

Railbelt Reliability Council Implementation Committee – Meeting

March 2, 2022

FINAL Minutes

1) Roll-call

The meeting was held via Zoom, was called to order at 11:00 am, and was chaired by JE.

Primary		Alternate		Organization
Brian Hickey (BH)	n	Jeff Warner (JWR)	Y	Chugach Electric Association
Frank Perkins (FP)	Y	John Burns (JB)	n	Golden Valley Electric Association
Dave Thomas (DT)	Y2	Rick Baldwin (RB)	Y	Homer Electric Association
Julie Estey (JE)	Y	Ed Jenkin (EJ)	Y3	Matanuska Electric Association
Lou Florence (LF)	Y4	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)	n	Sam Dennis (SD)	Y5	Cook Inlet Regional Inc.
Joel Groves (JG)	Y	Mike Craft (MC)	Y6	Alaska Environmental Power, LLC
Veri di Suvero (VDS)	Y7	Alyssa Sappenfield (ASF)	Y8	Alaska Public Interest Research Group
Chris Rose (CR)	n	Greg Stiegel (GS)	Y	Renewable Energy Alaska Project (REAP)
Paul Morrison (PM)	Y	Dustin Madden (DM)	n	Large Consumer
Hank Koegel (HK)	Y	David Newman (DN)	Y	Unaffiliated seat
Jeff Waller (JWL)	Y	James “Jay” Layne (JL)	Y	Regulatory Affairs and Public Advocacy
Bob Pickett (BP)	n	Antony Scott (AS)	n	Regulatory Commission of Alaska

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

Y1: DT joined at 11:10 AM.

Y4: SD left meeting at 12:49PM, rejoined at 1:25 PM.

Y2: EJ left at 12:49 PM, rejoined at 1:31 PM.

Y5: MC joined before 1:50 PM.

Y3: LF left meeting at 1:54 PM.

Y6: VDS left at 1:28 PM.

Y7: ASF joined at 11:41 AM, left meeting at 2:03 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	Left at 1:28 PM
Steve Mahoney, Manley & Brautigam (SM)	Y	Joined before 12:50 PM
Elena Romerdahl, Perkins Coie (ER)	Y	
Bayunt Ollek, Sapere (BO)	Y	
Sebastian Orillac, Sapere (SO)	Y	
Rachel Wilson, Synapse (RW)	n	
Lori-Jo Oswald, Wordsworth (LO)	n	
Rena Miller (RMR)	Y	

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, 1HK, 2VDS.

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

3) Consent Agenda

JE asked for requests to pull items from the consent agenda, none offered.

MOTION to approve consent agenda 1JG, 2DN.

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

4) PubSub – Confidentiality Policy

VDS introduced confidentiality policy for first look. Still under active development at committee. Some bits merit discussion, but not now.

JE interjected to ask what the process for the document will be? VDS clarified this is first look, will be looking for TA next Monday after some RMR/ER/LO cleanup.

VDS continued with first run through document.

LF asked why require hardcopies with document petitions?

VDS responded that a web portal for upload was flagged as a cybersecurity concern, and email submittal presented risks for mismanagement of confidential materials.

DB commented firstly to commend VDS for great job. On hard copy he suggested for some submittals hardcopy is simply not possible, namely for data, programs, models etc. Those exist only in digital realm.

VDS thanked DB for comment. They also flagged NDAs may apply to this.

ER clarified, electronic items could be submitted by air-gapped means, thumb drive or similar.

LF, to close this topic out, advised DU uses confidential portals and similar means to expedite transmittal of this stuff.

[DT joined at 11:10 AM, 12 of 13 voting members present.]

DT clarified that items like reports are easy enough to print out, but models exist in the cloud or something similar. You might print the inputs or outputs, but the model is a magic black box that can't be printed, or sometimes even put on a thumb drive.

ER responded, for purposes of petition, can provide flexibility for this. Point is to facilitate the petition process to enable review of the subject material and maintain confidentiality.

