

**FINAL**

A meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, September 13, 2013 at the Colonnade Hotel, 120 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA pursuant to notice duly given. A quorum determined in accordance with the Second Restated NEPOOL Agreement was present and acting throughout the meeting. Attachment 1 identifies the members, alternates, and temporary alternates attending the meeting.

Mr. Calvin Bowie, Chair, presided and Mr. David Doot, Secretary, recorded. Mr. Bowie welcomed the members, alternates and guests who were present.

**RECOGNITION OF FERNANDO DASILVA**

Mr. Bowie reported that Mr. Fernando DaSilva was retiring from NextEra. He referred the Committee to a tribute to Mr. DaSilva produced by Mr. Peter Fuller, as presented at the NEPOOL Markets Committee Summer Meeting. Following the Committee's review of the tribute presentation, Mr. Fuller read and presented the following resolution to Mr. DaSilva:

**RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION**

Fernando DaSilva

*WHEREAS*, Mr. Fernando DaSilva, the current Director of Market Affairs of NextEra Energy Resources, LLC, has been involved in the New England Power Pool for 30 years in virtually every role and served on virtually every committee imagined and real, including as a member or alternate of the Participants Committee and its Generation Sector for well over 13 years; and

*WHEREAS*, Fernando has always contributed to NEPOOL with great grace, clarity and brevity, and, while staunchly advocating for his Company, has unfailingly done so with a gentlemanly charm, genuine respect for his colleagues, and distinctive ability, where necessary, to disagree without being disagreeable; and

*WHEREAS*, Fernando has resigned from his membership on this Committee and is surrendering his standing as most senior statesman in the Generation Sector and status as The Most Interesting Man in NEPOOL in order to be a full-time husband, father, and grandfather, a part-time golfer, and otherwise engage in a life of leisure here and abroad to the extent permitted by those full- and part-time duties;

*NOW, THEREFORE*, the Participants Committee of the New England Power Pool, on behalf of the NEPOOL Participants, hereby expresses its gratitude to Fernando for his many

years of service to the Pool and wishes him well in his future endeavors upon his retirement from NextEra.

Mr. DaSilva expressed appreciation to Mr. Fuller and to the Committee for their long standing working relationships and personal relationships developed over the years. On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Doot expressed appreciation to Mr. DaSilva and presented him with golf-related gifts and welcomed him to participate as a guest in future NEPOOL gatherings.

#### **APPROVAL OF JUNE 25-27, AUGUST 2, AND AUGUST 16, 2013 MINUTES**

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes for the June 25-27, August 2, and August 16, 2013 Participants Committee meetings that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes were unanimously approved as circulated, with an abstention noted by National Grid.

#### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the Consent Agenda that was circulated in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the Consent Agenda was unanimously approved.

#### **FAP COMPLIANCE CHANGE RELATED TO CFTC EXEMPTION**

Mr. Robert Ludlow, ISO Vice President, Chief Financial and Compliance Officer, referred the Committee to the materials posted in advance of the meeting regarding a compliance change to the ISO Financial Assurance Policy (FAP) proposed in response to an August 30, 2013 FERC order in Docket No. ER13-1875-000. The August 30 order conditionally accepted changes to the FAP and Information Policy that were filed to meet conditions of a Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) exemption of certain transactions from certain provisions of the laws and regulations administered and enforced by the CFTC granted to ISO-NE and the other RTOs.

Mr. Bowie asked Mr. Joel Gordon, Chair, Budget & Finance Subcommittee (Subcommittee), whether there had been any questions or comments on the ISO's proposed compliance change submitted to him following the circulation of the compliance change to the Subcommittee. Mr. Gordon responded that no questions, concerns, or comments had been raised. In response to a member's question regarding the transmittal letter that would accompany the filing of the compliance change, Mr. Ludlow stated the transmittal letter would, in response to the order, focus on the changes proposed to be made to the FAP (i.e. the letter of credit changes), and would clarify one aspect of establishing qualification as an "appropriate person", but would not otherwise repeat the discussion included in the previous filing letter.

The following motion was duly made, seconded, and unanimously approved:

RESOLVED, that the NEPOOL Participants Committee supports the change to the ISO New England Financial Assurance Policy (FAP) to comply with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's order in Docket No. ER13-1875, as circulated to the Committee and discussed at this meeting, together with such further non-substantive changes as the Chief Financial Officer of ISO New England and the Chairman of the Budget and Finance Subcommittee may approve.

