawsuits between and amongst directors? SM advised yes it should. Covers individual directors and the corporation. Does not cover the suing director.

PM inquired whether hiring an executive director would be an external action? SM responded in the first few months not likely, but if you had two candidates then one could have sour grapes and present a risk.

EJ asked for the cost. SM advised about \$2,000 / year for \$2M coverage, if we were a normal non-profit. Because the RRC is unusual, maybe 2x-4x this value? Lots of public engagement so increased risk. EJ surmised less than \$1000/month, seems reasonable.

**5) StanCom**

a) CMEP Presentation

JWR introduced DZ and DH. Generally, CMEP is very complex, and this is a first look for the IC. Still dealing with legal review comments so not yet released by StanCom but getting close.

DH ran through brief professional history. In business for 40 years, worked for IOUs, COOPs, elected official on a Muni. Predecessor of RTO, then went to NERC in 1999 and was employee #1

to set up that regulatory framework, coming up through major blackouts that moved policy. Since then, moved into consulting realm.

CR raised question on kinds of data that would be transmitted to the CMEP. And what kind of questions would be relayed to board.

DH provided data examples. Protective relay test records, to confirm relay owner is doing the testing required. Also, cybersecurity training records to confirm employee training is happening. It depends on standards. JWR added there is language in CMEP that stipulates info needs to be applicable to the standard being investigated. DH continued, was debated on who gets to make the request. Can be whatever group board thinks best, board directs. JWR continued that he does not believe that board will perform that function necessarily.

JWL asked, regarding registration challenge, is it heard by ERO? DH confirmed yes. JWL continued, so entity decides, then challenge goes back to the same entity? Not robust process. Any thought to a different appellate body? Board vs. staff or something? DH clarified, yes different 'hearing body' defined by RRC board. So, Staff makes recommendation, then staff and RE go to separate appellate body. EJ added they can also appeal to RCA if desired. JWR added, not clear if RCA appeal is built into this. RCA appeal is specific to penalties.

SS asked, RE or not is a clear break, or is it a standard-specific matter. DH clarified, in Lower 48 (L48), if you are a transmission owner, balancing authority, generation owner, generation operator, then you are registered for the standards that apply to that function. SS thanked for the clarification.

DH continued with compliance check scope and process.

JWL asked what criteria there will be for entities requested to do audits. When the RRC publishes its list of auditees what message does the RRC want to send. Will it be viewed as a random group, troublemaker group, etc? JWL posited that IC doesn't want 1700 registered entities, more like a dozen. So, the audit list could be construed negatively unless carefully presented. DH responded it is up to board. DH gave example of what happens in L48. The list is typically comprised of balancing authorities, transmission operators, and air traffic controllers/reliability coordinators. Audited on three-year cycle.

JWL thanked for clarifications. So, FERC has a sizeable audit staff. JWL asked who should RRC hire? JWR interjected, no requirement for mandatory audits in CMEP. JWR anticipates those are risk-based. Risk-based audits are a good way to find and isolate problems. JWL thanked JWR for the comment but stated the issue with risk-based audit is same as his comment before, risk infers problem operators.

DZ added, registration criteria will help define this. CMEP deals with you once you are an RE.

DH continued, no requirement for scheduled audit. You can schedule them however structured. Once you make that decision, you must give 90d notice, develop the audit team, and scope of audit. RE can appeal all of these elements. RRC provides exit briefing. Self-reporting is excluded from audits, no double jeopardy. Audit teams are subject to conflict check and antitrust guidelines.

DH explained self-certification provisions.

JWL asked what happens if an RE objects to an audit team member. And how does the RRC determine if it's a valid complaint.

DH stated there is a process to determine that.

PM asked if an entity could recover their costs for a successful challenge to a violation claim?

DH, JWR informed that this is not addressed in CMEP, don't know.

JWL commented from RAPA's perspective, monopoly utility collecting money from rates to cover a fine, RAPA says disallow the fine from rates. Unregulated entities are a different matter.

CR asked, when we talk about RRC choosing to do something, who is making that decision. JWR responded. Sometimes this is the audit team. Team lead must be an RRC employee. Not stated who, but default is the Compliance Engineer. Balance could be RRC consultants. Same framework for investigation team.