DB opined that at this point in time he is more concerned with properly managing hard copies than digital copies. You're not going to get a hard copy of programs. The source code is proprietary and you'll just never get it in any form. Need to mitigate cybersecurity risks and adhere to digital format.

VDS thanked all for the helpful feedback, will circulate refined language with commenters to strike the balance.

JE echoed DB comments, great job! VDS thanks JE and thanked all for contributing.

5) Tariff Workplan and Budget

EJ deferred to TL who led discussion. Tariff for application is done, will be ready to be filed concurrently with application. Walked through narrative and tariff filing budget estimates.

JE requested a motion.

MOTION to approve the workplan and budget for the tariff as presented. 1EJ, 2LF.

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

6) BudCom

a) Cost Allocation Methodology

JG introduced matter. Reviewed new direction with IC two weeks ago (2/16), no comments received then or since, so up for today is approval of new method. As refresher, difference is essentially net energy for load measured at load instead of net energy for load as measured at generation. Rationale is easier to compile numbers as avoids interchange reconciliation process. Impact is anticipated to be negligible.

EJ commented that the difference between net energy at generation and at metered loads. For the at generation approach, we consider distributed resources as a negative load. How does this difference address that?

JG replied the point is to simplify the calculation process by eliminating the complexities of where the energy comes from – LSE's plant, interchanges over the transmission system, distributed generation, etc. The proposed methodology is the LSE's native load as metered.

[DT commented in Zoom chat that some of HEA's older distributed roof-top solar meter installations only report net kWhs, not gross demand / supply and net].

JWR concurred with JG.

TL commented this is straightforward and makes sense. Raised a flag that the tariff does need to be adjusted to reflect this language. RMR confirmed, and will also need a Rule for this.

SD asked who does this, where does the data come from?

JG advised the RRC would compute the surcharge, presumably based on metered load data published in LSE tariffs on quarterly basis. But the availability of requisite data hasn't been verified.

JWR added that probably LSEs would do filings, perhaps a tariff between LSEs and RCA on this.

TL asked for clarification from JWR, tariff filing from LSEs? JWR clarified tariff filings on how the LSEs would recover the RRC surcharge in their rates.

TL agreed LSEs could do that, but how LSEs recover the surcharge cost is up to them. Don't know that RRC should presume any particular approach. But to the extent the RRC needs the load info to figure out the surcharge allocation, it can certainly request that.

JWR clarified that is why he said the LSEs would provide that. TL concurred, we can make that more specific in the tariff.

JE invited RMR to jump in. RMR added (1) how does RRC get info from LSEs - TL answered per the tariff - and (2) what do LSEs do to provide information, observed AS and AAC are silent on this. In 420(e) and (f), regs tell LSEs how they can set up a surcharge to recover the ERO surcharge. TL concurred those provisions don't speak to how they do it.

JE interjected that utilities were talking about a consistent approach, but that is separate matter.

SD concluded he thinks he understands. He recapped that the RRC would look at previous year net energy at load, set a budget, \$X, per prior year's data the surcharge allocations are thus, and provide that data to LSEs, they would figure out how they recover the cost, and cut the RRC a check.

JE confirmed yes that is the essence.

TL observed the balancing account is for the RRC, regs are silent on LSEs and how they manage the expense. Concurred with DT comment made in Zoom chat that the RRC cost might show up as similar to the RCC line item on ratepayer bills.

JWR advised there is also an open discussion on the formula to allocate RRC cost. Right now says calendar year, but considering a three-year average. Smooths allocation out if there are large load changes.

TL sought clarification on whether historic load is what is being talked about? JWR confirmed that is correct, not future projections.

MOTION to approve Cost Allocation Methodology as presented in 2/16 Meeting Packet. 1JG, 2JWR.

RMR, do we need to address the look back question?

JWR, just a timing issue. That process hasn't been concluded yet, but discussions are in progress.

MOTION to AMEND to allow either option, one-year or three-year look back. Change "year" to "year or years" into language. 1EJ, 2SD.

AMENDMENT PASSES with no objections [12-0-1].