## **REPORT OF ISO CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

Mr. Gordon van Welie, ISO Chief Executive Officer, referred the Committee to the summary of the ISO Board and Board Committee meetings that had occurred since the August 2 meeting, which had been posted in advance of the meeting. He announced that the ISO customer survey had been circulated and posted on the ISO website to make it less time consuming and more accessible for those participating. In response to a question, Mr. van Welie explained that the references in the Board Markets Committee report to generator gross margin, expanded analysis, and economic efficiency of energy prices related to content from the Internal Market Monitor (IMM) Report, and the references to the Forward Capacity Market (FCM) Performance

Incentive Proposal (FCM PI) was to update the Board on the status of the stakeholder process with regard to that proposal.

## **REPORT OF ISO CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER**

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer, referred the Committee to the September COO Report, which had been posted in advance of the meeting on both the NEPOOL and ISO websites. He reported that, in August: (i) natural gas prices were 15.1% lower and oil prices were 2.5% higher than July 2013 average values; (ii) Real-Time Hub LMPs were 39% lower than July averages; (iii) Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC), totaling \$4.7 million, was \$17.2 million lower than July NCPC; (iv) first contingency payments totaled \$1.3 million, which was \$10.1 million lower than July's first contingency payments; (v) second contingency payments totaled \$49,000, which was \$1.1 million lower than the \$1.2 million in July; and (vi) voltage support payments totaled \$1.4 million, down \$5.8 million from July. He reported that, based on the 50/50 and 90/10 load forecasts, the lowest Fall Operable Capacity Margin was projected for the week beginning September 21 and the lowest Winter Operable Capacity Margin was projected for the week beginning January 18, 2014.

Dr. Chadalavada went on to report that the Regional System Plan (RSP 13) Public Meeting had been held the day before and featured discussions regarding distributed generation resources. He reported that the Distributed Generation (DG) Forecast Working Group (which, similar to the Energy Efficiency Working Group, was established to determine how best to account for DG in the RSP process) was scheduled to meet for the first time on September 30 at the DoubleTree Hotel in Westborough, MA. Dr. Chadalavada encouraged all those interested to participate. He stated that resource qualification for the eighth Forward Capacity Auction (FCA8) would be released no later than September 27. He noted that the ISO was reviewing Vermont Yankee's Non-Price Retirement request and would report its reliability determination

findings at the October 15 Reliability Committee meeting. He advised that work on developing an approach for modeling capacity zones for FCA9 and beyond continued.

The Committee then commented and asked clarifying questions on the COO Report. In response to a question concerning September 11 Day-Ahead Market results, Dr. Chadalavada explained that two 115 kv transmission line outages (for scheduled maintenance, which would last through October), in conjunction with forecasts for extremely high temperatures and what ultimately was the second highest September peak to date, caused extremely high congestion at four nodes, which ultimately was reflected in high LMPs at the hub. Although that circumstance was not expected to last or re-occur, he noted the increasing challenges facing the ISO and asset owners at both the beginning and end of the transmission outage seasons.

#### **REPORT ON 2014 ISO-NE OPERATING AND CAPITAL BUDGETS AND 2014 NESCOE BUDGET**

Mr. Gordon introduced discussion of the 2014 ISO Operating and Capital Budgets (2014 ISO Budgets). He outlined the following stakeholder process for review of the 2014 ISO Budgets that came out of the 2013 ISO Budget settlement:

- Presentation and discussion with Regulators at 2013 NECPUC Symposium (complete).
- Presentation and discussion with Participants at Committee Summer Meeting (complete).
- Management review of feedback from the stakeholder meetings and the ISO Board and incorporate initiatives into the 2014 ISO Budgets (complete).
- Presentation and discussion at August 23 Budget and Finance Subcommittee meeting (complete).
- Presentation and discussion at September 13 Committee meeting.
- Consideration and vote at October 4 Participants Committee meeting.

Mr. Ludlow then referred the Committee to the presentations of the proposed 2014 ISO Budgets and 2014 NESCOE Budget posted in advance of the meeting, which reflected 2013 to

2014 Budgets comparisons. He said that, based on feedback received, the Operating Budget proposal was \$5 million less than anticipated in June. That reduction since June was driven by:

1. Identification and reallocation of resources to new initiatives
2. Pension Cost Reductions
3. Lower Salary Costs – high vacancy rate
4. Reduced Professional Fees Including Legal Fees
5. Medical Plan Cost Reductions

He explained that estimates for these and other costs could still change before a final budget was presented. He cited examples of drivers for changing costs, including: interest rate trends, which had resulted in an increase in projected interest costs; increases in Northeast Power Coordinating Council (NPCC) and North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) fees passed through the ISO Tariff; and changes in depreciation schedules that largely offset those increases. He stated that projected revenue requirements had remained largely unchanged since presented at the August Subcommittee meeting.