DB asked didn't CMEP use term RRC generally, could be compliance engineer, board, consultant, etc? JWR confirmed yes, tried to back away from specific title within the org. In some cases, it does say RRC employee. DZ highlighted distinction between audit (not intended to be a precursor to an enforcement action), vs. an investigation. Audit is not punitive, it is to ensure compliance for benefit of system. JWR confirmed CMEP language makes this distinction.

SS noted, to PM question, difference is that all LSEs will be using internal resources to do all the reporting actions. The IPPs are doing this on their own dime. Big difference between a 250 MW LSE and a 6 MW solar farm. Cost question is a big issue when thinking about audits and compliance. This is a big deal. LSEs recover these costs through rates, IPPs do not have this recovery mechanism.

JWR stated that CMEP doesn't address this. Penalty setting does consider impact to RE regarding their financial size etc. LSEs will be subject to more standards than an IPP, so there is some economy of scale.

DH added, lots of debate in L48 on this matter. Small municipalities are vocal on this for same reasons. Can come in at standard, registration process, and enforcement process.

DH continued with Self Reports.

JWL asked if anonymous complaints cover the scope of the complaint and the complainant.

DH clarified, yes until the complaint results in a violation. Lots of examples of this, but he has never known a complainant that chose to waive anonymity.

Next up is enforcement. DH continued through that process then described compliance hearing, enforcement steps and actions.

FP asked, on WECC, people can see all prior enforcements, but many of them are sealed. Will we have such a mechanism?

DH responded can do same thing as NERC. Many enforcement actions are covered under settlement agreements, can be hard to find root violation, some stuff is sealed. CEII and CIP items are sealed. Will not name entity but will say which standards were violated.

JWR clarified there is robust confidentiality language in the RCA rules, those should come forward to RRC for same reasons. But not addressed.

CR asked whether settlement process here contemplates whether enforcement is solely within the jurisdiction of the RRC employees? DH confirmed the board does need to confirm a settlement agreement. It also gets shared with RCA so board has to approve that filing.

DB inquired whether the board must approve any proposed action. DH confirmed yes, even for \$0 fines. Must have a hearing process for everything, even mutually agreed items.

DH continued with appeals.

JWL asked about appeals process. Are violations and penalties tied together? These can slowly wind up to the state supreme court over years. At enforcement, same appeal opportunity, years could drag out. JWL wondered if RRC could bundle the enforcement and penalty to eliminate one appeal chain? DH clarified yes it could be bundled to eliminate that option.

CR wondered if a matrix that included aggravating and mitigating circumstances could guide RRC penalty formation. DH confirmed yes that is part of the sanctions guidelines. JWR concurred and added that those are not required for application, but a strawman is on SP for review.

Development suspended to focus on application. DH continued NERC has a NERC-approved set of sanctions guidelines.

DH finished with enforcement onwards to mitigations.

DH described remedial action directives. NERC has done many of these.

DH provided examples. One was vegetation clearances, another was equipment oil levels. Gauges pegged at low and crews wouldn't enter a facility. Combined NERC / OSHA other violation complaint.

*[JE joined at 2:43 PM, 12 of 13 voting members present.]*

DH concluded the CMEP presentation and asked for questions.

JWL noted confusion over anti-trust, request examples from L48 when NERC needed guidelines. DH replied every NERC meeting includes NERC antitrust provisions. JWL thanked DH for clarification.

SS advised draft CMEP is on SP and in packet, 44 pages, scheduled to vote on it next Monday. JWR directed to LF.

LF commented, hope all appreciate how fortunate we are to have DH available to help on this. This is a huge program, WECC has ~100 employees on this scope, this structure is modified to make sense for Railbelt. JWR concurred, thanked LF for saying it well. Hope we can continue to use DH to develop these processes. To build on SS comments, CMEP has been through two RMR / LJO reviews, one ER comment cycle. DH, DZ have responded to comments, and StanCom will review those comments and then finalize the edited copy on 2/2.

b) Standards Workplan & Budget

JWR reviewed changes from prior look. Project management changed to project facilitation, and schedule clarified to RRC completion, not RCA completion. Also clarified budget is to RRC completion and does not cover RCA approval costs to RRC.

TL asked whether any further consideration had gone into how the standards might be bundled, to help inform the tariff filing cost. JWR concurred, doesn't impact our budget but does yours. StanCom does plan to discuss a bundling strategy in the future.

**MOTION** to approve RRC standards development budget and schedule. 1HK, 2BH.

SS asked on last slide of presentation, includes a list of documents that will be required that infers significant amount of time and effort. Where is that included? JWR clarified that will be addressed in BudCom's overall budget. Not part of this standards budget per se. Concurred we do need to make sure we don't lose those items. JWR confirmed will track that as a member of BudCom.

