

**Railbelt Reliability Council Implementation Committee – Meeting**  
**February 14, 2022**  
**FINAL Minutes**

**1) Roll-call**

The meeting was held via Zoom, was called to order upon reaching quorum 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)	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)	n	City of Seward
Kirk Warren (KW)	Y	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)	Y3	Alaska Environmental Power, LLC
Veri di Suvero (VDS)	Y	Alyssa Sappenfield (ASF)	Y	Alaska Public Interest Research Group
Chris Rose (CR)	Y	Greg Stiegel (GS)	n	Renewable Energy Alaska Project (REAP)
Paul Morrison (PM)	Y	Dustin Madden (DM)	n	Large Consumer
Hank Koegel (HK)	Y	David Newman (DN)	Y4	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 joined at 1:50 PM. Y2: EJ left at 2:45 PM, rejoined 3:00 PM, left at 3:37 PM. Y3: MC left at 2:52 PM.  
Y4: DN left at 3:13 PM.

IC Consultant	Y/n	Attendance Notes
Tom Lovas, Energy and Resource Economics (TL)	Y	
Dana Zentz, Fish Bay Consulting (DZ)	n	
David Hilt, Grid Reliability (DH)	Y	
Steve Mahoney, Manley & Brautigam (SM)	Y	
Elena Romerdahl, Perkins Coie (ER)	Y	
Bayunt Ollek, Sapere (BO)	Y	
Sebastian Orillac, Sapere (SO)	n	
Rachel Wilson, Synapse (RW)	n	
Lori-Jo Oswald, Wordsworth (LO)	n	
Rena Miller (RMR)	Y	

13 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, 1VDS, 2EJ.

**PASSED** with no objections. [13-0-0].

### 3) ExCom Update

#### a. Workplan check in.

SS advised draft application date moved to all deliverables approved 3/7, plus a couple days for compilation. Handed to BO for review.

BO advised he's been compressing the schedule as much as possible, but hit the limit. Pushed application back a week. 3/7 is all documents IC approved and transmitted to AppCom for integration and distribution prior to 3/14 meeting. Doesn't include narratives, those will go straight into application, no IC approval necessary.

Deliverables that miss 3/7 deadline will have to be integrated later.

PM asked what the final application submittal deadline is? SS clarified 3/28.

TL commented he is confused. Tariff narrative will include workplan and budget. Requested clarification. BO referred to RMR. RMR explained don't need a separate narrative for the tariff workplan and budget. That is for the IRP and standards. So tariff workplan / budget narrative no longer necessary. TL asked so is it a consolidated narrative now? BO clarified still need tariff workplan/budget and tariff narrative. Narrative specific to tariff workplan/budget is not needed.

EJ agreed that the review process we have works. Just sent narrative to RMR, she would point out any problems.

TL concluded that there may be some conflict and integration issues, but our submittals are in so will just see how it plays out.

CR asked BO about the 28<sup>th</sup> meeting there are many items to review, how do we get through all of them. BO deferred to ExCom on plan. Too soon to make call given overall fluidity. Expect 28<sup>th</sup> will be a full agenda regardless. Also, the 3/2 meeting is likely to be time consuming as well. Committee work is the expected bottleneck. Just a few committees doing much of the outstanding work now, so work shift is being watched. Three weeks left so can see now how it all plays out.

EJ pointed out tariff narrative on 2/28 meeting agenda is AppCom's responsibility.

SS continued, asked RMR about her/AppCom workload.

RMR advised looking good. AppCom is tracking lots of moving pieces. Trying to get ahead where possible.

#### b. 3/14 Application Workshop

Draft application review session is planned for 3/14 in Anchorage, also organizational meeting for about an hour at the end of the day.

BH addressed location and travel. Meeting is at Embassy Suites. Setup for 2 full days, 30 people, unsure if we will need day 2 yet. Travel arrangement requests should be directed to Arden Quezon

at CEA. Need info by 3/1. Clarified CEA needs to do the arrangements if you want utilities to pay for it. Can't do reimbursement.

SS added, expect RMR, SM, ER, BO, SO to join us in person. No plan to do video conference.