He reported that the ISO sought in its materials to explain how it was complying with the 2013 Budget Settlement Agreement, which required a \$2.2 million reduction in 2013 expenses and a \$600,000 reduction under the Capital Funding Tariff. He said that, per the agreed-upon procedure in the Settlement Agreement, the ISO had met with State Regulators the week before, a meeting which was well attended and had representatives of all six New England States participating in the discussion. That Settlement Agreement also provided that Regulators would send the ISO questions from that discussion in writing. The ISO received questions from the Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (CT PURA) and the Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel (CT OCC), which he said ISO would respond to within the following week. He also said that the ISO would post those questions and answers on its website, and the 2014 Budgets would be presented for vote at the October 4 Committee meeting.

Mr. Ludlow went on to explain that the ISO would consolidate the 2014 Capital Funding Budget and the 2014 Administrative Costs Budget into a single filing with the FERC, as required by the 2013 Budget Settlement Agreement. He stated the ISO was reviewing whether that would require a separate 3rd Quarter Capital Funding Tariff and would report that to the Subcommittee and the Committee once a decision had been made.

Focusing specifically on the 2014 Capital Budget, he said the ISO would keep that Budget at \$28 million. He reviewed the key capital priorities for 2014, including finalizing changes for Intra-Day Offers, finalizing the backup Control Center, and completing the Alternative Technologies and Regulation Market Project. The ISO would continue to update the Subcommittee when projects were chartered and implemented, and would continue to review throughout the year all of the actual versus budgeted changes that occur.

Mr. Ludlow completed his presentation by explaining that the ISO was reasonably positioned when compared to similarly-situated ISOs and RTOs.

The Committee then commented and asked clarifying questions on the proposed 2014 Budgets. Members questioned whether the ISO was satisfied that it had the resources it needed to implement the Work Plan it had discussed earlier in the year with stakeholders. Some expressed concern that ISO used lack of funds as a basis for deferring projects, and urged that the ISO instead report when it is constrained so that the region could choose whether to accept the constraint or commit additional funds. Mr. Ludlow responded that the \$28 million budget for its Capital program was a financial constraint that acknowledged the reality that the ISO did not have organizational capacity to do more work than could be accomplished with this budget. Mr. van Welie also emphasized that the ISO was people-constrained, and given the volume of work coming in, there were not sufficient personnel resources available to assign personnel to all new activities. He went on to say, though, that the ISO had adequate resources to execute its commitments under the Work Plan.

Messrs. Bowie and Doot re-emphasized that the Budgets would be voted at the October 4 Committee meeting. They urged members to raise any questions or concerns that needed to be answered in advance of the vote directly with Messrs. Gordon and/or Ludlow as soon as possible. If needed, another Subcommittee meeting would be scheduled to consider any additional questions or concerns raised.

Turning to the 2014 NESCOE Budget, Mr. Gordon referred the Committee to the NESCOE materials posted in advance of the meeting. He said that that the 2014 NESCOE Budget was presented at the August 23 Subcommittee meeting and was consistent with NESCOE's previously approved 5-Year Pro Forma Budget. Members were asked whether there were any questions. There were none raised at the meeting.

#### **LOCAL RELIABILITY COMMITMENT MITIGATION CHANGES TO MARKET RULE 1 APPENDIX A**

Ms. Allison DiGrande, Markets Committee Chair, referred the Committee to materials posted in advance of the meeting regarding revisions to Market Rule 1 Appendix A as proposed by the IMM to adopt a new *ex-post* conduct test for any resource committed for local reliability, and to specify in greater detail the information a Market Participant must provide if a dual-fuel resource committed for local reliability operates with its higher-cost fuel.