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

**6) IRP Workplan & Budget**

DB reviewed this last week. Only thing not done is to reconcile formatting to conform with StanCom. SS suggested proceeding with vote. DB clarified change would not change schedule, but we did not include general manager so missing CEO and other TAC member time.

JG suggested reconciling these at BudCom.

RMR noted we do need to provide a budget and schedule for IRP to RCA.

LF suggested it is hard to spread around permanent staff. May be better to take out overhead and leave those budgets to the RRC and not to each task.

EJ stated that individual staff time is not terribly useful, aside from adequate staffing levels and overall budget.

DB posited RRC needs to provide a cost to the RCA.

SS asked RMR for language.

RMR read language of item 6 for standards, and item 17 for IRP. SS suggested overhead costs are base load, and IRP / standards should be incremental cost.

DB asked if fully loaded employees get counted, and partials do not?

SS stated that is one way to do it.

BH opined there is a fork in the road here, development base cost of org, then incremental cost for doing these activities.

EJ concurred with BH, JWR concurred with him as well.

**MOTION** to approve the IRP workplan and budget and send it to BudCom recognizing cleanup needed. 1FP, 2EJ.

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

**MOTION** to strip out staff costs and approve remainder of IRP budget. 1FP, 2BH.

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

## 7) AppCom

### a) Product Development Rule

JE introduced matter and passed to RMR for presentation, namely to focus on changes from last week.

SS suggested change 3.2.e to include preliminary schedule to help public scope the obligation.

JWR commented no objection to the change, but other documents will provide more detail.

VDS commented at 3.2.d, it is redundant with public participation policy (PPP). Not a problem, but it is repetitive. RMR stated she will reconcile it with PPP.

JE highlighted this is a rule, so we cannot change this class of document without an RCA tariff filing-type process.

SS commented that the title to 5.0 presumes a board approval mandate – say consideration instead.



CR commented to agree. RMR will make global revision to that effect.

RMR commented, per FP, prudent for RRC to develop internal audit process. Email dialog was to keep it out of the rule but put it on RRC to do list for later. SS concurred, keep it out of rule.

DB asked to clarify the board approval / vs consideration rationale? SS restated nuance. DB concurred, thanked for clarification.

**MOTION** to approve Product Development Rule, as modified in sections 3d, 3e, 5.0 and 6.0. 1PM, 2JG.

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

b) Rules Table

RMR introduced rules table. Developed by AppCom, RMR, reviewed by ER.

EJ commented multiple instances of 'rule' in regulation, elsewhere, rules under RCA jurisdiction. So, it seems like RRC rules are a superset of RCA-approved rules? RMR replied that language / nuance is not familiar to her. EJ conceded may be from a draft of the regs.

RMR clarified it is serious to RCA, will search for that language. SS recapped, no 'rules', only 'Rules'. ER concurred, requested to flag to her any regulations contrary of that.

TL also confused, rules are also built into the tariff, specifically and generally, and does use Rules and rules. Also flagged nomenclature. Our certification will presumably be ER-1, so rule should be ER-1-1.

RMR suggested she and TL get together and dovetail tariff and rule language.

JE provided context – this is list for the group. If anyone has different idea about rule scope, please advise.

**8) TAC Process**

JG raised issue of vote threshold to approve TAC charter. Read motion 2 and 3 from 7/23/2020 that established IC voting thresholds for clarity. At 13 members, original voting thresholds of 8 and 9 (2/3rds, 3/4ths of voting members, originally 12) clearly with 13 voting members now become 9 and 10. JG acknowledged this is contrary to his contemporaneous comment made when PM was made a voting member of the IC and apologized for that incorrect statement.

FP commented this is a development process, so why would approval be different than for any other process document?

**MOTION** that the TAC charter is a foundational document and requires a supermajority vote 1CR, 2SD.

CR spoke to rationale for supporting higher threshold.

DB asked if this is for the whole document? JG opined yes.

LF commented, inclined to agree this document is foundational, but would appreciate time to deliberate.

**MOTION to TABLE 1LF, 2DB.**

VDS objected.

**FAILS** [7-5-1]. With HEA, MEA, CIRI, AKPIRG, REAP voting against and AEA absent.

FP stated there has been evolution of the document and he wants more time to review before deciding whether it is a foundational document. He continued saying this document isn't even done yet.