BH clarified contractors with existing contracts can do travel through their contracts and not separately. TL asked if he should attend. EJ advised up to AppCom, expect will be done with tariff so not needed there. SS asked BH to circulate Arden's info: [arden\_quezon@chugachelectric.com]

#### c. 3/25 Special IC Meeting

Due to weekend app deadline, there is a need for a special IC meeting and vote to approve the application. No edits, just up or down vote. Looking at morning of 3/25. BO will circulate doodle poll.

DN advised he will not be available.

FP asked, as employee of GVEA, does he need to go through CEA for 3/14 travel arrangements? BH clarified no he does not.

JWR asked what the gap between 3/15 and 3/25 is for? SS deferred to RMR.

RMR advised, workshop allows for changes to provisions to support application. Not wordsmithing but other tweaking. This 10-day period gives time to incorporate changes. BO confirmed yes, time is for change integration. Intent is to have final application out on 3/21, full work week prior to final vote.

#### **4) Tariff for Application**

EJ introduced topic.

**MOTION** to approve draft tariff as submitted. 1EJ, 2FP.

EJ continued, up last week, no further comments or questions came up over past week.

BH thanked tariff committee for hard work.

SS asked red/green/black language, what is this for. Is intent to accept all changes and create blackline version? So no further changes expected?

EJ clarified specific references to other work products will remain subject to change until those documents are finalized. TL confirmed correct. Two main things. 1 is finalized definitions, 2 is several rules referenced that need final names inserted. Also the final CMEP language needs to be inserted. TL suggested turn it all black, then any subsequent changes be highlighted.

SS gave recommendation that any further changes be made under Track Changes for final approval of application. RMR concurred, as a global practice she will track every change made to a TA'd document.

DB called the question.

JG objected.

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

SS observed there are plenty of details to work out post certification, but good document. EJ thanked TL for valued work. TL thanked IC for opportunity.

EJ clarified this now belongs to AppCom and the IC. RMR confirmed yes.

## 5) CME Program

JWR introduced topic. Packet document doesn't include markups, or very recent CR or ASF comments. JWR shared his version which does include these late additions.

CR wanted to understand who is making the value judgements in the document. JWR clarified he would go over that today.

ASF asked how this process relates to PubSub's confidentiality policy and whether it should be included in the CMEP. JWR stated they will go through to ensure it follows or references directly the PubSub confidentiality policy, once that is approved.

DB voiced concern with language saying RRC is from CEO down. It should start at board and go down. Other point, confidentiality, not LSEs but any RE.

JG voiced concern with approving this document. He asked RMR if this could be called the working CMEP for the application and so RCA knows the RRC is still working on this. Secondly it would be useful to see a sectional analysis that compares this CMEP to the NERC process.

JWR deferred to RMR. She went over application requirements, rules are fair and impartial means to enforce standards. Defined by IC to be the CMEP. Could be other ways to consider, but up to AppCom and CMEP.

JWR also pointed out several docs herein that don't exist. This is the rule, but other docs need to be developed. Path considered so far was that CMEP would be the rule.

JWR asked DH to respond to JG's 2<sup>nd</sup> question. This doc vs NERC? High level comment?

DH had one comment, quickly, overall process in FERC/NERC, when we submitted our application, took 5 years for final approval of CMEP docs. Several conditional approvals with 'must change this'. So this won't be last bite at apple. Even after FERC approval, NERC changed more language. DH agreed he could go through this doc and compare it to NERC. That is doable, can see value in that.

DB referred to JG comment. Curious if we are under obligation or date if we don't define RS by a certain date? JWR commented that RCA will give us a timeframe in certain order. RMR confirmed this is correct, RCA will be looking for timeframe for sure.

CR stated that JG raised important questions. There is time before we need this, but regulations say what they say for application requirements. Hearing process is integral to this but we don't have that in here. Also hear we should expect plenty of RCA back and forth. Maybe we call it proposed – obviously not complete. Not sure how RCA will view that.

JWR responded to CR – part of what drove this work is regulation requirements. RE sign up process is required, so it is in here. Agreed on hearing process being important but that is not in this document.

SS directed next question to ER – risks of draft vs. part of certification approval request. ER responded, depends on what you're talking about, but everything that is submitted is technically a draft. The assumption should be there will be many questions from RCA.