Ms. DiGrande explained the IMM's concern that the current conduct test for Local Reliability Commitment Mitigation was "susceptible to manipulation by Market Participants that have reasonable certainty their resource will be operated for local reliability." Because of that concern, the ISO and the IMM had asked that proposed changes addressing the issue be worked through the stakeholder process on an expedited basis so that changes could be filed with the FERC and implemented as soon as possible. She reported that the Markets Committee-recommended changes had removed from the changes to Appendix A originally proposed by the IMM certain revisions concerning treatment for dual-fuel resources committed for local



reliability. The IMM initially proposed to specify that, if a Market Participant bidding such resources presented offers based on the resource's higher-cost fuel, that Market Participant would be required to explain why the lower-cost fuel was unavailable. Based on stakeholder feedback, and prior to the Markets Committee vote, the IMM agreed to remove those changes from its proposal. The Markets Committee considered the revised IMM-proposed changes at its September 11 meeting and recommended Participants Committee support with a 79.4% Vote in favor. She also reported that another change, recently circulated, was determined not to be necessary, so the proposal the ISO requested be voted was the proposal as recommended by the Markets Committee.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the revisions to Appendix A to Market Rule 1, as recommended by the Markets Committee at its September 10-11, 2013 meeting and as provided to this Committee in advance of this meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Markets Committee.

The Committee then commented on the main motion, with most comments in the nature of questions trying to better understand the IMM's concerns. In addition, a large number of members expressed concerns with not having sufficient time or information either to understand the concerns raised or adequately consider the proposal. Many explained that they would abstain because, although they did not want to expose the markets to potential manipulation and would not oppose the change, they could not affirmatively support the changes.

#### ***NextEra Amendment***

After discussion, the NextEra representative made a motion, which was seconded, to amend the main motion so as to require in Section III.A.5.5.5.4 a consultation process with the Market Participant prior to the ISO deciding whether to set all financial parameters of the Supply Offer to their Reference Level for purposes of calculating Day-Ahead Energy Market and Real-

Time Energy Market revenues (NextEra Amendment). The NextEra Amendment was voted and passed by a show of hands.

The once-amended main motion (as amended by the NextEra Amendment) was then voted and failed with a 32.53% Vote in favor (Generation – 0%; Transmission – 0%; Supplier – 0%; Alternative Resources – 0%; Publicly Owned Entity – 17.17%; and End User – 15.36%). (See Vote 1 on Attachment 2).

At the request of the ISO, the Committee considered and approved the ISO's unamended Proposal (the ISO Proposal) with a 88.96% Vote in favor (Generation – 8.58%; Transmission – 17.17%; Supplier – 14.71%; Alternative Resources – 14.16%; Publicly Owned Entity – 17.17%; and End User – 17.17%). (See Vote 2 on Attachment 2).

#### **EMM MARKETS REPORT CONTINUED DISCUSSION**

At the request of the Chairman, Mr. Doot explained that Dr. David Patton, President, Potomac Economics and ISO External Market Monitor (EMM), was asked by the Officers to return to the Committee in response to member feedback that there were still questions for Dr. Patton on his 2012 EMM Markets Report that had been presented at the June Summer Meeting. Committee members then asked Dr. Patton questions evoked by his report.

In response to whether there was a way to construct a demand curve reflecting true consumer demand behavior, Dr. Patton began by stating that the demand for capacity stems from the demand for reliability and suggested that the most constructive way to reflect that demand would be to employ a sloped demand curve that (i) satisfies planning reserve and capacity requirements and (ii) captures the marginal effects on the Loss of Load Expectation (LOLE) as capacity levels increase above the minimum designated target (i.e. tying the demand curve back to the value of loss of load implied by the requirement).

A member asked for clarification on the EMM's recommendation that the ISO determine whether the Rationing and Capacity Commitment Period Elections would promote efficient investment and FCM outcomes over the long-term. Dr. Patton reviewed that his concern spans more than just the Capacity Commitment Period. He explained that the pricing mechanism in FCM for new capacity could have undesired impacts on broader FCM pricing that should be thought through. With the ability of a new resource to lock in a price for 5 years, the new supplier would receive after the first year a price that is different than what is paid to existing capacity. Thus, in the year the new capacity clears, it would set the price of new entry, but in years 2, 3, 4 and 5, particularly if a large unit is rationed, there could likely be a surplus, with the possibility (particularly without a sloped demand curve) of the price clearing very close to zero. The EMM's concern was that this market structure could set up a boom bust pricing cycle in the capacity market. Even new suppliers emerging from the initial 5-year period could expect that this structure in most years would produce a very low price and would have to build that consideration into their offers. Acknowledging that there may be some appeal to locking in a price for new capacity for 5 years, he questioned whether it would produce appropriate outcomes, and therefore recommended that the ISO re-evaluate that feature of the capacity pricing mechanism.