DB posited there are only two or three foundational items in here. RRC should make those foundational, but not the rest of the document.

HK agreed with DB, parts of this "cake" are not done yet. Portions are foundational, most not, so shouldn't tie our hands excessively.

JG entertained an amendment to specify which sections should be considered foundational.

SD advised that the draft bylaws require a supermajority to approve policies, procedures, and committee charters.

CR clarified that SD said also committee charters. Is this not a charter? SD clarified his point is that the bylaws require a supermajority for most everything. SS added for clarity, they do not require it for a process. SD countered they do for policies and procedures.

LF debated process versus procedures. LF asked where SD is reading this in bylaws. SD clarified at 2.2.4.3.

DB clarified, if RRC says all charters need supermajority, that means charter from TAC to WG means supermajority – changes by BySub, IC, or both?

SM explained that the intent is board charters only. Per his recollection of discussion.

DB asked what status of approval of that section is, SS believed it is TA'd by IC.

FP asked if RRC was looking at previous version of TAC charter, would TAC charter have been a board charter or not? SM replied yes, TAC charter is a board charter.

DB clarified he is trying to differentiate between board charter vs not. SM says TAC charter must be approved by the board, but TAC charters for WGs are not.

LF stated SM made key point. In section 2.2.4.3 of bylaws supermajority of bylaws for policy or procedure.

SD advised bylaws are not in effect yet, we are working under IC's rules.

DB detailed it doesn't matter if TAC is charter or process. Document is what it is. Issue is whether approval requires a supermajority, DB stated that is wrong in his opinion. Portions of it are important but not the whole thing.

JWR concurred with SD.

PM agreed that parts of this document are foundational, not all.

FP opposed to this motion due to TAC not done, and preface of issues underscores that. Too in flux to make a decision on whether it is foundational.

BH concurred. Agreed that the foundational elements should be excised and capsulated. Would vote no, just to clean this up.

CR responded to FP that document is close to 99%. However, that doesn't matter, essential point is the words within it are foundational, key to RRC. CR added it's a waste of time to pick this apart, so he supports the motion.

VDS observed there's a difference between not being ready to vote to approve this vs. whether this is foundational. Sounds like we are agreeing it is foundational, regardless of name.

EJ asked if this motion is passed like an amendment.

JG expressed view that we passed the original voting thresholds motion on a simple majority basis so we can change it by the same threshold.

SS wished to understand the voting threshold.

BH asked SM for his opinion. He stated he can't offer a professional opinion here, but only his personal view.

*[CR left at 4:10 PM, 11 of 13 voting members present.]*

JG read out voting thresholds from old passed motions. Clarified it's a percentage of votes that define simple and supermajority.

SM agreed that IC fixed the rate of votes and not the number. This is the decision presenting body, it cannot function with what has been developed in the TAC so it sounds foundational to him.

HK agreed with SM's opinion.

SM explained that the question here is not foundational, so 9 votes are needed for the current question/motion.

SS called the question.

FP objected.

EJ clarified we're voting on the TAC by roll call vote.

*[GS joined at 4:15 PM, 12 of 13 voting members present.]*

**FAILED** by roll call vote [8-4-1]. With CEA, GVEA, MEA, SES voting against and AEA absent.

JG introduced TAC Charter (TAC IRP and Standards Recommendation Development Process). Where we've been, now ready for IC TA.

**MOTION** to tentatively approve the TAC IRP and Standards Recommendation Development Process). 1JG, 2VDS.

BH commented he would vote no, just not ready. Close, but need consensus building and some verification and cleanup.

SS asked if BH can provide specific comments to help advance the question.

BH pointed out there is no definition of a task order. He can infer, but its missing. Open issue of director participation in working groups. And another substantive one somewhere that he's forgotten.

PM asked why JG asked for Tentative Approval of the TAC. JG clarified IC process, SS added final is the total application approval.

DB stated the motion to approve this is a surprise to him. How can we do this with a document that has never been presented to the IC. Should be a working session. There is plenty of new material and still blank areas in the document.

FP commented the conversation was to move portions of TAC to bylaws. This is a board charter, wonder if those items shouldn't stay here instead. Work those out within the TAC.

**WITHDRAW MOTION** 1JG, 2VDS.

LF asked what the best way is to proceed, and if people could enumerate all their issues with the document.