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

[ASF joined at 11:41 AM, 12 of 13 voting members present.]

b) Initial RRC Budget

JG gave update. BudCom is optimistically pivoting to budget. Past two months and beyond BudCom has been consumed by TAC, so a bit behind schedule. Many of the big pieces exist as committee product, and many of those have come before IC – IRP, standards, tariff. Big missing pieces are RRC staff (which is partially included in the above) and the cost of all the RRC funded

committee participation – director fees, RRC funded SMEs, RRC funded QRs, appropriate staff level to run all the processes. BudCom will start pulling this together. Since budget is a relatively stand-alone element of the application, and given late date, expect this will come screeching into place at the last minute prior to 3/25 so the tariff and surcharge can be updated and submitted with the filing. There remain large unknowns on the budget requirements and burn rates, so we know the budget will be wrong. The goal is to get cash flow to support the board and CEO in standing up the organization, be as close as possible in budgeting, and recognize that regulations do provide for course correction through supplemental surcharge filings. The balancing account will also be available to help the RRC manage its cash flow.

ASF asked JG to clarify budget, JE shared similar concern.

JG clarified it is still a work in progress. Many pieces exist, not all, and just pivoted to it yesterday.

HK asked if we have a list of all items that are missing? JG replied yes and no. Working on it.

JE inquired what the status and plan for the transition period is?

JG replied BudCom issued a transition budget some time ago, that is out there. There was much discussion some time back about how the RRC would be funded during the transition period, but he is not aware of any new activity there. Since the RRC likely now exists as a shell, we are in the transition period and the presumption is the status quo IC funding process will continue through to the certification of the RRC at which time the surcharge will take over.

c) TAC Process

JG introduced matter. TAC draft issued Monday morning (version 17) is the final draft for approval. There were some minor language cleanups that occurred at BudCom yesterday in 3.1(1). v17 is an entirely new organization from IC's prior looks. The content is mostly the same but with substantial cleanup and reorganization. The process is much tighter, and more linear. Did more clearly delineate the document into two topics (TAC structure, TAC process) but kept them both in the single document. This is first look at this draft, could shoot for approval today or stick to first look and approve later. Schedule dictates swift progress, don't want to steam-roll the IC though.

LF commented he doesn't need a walk through. He wants this discussion to focus on the hard spots.

VDS requested a preview from ExCom, do we have another meeting before Monday? If not suggest we try to pass this.

JE advised no meeting scheduled, concurred with LF that JG highlight anything that has changed.

JG highlighted sections 3.3.2.1 qualified representatives and 3.3.2.2 subject matter experts, and read language of 3.3.2.2. Invited BudCom to raise other key elements of the document, none offered.

MOTION to approve TAC process document as presented 1JG, 2VDS.

MOTION TO AMEND 2nd paragraph to include at end of 2nd paragraph in Section 5: “Restricted WGs may allow public participants who have signed confidentiality agreements” 1ASF, 2SD

SD asked can we just delete the 3rd paragraph instead? JE said not yet, deal with this motion.

DB agree with SD. 3rd can go away. It is there to inform, but it could go away.

RB observed there are people in this world who will sign a CA and not honor it. With no sanctions to deter violations, don’t know how you can share CI and not be damaged by misuse or misdistribution.

LF commented we got to the right answer, but concerned about ASF modification. Objected to ASF amendment but support SD’s.

ASF asked about SD suggestion, does that leave possibility of manager discretion?

JG confirmed yes the paragraph 2 language only defined the process by which the bounds of the restricted WG are developed and approved. What the restrictions are is not defined at all. Paragraph 3 on vulnerability assessments was included as one specific example of a WG and perhaps the most restrictive WG possible. But it served its purpose to illustrate to the IC what this section means and now would support its deletion.

EJ commented so long as language allows manager to allow public participation, but in a manner where if we are talking confidential information it allows manager to exclude public from those conversations. EJ also requested the amendment be shared on the screen.

DN commented that bad actors can be just as likely within an LSE as a member of the public. Concerned about explicitly excluding that representation.

JWR was OK with deleting 3rd paragraph. It was an important example. 2nd paragraph, ok w/ CEII vs CI.