Dr. Patton was asked whether, in his opinion, the existing Energy, Capacity, and Ancillary Service Markets provided sufficient revenues to incent new investments and support existing generation in New England where and when needed. Dr. Patton responded that other markets have analyzed the prevailing market revenues from various sources and evaluated whether those revenues would support new entry. He agreed that such analysis was valuable and was not opposed to adding it to future reports or determining whether it was feasible, based on the EMM's current arrangements, to conduct that analysis prior to undertaking the following year's report. He committed to explore the feasibility of that analysis with the ISO.

A member commented that the EMM Markets Report identified overall the need for improved price formation in the market, which NEPOOL was trying to address through the Committee process through improved reserve markets, reserve scarcity pricing, modeling, and modification to the capacity market. He complained that the region was not addressing the recommendation, which had been in the EMM's market reports since 2004, to allow the cost of dispatch and commitment to be more clearly and transparently reflected in LMPs and asked what Dr. Patton viewed as the next steps for addressing this recommendation. Dr. Patton indicated that the New England Market was providing relatively high Real-Time prices that efficiently reflected marginal costs of satisfying system demand, but that there remained many hours when New England was short of reserves where prices may not rise sufficiently high to provide adequate performance incentives. He indicated his recommendation was that New England continue to place a high priority on addressing this feature of the market, and begin by looking at the software methodology initiative (Extended LMP or ELMP) being pursued by the Midwest ISO, which was being developed by the software vendor that ISO-NE also employed. Dr. Chadalavada added that the ISO had performed a detailed technical analysis of LMP and price formation in the Midwest ISO market and offered to host a technical session at the ISO to review that analysis if there was interest.

Dr. Patton was asked to clarify the recommendation to allow the ISO to vary the quantity of replacement reserves in the operating day to improve consistency between the market outcomes and the ISO's reliability needs. He explained that the ISO needed flexibility day-to-day that may require differing levels of on-line resources to operate the system reliably. His recommendation was to translate that need/concern into an actual reserve product that could be priced into the reserve market. He reported that the ISO was in the process of implementing a fixed quantity replacement reserve product, which he viewed as a better means of reflecting operating needs in market prices.

**LITIGATION REPORT**

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the Litigation Report that had been posted in advance of the meeting, noting the especially high level of activity. He flagged specifically the Commission's ruling on the NEPGA complaint and the Winter Operations filing, and the filing of two proposals where NEPOOL and ISO-NE had proposed alternative Market Rule changes. There were no questions on that report.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the NEPOOL calendar on the NEPOOL website, highlighting upcoming meetings and events. He reminded the Committee that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Participants Committee was to be held on October 4 at the Renaissance Hotel in Providence, RI. He said that the November 8 meeting with the ISO Board would be held at the Hilton Logan Hotel in Boston and that meeting would include times for Sectors to meet again with the ISO Board. He encouraged Sectors to begin planning for the breakout meetings. He also reported that the Annual Meeting was to be held on December 6 at the Colonnade Hotel in Boston. He indicated that an invitation had been extended and was pending for a FERC Commissioner to attend and offer remarks at the Annual Meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

David T. Doot, Secretary

**MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PARTICIPATING IN  
SEPTEMBER 13, 2013 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