EJ asked if this work session is to discuss everything or just what has been changed since the last work session. SS clarified IC will discuss issues of people who came prepared.

SD stated one key issue is director participation on WGs. He suggested revision to make total director representation at 13, posted language in the chat box.

PM concurred with all of SD's point. He suggested getting rid of word class and get rid of sub paragraph 2. He wants to consolidate SMEs where he can.

DB requested clarification on SD's language. As written, it doesn't allow directors to designate someone within their organization, which is not right in his mind. DB asked if intent is simply to limit number of representatives? SD confirmed this is the intent. JWR concurred with DB's concern. VDS supported SD language, they believe it is equitable.

EJ asked how many SMEs will be on WG in this situation. SD clarified his change would dial it back to just qualified representatives, so 13. EJ continued that seems too possibly be reasonable.

DB asked SD to lead through example. DB posited a single director stakeholder class example - how does one person do SME activities and interest advocacy? Plus, how do you handle regulations that allow a director to write a dissent if they can't participate.

SD suggested we return to qualified representative language. And that the director participating on WG will be handled by bylaws. DB responded that in SD's scenario the qualified representative needs to handle SME tasks and manage interests.

BH voiced confusion. He stated that originally RRC agreed to pay for SMEs, 9 total. He read 080 regulation to require balance between represented stakeholder classes per the board balance. BH stated RRC is at 13 paid representatives versus one per stakeholder class, in this language would non-voting members get one as well? JG thanked BH for his comments.

VDS to BH and EJ point on cost, SD's language may well be less cost that SME and some other designee. Cost measured both in SME and QR, that cost is less, also difference between stakeholder class at 9 v 15. Non-voting members still count as shareholder classes. 9 v 15. If ½ of 15 choose to do it from their staff, then not paid by RRC. Savings is from controlling WG size. And the amount of time to make a more manageable WG. To DB point there needs to be coordination between director and SME to handle SME and advocacy tasks. But overall, this language streamlines the situation.

SS noted time is up, asked BO to advise whether the schedule necessitated a Wednesday IC meeting this week? BO stated that Wednesday meeting is happening, agenda is already solid.

SS thanked BO, advised no need for agenda setting item if its already set. SS allowed discussion to continue.

JG discussed cost of SMEs. From IC experience the RRC doesn't need a large slew of subject matter experts to handle matters. The 'experts' just need to be interest experts to handle board interests. If correlation did change from 9 to 13 RRC will need to discuss how those costs are managed in the budget. JG suggested that once costs and budget are worked out everything else will follow suit.

DM agreed with VDS on cost. DM stated RRC is paying either way. 13 is better option than previously suggested 21.

JE opined the issue is boiling down to cost. Perhaps we turn compensation on its head. Instead of per meeting, switch to per organization, let each organization use it as they see fit.

JG added that BudCom is meeting to discuss the TAC but no designs past that. If people have alternative solutions, they should send them to him to circulate to BudCom.

JE asked when we need TAC done. BO stated RRC is behind schedule as is. Need to push TAC to get other deliverables finalized.

## 9) Committee Updates

BySub: SD gave update, stated BySub still must finish governance charter, discrimination and harassment, whistleblower. Planning to bring all policies to IC on Wednesday.

*[Other committees declined to offer updates due to late hour.]*

## 10) Member Comments

SS solicited member comments, none offered.

## 11) Tentative Future IC Agenda for 2/2

BO underscored TAC is impacting overall schedule, will result in reduced review time for the balance of the application and impact dependencies. Agenda for Wednesday is BySub policies, PubSub policies, TAC.

## 12) Adjourn

**MOVE** to adjourn 1HK, 2BH.

**MEETING ADJOURNED at 5:02 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)

COA:	chart of accounts
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
PC:	Perkins Coie Law Firm
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
RCC:	regulatory cost charge
RE:	registered entity
RRC:	Railbelt Reliability Council
SB:	Senate bill
SES:	Seward Electric System
SOW:	scope of work
SRF:	simplified rate filing
StanCom:	standards subcommittee
TA:	tentatively approve, tentative approval
TAC:	technical advisory committee
TAQ:	technical advisory quango
TAT:	technical advisory team
TarCom:	tariff subcommittee
TIER:	times interest earned ratio
UOO:	user owner operator
USOA:	uniform system of accounts
WG:	working group

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1) November Expense Report
- 2) RRC standards development budget and schedule
- 3) IRP Workplan & Budget
- 4) Product Development Rule