LF appreciated JG comments. Encouraged all to think about trying to put together subset of docs we need for RRC to be fully functioning. Not what we chose, but what RCA chose in their regulations. Because they gave us a deadline, we have to do what we can. The application is all draft. Shouldn't compromise suitability of application by calling it a draft. Submit it all and do the best we can. LF commented that this is a robust document, admittedly not complete.

SS continued, given time available and progress, what is plan for completion of review?

JG prefaced that SS is correct there is so much to do and so little time. JG suggested prefacing the application letting RCA know that this document will be further refined in the future.

JWR said he views this as a complete document. Does what it needs to adequately. Confidentiality is still an issue. He understood all along we need to modify it. Doesn't think there is much left to do for the CMEP.

DH advised NERC also included hearing procedures as separate document. That document is as lengthy as this document. StanCom decided to kick hearing process to a different place. Having it in here wouldn't be possible in the current timeframe.

JWR appreciated SS concerns. Will just keep going as best as he can to go over this document in the time allotted.

JWR continued through 2.0.

CR, at 2.4, final clarification, asked who makes the RRC decision, and is there an appeals process? RMR flagged appeals is a broader issue, question of standard appeal process that may apply here. CR thanked for clarification, point is appeal is internal to RRC, and may point to standard process.

JWR continued through 3.0. At 3.2 CR asked DH how RRC had authority to audit without notice. DH responded that spot audits can get ten days' notice generally. SD asked when and in what document will RRC auditing be fully defined and laid out. JWR answered that hearing process will define most of that. It would most likely fall in a policy, name uncertain for now.

*[EJ left meeting at 2:45 PM, 12 of 13 voting members present]*

ASF flagged, at 3.2.1, what does 'recent' mean? Is it defined? JWR said doc was built from NERC template, asked DH. DH recalled either 3 or 5 years, not sure which. Unclear if this can be staff or consultant, would want consultant disclosure for sure.

RMR added that ASF suggestion is good. Per 460(a)(3) rule, JWR and DH have been helpful in advancing her understanding that this is not part of enforcement, which is what 460(a)(3) is about. JWR concurred, that is at Section 4.

JG, at 3.2.2, small IPPs, asked who may or may not be REs, sub 1 MW, possibly sub 5 MW, will typically be part time employees with no full-time capacity to review or catch a last-minute change and object within 5 business days. In recognition of this, suggest 10 business days instead to conform to timeframe over at 3.4.1.

JWR recognized point, but document has been out for awhile. JWR would entertain a motion. DH advised this is just within the last 20 days prior. JG observed there is no motion on the table so odd to bring forward motion for amendment here.

DB added that JG comment underscores need for all to review the standards.

Discussion on overall process. BO confirmed no motion on floor, JWR concurred, that is intentional, SS observed the CMEP is not ready for approval today.

CR opined that confidentiality is big issue, would like to see that settle down before approving this.

MC asked if there's opposition to JG's suggestion to changing to 10 business days.

JWR said no, will take it back to StanCom.

JG asked, at 3.2.5, why observers for an audit can move to a different audit, it seems inappropriate.

DH replied that the intent is that observers are there to learn how an audit is conducted.

JG suggested clarifying role of observers. Thought they would be members of the audited entity but not part of the team.

DB said also observers are often from other entities, wanting to learn from others' mistakes so they can take corrective action.

DH concurred and thanked DB for pointing that out.

*[MC left at 2:52 PM, 12 of 13 voting members present]*

CR asked about confidentiality at 3.4.

JWR said this is really a broader issue. If there are only 7, maybe 10 REs on the Railbelt, need to think through the confidentiality and CEII handling.

SS called time on this agenda item. Asked JWR to advise on strategy to finish this document? JWR advised need confidentiality policy in here, so it can integrate CMEP and CMEP can reference that policy. Alignment is essential.

*[EJ joined meeting at 3:00 PM, 13 of 13 voting members present]*

#### 6) AppCom

RMR introduced original set of books rule for approval.

**MOTION** to approve rule ER-9 1BH, 2EJ.

**PASSED** with no objections [13-0-0].

#### 7) PubCom

VDS introduced PubSub, two policies today. Public Meetings and Confidentiality.