<b>PARTICIPANT NAME</b>	<b>SECTOR</b>	<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	<b>ALTERNATE NAME</b>	<b>PROXY</b>
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Associated Industries of Massachusetts	End User			Roger Borghesani
Bangor Hydro-Electric Company	Transmission	Jeffrey Jones (tel)	Stacy Dimou (tel)	
Boylston Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
BP Energy Company	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc. / CSC	Supplier	Aleksandar Mitreski		Jose Rotger
Calpine Energy Services, LP	Supplier	John Flumerfelt		
Central Maine Power Company	Transmission	Eric Stinneford (tel)		
Cianbro Companies	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Citigroup Energy Inc.	Supplier	Barry Trayers (tel)		
Concord Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Conservation Law Foundation (CLF)	End User	Seth Kaplan		
Conservation Services Group (CSG)	AR	Doug Hurley		
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	Supplier	Jeff Dannels		
Corinth Wood Pellets LLC	End User	Gus Fromuth		
CP Energy Marketing (US) Inc. (Capital Power)	Supplier			Coleen Walsh
DC Energy, LLC	Supplier	Bruce Bleiweis		
Dominion Energy Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Ronald Hart (tel)		
Dragon Products Company LLC	End User	Gus Fromuth		
DR Power, LLC	Supplier	Jerry Tudan		
Dynegy Marketing and Trade, LLC	Supplier			William Fowler
Elektrisola, Inc.	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Energy America, LLC	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
EnerNOC, Inc.	AR	Herb Healy (tel)	Greg Geller	
EP Energy Massachusetts, LLC (Essential Power)	Generation		William Fowler	
EquiPower Resources Management, LLC	Generation		William Fowler	
Exelon New England Holdings / Constellation	Supplier		William Fowler	
Fairchild Semiconductor Corporation	End User	Gus Fromuth		
First Wind Energy Marketing, Inc.	AR	John Keene		Robert Stein
Food City, Inc.	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Galt Power, Inc.	Supplier	Nancy Chafetz		
GDF SUEZ Energy Marketing North America	Generation			Joe Dalton
Generation Group Member	Generation		Abby Krich	Robert Stein
Granite Ridge/Merrill Lynch	Supplier		William Fowler	
Groton Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	Supplier		Robert Stein	
Hardwood Products Company	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User			Roger Borghesani
Hess Corporation	Supplier			
High Liner Foods (USA) Incorporated	End User		William P. Short III (tel)	
Holden Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Hudson Light and Power Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Kimberly-Clark Corporation	Supplier			Vicki Karandrikas (tel)
LaBree's Inc.	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Linde Energy Services	Supplier			Vicki Karandrikas (tel)
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department	Publicly Owned		Craig Kieny	
Long Island Lighting Company (LIPA)	Supplier	William Killgoar		
Maine Public Advocate Office	End User			Sarah Jackson
Mansfield Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Marblehead Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Marden's Inc.	End User	Gus Fromuth		

**MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PARTICIPATING IN  
SEPTEMBER 13, 2013 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

<b>PARTICIPANT NAME</b>	<b>SECTOR</b>	<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	<b>ALTERNATE NAME</b>	<b>PROXY</b>
Mass. Attorney General's Office	End User	Fred Plett	Patrick Tarmey	
Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Company (MMWEC)	Publicly Owned	Gary Will		
Middleborough Gas and Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Millennium Power Partners	Generation		Ken Dell Orto	
MoArk, Inc.	End User	Gus Fromuth		
New England Power Company (National Grid)	Transmission	Timothy Brennan		
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, Inc.	Publicly Owned		Steve Kaminski (tel)	
New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate (NH OCA)	End User	Paul Peterson	Sarah Jackson	
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	Generation	Fernando DaSilva		
NRG Power Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Peter Fuller		Bruce Anderson
NU / NSTAR	Transmission	James Daly	Calvin Bowie	Joe Staszowski
PalletOne of Maine	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Paxton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
PowerOptions, Inc.	End User	Cindy Arcate		
PPL EnergyPlus (PPL)	Supplier		Sharon Weber (tel)	
Praxair, Inc.	End User			Vicki Karandrikas (tel)
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Provisional Group Member – Load Response Sub-Sector	AR	Brad Swalwell (tel)		
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC	Supplier	Joel Gordon		
RJF-Morin Brick LLC	End User			
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Russell Municipal Light Dept	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Shipyard Brewing LLC	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Operations	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Small Distributed Generation Group Member	AR	Doug Hurley		
Small Load Response Group Member	AR	Doug Hurley		
Small Renewable Generation Group Member	AR	Erik Abend (tel)		
South Hadley Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
St. Anselm College	End User	Gus Fromuth		
St. Joseph Health Services of Rhode Island	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Forshaw	
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
The Energy Consortium	End User	Roger Borghesani		
TransCanada Power Marketing Ltd.	Generation		Michael Hachey	
Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS)	End User	Paul Peterson		
United Illuminating Company, The (UI)	Transmission	Rich Peters		
Utility Services Inc.	End User			Paul Peterson
Vermont Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned	Craig Kieny		
Vermont Electric Power Company, Inc. (VELCO)	Transmission	Frank Ettori	Bill Ryan (tel)	
Vermont Energy Investment Corporation	AR		Doug Hurley	
Vermont Public Power Supply Authority (VPPSA)	Publicly Owned	David Mullett		
Vitol Inc.	Supplier	Joe Wadsworth		
Wakefield Municipal Gas and Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Westerly Hospital	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Westfield Gas & Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
ZTECH, LLC	End User		Gus Fromuth	