HK respond to DN comment. What he said is correct, but vulnerability goes up as the number of informed people goes up. Limiting the number of people is the only way to control leaks.

FP reviewing comments, for security purposes, NDA is not appropriate – it is a security clearance type of matter.

DB commented all we need to understand is that this paragraph was written for vulnerability assessments, that was the specific target. In the past LSEs have done this annually or so, they are familiar with the security requirements and it has never been an issue. The responsibility is not the RRCs, it is the LSEs. This is a systems operation issue, and that is in the domain of the LSEs. TAC will review the outcome, but it needs to maintain the historic confidentiality treatments. If this passes, the vulnerability assessment would continue to be done in-house by the LSEs and just pass the result to the RRC.

EJ pointed out he is COO for MEA, and he does not have clearance to all CEII / CII information. Some of this is extremely restricted. For due cause, as DN said. This amendment reads that any NDA'd member of the public has access to this stuff. That is extremely broad. At a minimum change 'will' to 'may'.

ASF interjected, "may" was the intent of her motion. *[motion documented with "may"]*

VDS spoke to interplay with the Confidentiality Policy. If member of public joins WG, they would still not have full access to everything. There are tiers of restriction, and discretion remains to let them in only as appropriate. If only speaking to vulnerability assessment, then appropriate to leave 3rd paragraph. Not comfortable with a blanket statement that the public are not allowed at any restricted WG. But if specific to vulnerability assessment, then OK with that.

PM asked does the 2nd paragraph (without the amendment and if 3rd paragraph is removed) allow manager to add someone from the public to the WG.

JG clarified, 2nd paragraph only provides a framework. It contains no specific restrictions, those would be developed by the manager in the task order work plan as appropriate to the specific scope and subject of the task order, and as approved by the CEO.

EJ recapped, based on what he's heard, that the 3rd paragraph is unnecessary since the confidentiality policy exists.

JG objected.

AMENDMENT FAILS [2-10-1] with DU and AKPIRG voting in favor and AEA absent.

AMENDMENT to strike 3rd and 4th paragraphs from section 5.2.

1SD, 2DB.

AMENDED with no objections [12-0-1]

JE called for further discussion on the main motion?

GS asked where the size of TAC is defined and where the size of a WG defined?

JG explained the size of the TAC is defined at the top of 1.0, it is set by the CEO. The presumption is it would eventually be four senior RRC engineers but this document does not state that.

JG continued, the size of a WG is not defined. It will include the manager as chair, and may include up to 13 QRs, up to 13 SMEs including RRC-funded and director-funded SMEs, and an undefined number of approved public participants. So it could be anywhere from 1 to many.

GS asked, in 3.5, what an executive session may be.

VDS clarified executive sessions are covered in the meeting policy. ASF confirmed this is correct.

GS observed the recommendation development process is very circular. Where does it all end?

JG concurred the process is very circular. The point of that is to ensure the final recommendation(s) that come to the Board (1) have relevant dissents based on the specific recommendation language, and (2) that the specific recommendation language also has a TAC-finding of technical soundness as required by regulation. Any time the manager, TAC, or board modifies the recommendation language from what the WG has reviewed, it needs to go back to the WG to refresh the dissents before it proceeds. So it is very mobius-strip like. The thin exit ramp strip off of mobius-hell is when the Board approves a TAC recommendation as submitted. All other outcomes stay in the loop. The board can't just vote something down and have it die, the process must move forward because the RRC has to do these things.

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

[JE called a recess from 12:49 to 12:55]

[EJ and SD left at 12:49 PM, 11 of 13 voting members present.]

[SM joined before 12:50 PM, 11 of 13 voting members present.]

7) **CME Program**

JWR introduced CMEP. Walk-thru of final IC comments and clean copy dated 2/28.

As with everything, certain things are flagged for later true-up.

LF interjected, suggest skip walk-thru and proceed to questions.

JWR advised will do an abbreviated walk through of key changes, hold questions to end, and did so.

MOTION to approve CMEP as presented with following changes: (1) at 3.4.1, #2, replace "RCA" with "RRC", and (2) the complaints section be moved to new section 3.7. 1JWR, 2DB.