Public Meetings, TA'd last week, found some nits in meetings definitions that have been fixed. Now conforms to RRO definitions of special meetings.

**MOTION** to approve revised public meeting policy 1CR, 2DT.

PM asked why special meetings language is needed?

VDS deferred to SM.

SM explained normally you can amend the agenda. In a special meeting, you cannot change the agenda beyond what was noticed. In a general meeting anything can happen through agenda changes, new business, etc. A special meeting does not allow that.

**PASSED** with no objections [13-0-0].

VDS continued with the confidentiality policy. Several deliverables are entangled with this policy. Developed with DH and ER. Encouraged early comment / involvement, discouraged late engagement.

VDS did first walkthrough of Confidential Documents Policy – working draft. Welcomed comment.

BH asked how ER was involved in drafting this. How normal is this document compared to typical requirements and RCA requirements?

ER responded, she took and revised committee draft and tried to model after RCA process. This is consistent with statutory and regulatory requirements. Some notes, like the NDA piece, are new and not vetted, but base doc conforms to those requirements.

SD heard concerns about confidentiality in CMEP. Tried to just reference documents. Could this be a viable reference for the CMEP and just leave it at that?

VDS responded, 1.1 has some processes that belong in the CMEP. JWL's guidance is don't make the reader leapfrog excessively, too hard to parse language.

LF commented this is a great start, one of the last big hills to climb. Concerned with requests to see confidential info. Can't see how RRC could ever unilaterally agree to release CEII or CII information. That is not under RRC discretion to do. That seems too broad.

SS interjected, unclear what info the RRC is empowered to ask of REs, LSE or IPP. Concerned about letting RRC decide and compel decision. One thing to ask about wind farm capacity factor, another to ask what the cost of GE technicians is. Also, who is responsible for paying for appeals etc? In SS's opinion it is onerous for IPPs to navigate all this. IPPs are exempt from certain elements of regulations, don't understand all the interplay here.

VDS responded, both to SS and LF, anyone can petition to see information, but RRC will deny it. On CEII or CII, request will just be denied. RRC doesn't have jurisdiction to force info submittal. Directors sign to conform to COC, but not to the ends of the earth. End requirement is RCA jurisdiction. Any entity outside of RCA authority we have no control over, and just have to say please and hope for best.

VDS conceded, policy affects us all, can be anxiety inducing, working to get some answers.

FP observed he doesn't envy VDS. This is a tough item to finish. Contractual side is nuanced, won't go there. On CEII, more depth there than we are thinking. Need to reflect this.

*[EJ left at 3:30 PM, 12 of 13 voting members present]*

FP referred to AKCIP 4 as an example, very detailed, very significant, more to it that we are discussing here. VDS thanked FP, requested that he share that document. FP concurred he will.

DB concurred with LF and FP, VDS gave excellent review. It is unfortunate though that we are using RCA as template. We have no power to compel info, we have to ask for permission. We can ask the RCA to compel for us in limited circumstances, otherwise it's a request. If we want a good IRP, we will need to get info from IPPs, LSEs, manufacturers, etc. That is why we have the NDA language to try and enable information sharing. Complimented VDS for trying to walk this tight rope.

RB commented to append to DB, VDS has done an excellent job dealing with contentious, murky subject matter. RB suggested confidentiality is a policy that can create log jams. The problem that comes to mind, both as someone who would like to see utility info and as someone who represents a utility that wants to hold info close, in litigation parties can be compelled to share information. In this process, short of a fine what else can be done. RB asked ER, what can the RRC do to compel information out of any entity?

ER added that question came up early on. Understanding is you go to the RCA to compel. Depends on type of entity. Need to do another pass to make that clearer. Related to DB point about NDAs and so on, as means to get the info we need. May need a broader discussion with RCA to address this.



VDS thanked all for comment. Hard work. Next steps are dialog with SM, what items beyond IRP and standards should we anticipate? Is overarching process as for rules appropriate? They welcome all feedback. Stated that ER is working on jurisdiction, and they're working with DH on what is typically handled and how. Working with DZ on comparable IPR processes in L48 on typical data needs and processes. VDS is trying to find our wiggle room, balancing following the RCA process and what other options exist.

