



Filing Receipt

Filing Date - 2024-02-23 09:34:34 AM

Control Number - 56176

Item Number - 3

Texas Backup Power Package Advisory Committee

Project #56176

2/22/2024

Meeting convened at 1:32 PM.

Meeting Attendees:

- Sen. Nathan Johnson
- Rep. Jay Dean
- Alison Silverstein
- Ivan Velasquez, Oncor
- Kevin Knippa, Texas HHSC
- Matt Boms, TAEBA
- Blair Walsh, TDEM
- Adriana Hernandez, (Rep. Hernandez)
- Rudy England (Sen. Johnson)
- Lauren Cobb (Sen. Johnson)
- Matt Patterson, (Sen. Middleton)
- Tracie Tolle, PUC
- Jess Heck, PUC
- Brooke Camet, PUC
- Julie Davis, OPUC
- Matthew Cooksey, OPUC
- Nabaraj Pokharel, OPUC
- Christopher A Hill, Deloitte
- Brenda Villarreal, Deloitte
- Lucas Martin, Deloitte
- Alfredo Zarate, Deloitte

- I. The types of projects that should be funded, and procedures for the project application process:
 - a. Silverstein: Should not to be over restrictive about how to define facilities.
 - i. Ex: Hospitals, does that definition include cancer treatment facilities? Don't want to limit necessary care centers.
 - b. Hill: There will be a gray area surrounding the selection of applicants, should develop some way to draw a clear line on the range of applicants to avoid funding being taken advantage of.

- c. Johnson: Should have a clear idea of what exactly people are applying for so we know how to address the application issues.
 - d. Hill: The outreach is feasible to let people know this grant exists, we just need to know who we are trying to reach.
- II. Regarding the research project and timeline from the PUC contractor:
- a. Silverstein: Timing issue; in the next couple months the PUC is releasing the Deloitte drafted contractor which designs back up power packages, the contractor will have to do a survey to find out what the critical facilities are; we need to figure out what a critical facility is before they can start this research.
 - b. Tolle: Asking for clarity surrounding the survey. Confirming that we want to identify all possible facilities that could qualify.
 - c. Silverstein: The survey will be used to assess what packages are needed to offer to facilities.
- III. Defining qualifying critical facilities; how to locate qualifying facilities:
- a. Boms: Is there a way to crowdsource this information to get it directly from the source (local level)? This could alleviate the amount of work the commission is responsible for.
 - b. Knippa: HHSC is in charge of licensing for childcare and healthcare programs, could use the information from those programs to see what the requirements are and improve the backup power for associated facilities; Texas department of insurance has a list of campuses that might need these generators.
 - c. Johnson: Put together a list of categories to look into for locating qualifying facilities.
 - d. Velasquez: Might want to consider other criteria to help whittle down the list of who's eligible; provider companies can help provide a list of usage and needs for back up power.
- IV. The timeline and information included in the PUC research report; timeline for the BPP:

- a. Hill: Confirming the date for September 1st for the report from the research entity.
 - b. Johnson: Would rather have August 1st deadline, the more time the better.
 - c. Hill: What timeline are we expecting for the grant packages?
New timeline established: August 1st: receive the research report, Oct 1st: release commission report.
 - d. Silverstein: Our timeline needs to be much longer, considering how long it takes to select researchers and put together package designs. There will probably be another year and a half after the August 1 research deadline to get this project up and running.
 - e. Tolle: August 1st deadline would be difficult to achieve.
 - f. Hill: What do we need out of the report?
 - g. Silverstein: Need to establish what are the qualifications and the disqualifications for which facilities can apply.
 - h. Davis: Don't need to reinvent the wheel unnecessarily, look to see if there is already established criteria for the most critical facilities, and if there's already an existing list somewhere.
 - i. Walsh: There is no consolidated definition for critical infrastructure, there are lists from separate agencies that list different kinds of establishments, and usually these lists come from the local level. Some of these lists were already collected during the map of SB 3.
- V. Regarding outside council and input:
- a. Silverstein: Regarding public and stakeholder input, figure out how to create opportunities for them to provide input for the project.
 - b. Johnson: Would like everyone to start reaching out informally, be reaching out to anyone who has interest or information on these matters.
 - c. Knippa: HHSC can help get the word out and find who is needed to start stepping in.

- d. Boms: Maybe we should include public schools on this list, since they aren't explicitly listed.
- e. Johnson: Opening up the programs to public schools would create an entire expansion of the program, unsure if this is the direction we want to go. Currently, the focus of the program is on giving power to critical facilities that have an immediate effect on public safety. Continue to talk to people about this, ask questions and gather more information for the next meeting on March 11th.

Meeting adjourned at 2:28 PM.