ASF raised two items. Does this motion include 1.4 confidentiality sections?

JWR clarified none of the 1.4 comments have been deleted, intent remains to true up to confidentiality policy at AppCom review and integration.

ASF continued, issued with confidentiality policy, ~460(a)(4)(j), enforcement actions include opportunity for public comment. So unclear what is a proposed enforcement action. Notice of confirmed violation, notice of penalty, notice of alleged violation, all get sent to RE. Do all of these conform with regulations?

JWR responded, there was in-depth discussion with RMR, ER, StanCom on these topics. Outcome was there is no requirement until there is a confirmed violation and proposed enforcement action.

DH interjected, when the RE is presented with an alleged violation, the RE can contest that, it can go to appeal, and the whole thing gets dismissed. A confirmed violation is on the tail end of that process, and it is a real thing that is ready for public comment and transfer to RCA. Still not final pursuant to the RCA outcome, but it is a final thing for the RRC.

JE asked ASF if any amendments were forthcoming.

VDS advised AKPIRG will abstain.

PASSED with no objections and AKPIRG abstaining [11-0-2].

[DH and VDS left meeting at 1:28 PM, 11 of 13 voting members present.]

8) IRP Process

DB asked BO to display the IRP Process and led discussion. Document has same intent as prior versions, but has now been through RMR and ER review. Same intent, just addressed their comments. Also some true-up is still required to sync with other documents. He suggested approving and defer true-up to AppCom.

MOTION to approve document, deferring non-substantive revisions to AppCom. 1DB, 2FP.

ASF raised issue, and page 106 of packet at section 6. Clarify intent of language ‘...if TAC recommendation is approved by the board, public comment is completed’.

[EJ rejoined at 1:31 PM, 11 of 13 voting members present.]

DB explained, no need to revisit at WGs in this scenario. ASF asked if we can clean up this language to clarify WG comment, not all comment.

JE interjected, need an amendment.

MOTION to AMEND to revert this language to “following board approval, the PRP will be issued for public comment and LSEs will consult with their boards...” 1ASF, no 2nd, motion fails.

PM thanked team for impressive document. Concerned, at 3.2 page 4, and throughout, term is ‘the IRP will develop a resource plan that is least cost and greatest value’. In statute, least cost is not used. Wording is “cost effective and greatest value”. Slight twist, but greatest value is the driver.

DB responded, regs require ‘lowest reasonable cost’. As you move thru IRP process, the criteria changes. A project, or portfolio are evaluated on lowest reasonable cost. The PRP is evaluated on greatest value, considering two LRC portfolios. Greatest value comes in at the end.

PM stated he didn’t see ‘lowest cost’ anywhere in regs.

[SD returned at 1:25, 12 of 13 voting members present.]

RMR interjected that “cost effective” and “lowest reasonable cost” are both used in the regs. She explained the IRP was trying to differentiate how portfolios were selected.

DB read out the regs that refer to “lowest reasonable cost”, in section 4A.

EJ added that regulations require “lowest reasonable cost” analysis then choose your scenario based on greatest value.

RMR concurred with DB's interpretation. PM replied that he is not ready to make any changes at this time.

JG advised AEP will abstain.

PASSED with no objections [11-0-2] with AEP abstaining.

JE thanked DB and committee and RW for great job.

9) Bylaws

JE checked in with SD. 15 minutes remain, should we proceed with bylaws? SD advised nothing for committee to do, must keep on with it at IC.

EJ asked about status of legal review? SD deferred to ER. ER replied, the question was board members participating on WGs. There is no provision in regs that require a dissent by a director. But in safe harbor, there is a requirement that director put a QR on a committee. There could be a resource adequacy question of whether directors have resources to put QRs on committees. Bylaws allow for a budget for this, but the budget is not defined so it could be deemed inadequate. So there is the potential flag with that. Focus of RCA if this becomes an issue can be expected to be on the QR and ability of small directors to participate through their QRs.

SD commented in the current bylaws, each director can appoint a QR paid by RRC. This issue is why that provision is there.