VDS ended by saying there are two PubSub meetings this week. Wednesday at 8 AM, review this policy, Thursday 2:00-3:30, delve into more existential questions as raised today. Also talking about Documents Policy at one of those meetings. Can go through Documents Policy today also if time allows.

SS advised have 40 minutes left, till end of agenda time.

VDS opened floor for RMR / ER for further comments, none offered.

VDS continued to Document Policy, proceeded to walk through document.

RMR noted this is not contingent on RRC confidential policy. This pertains to all the other items.

SS asked what status of this is. VDS advised this is first look, may try to TA this Wednesday. Come to PubSub or provide comments before then.

DB asked, to VDS and ER, can we state in this doc that CEII / CII is not accessible through this policy?

ER confirmed, documents labels, can specify it by using those.

VDS added caveat, general public, definitely, but then have type 1 members that have signed a CA have different level of access, staff sees all of it, board sees some of it. Need to consider all those actors on WGs and elsewhere.

## **8) TAC Process Review**

JG described current situation of TAC. Working through revisions, trying to get a clean copy back for IC approval.

SS asked if the TAC would be up for a vote by the 16<sup>th</sup>. JG commented more realistically it would be next Monday 2/21.

FP suggested, if meeting on Wed goes well, could we schedule a Friday meeting to close this out?

SS asked what is on the agenda for Wed if not TAC? BO offered anything we can do with TAC Wed to get it set for approval Monday would be priority. A few other minor items that don't warrant a meeting on their own.

## 9) Committee Updates

BySub: SD gave update. BySub had session this morning, got through most of bylaws, tomorrow RMR and SD will review last gaps in the regs. BySub will meet on Wednesday, with luck, finish bylaws and move into packet for Monday 1<sup>st</sup> look.

StanCom: JWR gave update. CMEP, clean up and address comments. Standards development process started last week, will keep working for approval ASAP.

TarCom: TL gave update. Put together narrative, workplan, budget, passed to AppCom team for their action. Tariff reformat will occur per TarCom meeting today. TL will stand by to support RMR / ER for tariff approval processes.

IRPcom: DB gave update. Winding down. Narrative back from RMR, comments had nothing major. Final version of IRP process is back from Rachel. She will keep answering emails for the next week or so. Did get some changes from ER, circulating to committee for comment. Depending on comments will define next actions.

SS asked if this would be in the packet for next week? DB confirmed yes.

BudCom: JG gave update. BudCom will take up review comments tomorrow morning and provide direction for completion of review process. Expect document(s) back next week. Unsure if Monday or Wednesday.

AppCom. RMR gave update. BH will be chairing tomorrow, some questions on process next.

ExCom. SS gave update. Nothing to report. Next meeting next Thursday. Wed for TAC, then CMEP and Confidentiality.

FP said he was curious, should we expect to see similar process from RCA on their development process for our materials? Do we expect that, and if yes does that make our work here easier?

SS asked if anyone wanted to take a crack at that one? FP suggested JWL best to answer.

ER went for it. Unlikely to see a redline, but they will flag issues and require a resubmittal.

RMR offered a reminder, in workshop they suggested they could suspend elements for further investigation. Could certificate us and have a bunch of parallel suspended materials.

TL concurred with that. Review it, check against their regs, have a check sheet of conformance, and require us to add information through a written order to submit a compliance filing for a tariff filings type framework.

FP asked, so if they come back like that, does that mean our Rules will likely be changed no matter what?

TL advised, not necessarily. They may approve our submittals but we can always submit changes to our Rules anyway. Once we're established and have our tariff in place, we can tweak things

through routine filings. That could take several iterations. As we make compliance filings they go into effect unless suspended.

PubSub: VDS gave update. Already covered it. To reiterate, Documents Policy for Wednesday, 8AM Wed, 2-3:30p for the one on Thurs. Come all!

## 10) Member Comments

CR commented to thank all the committee chairs for their great work.

## 11) MEETING ADJOURNED AT 4:03 PM. 1CR, 2HK.

### 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

Items Attached:

1. Tariff