[LF left at 1:45 PM, 11 of 13 voting members present.]

ER concurred, but if questions are raised on this matter, they will revolve around this point. Unclear because don't understand budget, number of committees running, budget adequacy, etc. Not a red flag but a flag. For example if budget is low, it violates the principal, so potentially an issue.

JE could hop into bylaws, but not much time. Since bylaws narratives still need to be drafted and go through AppCom and ER, would be good to get through bylaws then this week. That presumes a 3rd meeting, just for bylaws. That allows weekend for working on stuff.

JE suggested look for meeting time. Suggest Thursday 8:00-10:00 AM, or 1:30 to 3:30 PM. HK preferred not the morning, JG advised he cannot, and is unavailable starting Friday but MC may be available. JE suggested 1:30 PM tomorrow? EJ advised he has negotiations 9:00 AM-3:00 PM. JE assented to that suggestion, she is just looking to have seats be represented. DT advised he cannot do afternoon tomorrow, but RB is available.

JWR advised PubSub meets tomorrow. ASF advised she and VDS both will be in PubSub Thursday at 11:00 AM.

[MC joined sometime before 1:50 PM 11 of 13 voting members present.]

JE concluded IC will meet at 8 AM tomorrow.

10) Committee Updates

JE asked if any updates.

BySub: SD advised draft narratives pending from RMR, SD can review without BySub to accept/address comments and get back to RMR.

TarCom: No update.

StanCom: No update.

IRPcom: No update.

BudCom: No update.

PubSub: VDS advised meeting this week to finish out confidentiality. Will have that back on Monday for approval. Then PubSub narrative is last item.

AppCom: JE advised, pursuant to ER review, cleared to limit Rules to regulations, otherwise just rules. For many big deliverables, final run through is needed by RMR / LO. AppCom will make these changes without committee oversight, but will flag substantive changes for review.

ExCom: No update. Meets tomorrow.

11) Member Comments

JG asked what the approval threshold will be to approve the bylaws? The IC will be done, we will be an RRC shell, so it is simple majority or something else? Should have clarity / consensus before the vote happens on 3/14. Hopefully a moot question, but suggest that we pin down an answer before we are in the vote, just in case.

SM responded, it is up to the directors, and expect it would be per the bylaws.

RB commented, he has always taken the position that bylaws and articles must be approved at the same time to avoid this issue. JG is right though, since we approved the articles first, then we're in a no-man's-land. A bit unclear. But if we cannot approve the bylaws by a clear majority, the RRC is practically dead-on-arrival anyway.

PM asked which supermajority applies, IC or RRC?

SM observed PM has a good point. Directors are approving bylaws, not the IC. So what the directors choose.

JE advised will sort out at ExCom and advise. JG observed he has the best questions.

DB commented BudCom is preparing the budget for the certificated RRC. Is there a requirement to show how the entity is funded in the transition period? JE deferred to ER / RMR? But think the answer is maintain status quo and don't ask permission?

RMR advised, if recall the RCA workshop correctly, informal guidance was we should maintain the status quo and just stick with that. The regs don't require a budget at application filing, but the motion to approve the tariff with the application means we do need a budget to set the surcharge and to put the tariff into effect. ER? ER confirmed that is correct. DB thanked ER and RMR.

[ASF left meeting at 2:03 PM, 10 of 13 voting members present.]

EJ added that a budget is needed for the surcharge filing. If that is part of the filing, need a budget.

JG asked if the budget and tariff filing needed to be concurrent with the application, or if the tariff could lag and still result in an approved tariff when the RRC gets certificated.

ER advised that RCA staff said their intent is to issue a single public notice for both the application filing and tariff filing, so strictly speaking they do not need to be concurrent but it is much cleaner procedurally if they are concurrent. Otherwise it potentially becomes a separate petition, separate docket, overall messier.

JG thanked ER for clarification.

12) MOTION to ADJOURN 1JG, 2DT ADJOURNED AT 2:07 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. Tariff Workplan and Budget
2. Cost Allocation Methodology
3. TAC Process
4. CME Program
5. IRP Process