**VOTES TAKEN AT  
SEPTEMBER 13, 2013 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

**TOTAL**

SECTOR	VOTE 1	VOTE 2
GENERATION	0.00	8.58
TRANSMISSION	0.00	17.17
SUPPLIER	0.00	14.71
AR	0.00	14.16
PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY	17.17	17.17
END USER	15.36	17.17
% IN FAVOR	32.53	88.96

**GENERATION**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Dominion Energy Marketing, Inc.	A	A
EquiPower Resources Management	A	A
Essential Power	A	A
GDF SUEZ Energy Marketing N. Amer.	A	A
Generation Group Member	A	A
Millennium Power Partners	A	A
NextEra Energy Resources	A	A
NRG Power Marketing	O	O
TransCanada Power Marketing	A	F
IN FAVOR (F)	0	1
OPPOSED (O)	1	1
TOTAL VOTES	1	2
ABSTENTIONS (A)	8	7

**TRANSMISSION**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Bangor Hydro-Electric Co.	A	A
Central Maine Power Co.	O	F
New England Power Co.	O	F
The United Illuminating Co.	O	F
NU /NSTAR	A	F
Vermont Electric Power Co.	A	A
IN FAVOR (F)	0	4
OPPOSED (O)	3	0
TOTAL VOTES	3	4
ABSTENTIONS (A)	3	2

**SUPPLIER**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
BP Energy Co.	A	A
Brookfield Energy Marketing/CSC	A	A
Calpine Energy Services	A	A
Citigroup Energy Inc.	A	A
Consolidated Edison Energy	A	A
CP Energy Marketing (US)	A	A
DC Energy, LLC	A	A
DR Power, LLC	A	A
Dynegy Marketing and Trade	A	A
Energy America	O	F
Exelon Generation Co.	A	A
Galt Power	A	F
Granite Ridge/Merrill Lynch Commodities.	A	A
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.)	A	A
Hess	O	F
Integrus Energy Services	O	F
Kimberly-Clark Corp.	A	F
Linde Energy Services	A	F
LIPA	A	A
PPL EnergyPlus	A	A
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade	A	O
Vitol	A	A
IN FAVOR (F)	0	6
OPPOSED (O)	3	1
TOTAL VOTES	3	7
ABSTENTIONS (A)	19	15

**ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
<b>Renewable Generation</b>		
First Wind Energy Marketing	--	A
Small RG Group Member	A	A
<b>Distributed Generation</b>		
Conservation Services Group	O	F
Small DG Group Member	O	F
<b>Load Response</b>		
EnerNOC, Inc.	A	A
Vermont Energy Investment Corp.	O	F
Small LR Group Member	A	F
LR Provisional Group Member	A	A
IN FAVOR (F)	0	4
OPPOSED (O)	3	0
TOTAL VOTES	3	4
ABSTENTIONS (A)	4	4



**VOTES TAKEN AT  
SEPTEMBER 13, 2013 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

**PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	F	F
Boylston Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Concord Municipal Light Plant	F	F
CT Municipal Electric Energy Coop.	F	A
Groton Electric Light Dept.,	F	F
Holden Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Holyoke Gas & Electric Dept.	F	F
Hudson Light and Power Dept.	F	F
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Ipswich Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Dept.	F	A
Mansfield Municipal Electric Dept.	F	F
Marblehead Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Co.	F	F
Middleborough Gas and Electric	F	F
Middleton Municipal Electric Dept.	F	F
New Hampshire Electric Coop.	F	A
Paxton Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	F	F
Princeton Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Russell Municipal Light Department	F	F
Shrewsbury's Electric & Cable Operations.	F	F
South Hadley Electric Light Dept.	F	F
Sterling Municipal Electric Light	F	F
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	F	A
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Vermont Electric Cooperative	O	A
VT Public. Power Supply Authority	F	A
Wakefield Municipal Gas and Light	F	F
W. Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Westfield Gas & Electric Light Dept.	F	F
IN FAVOR (F)	32	27
OPPOSED (O)	1	0
TOTAL VOTES	33	27
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	6

**END USER**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Associated Industries of MA	A	F
Cianbro Companies	A	F
Conservation Law Foundation	A	O
Corinth Wood Pellets, LLC	A	F
Dragon Products Company	A	F
Elektrisola, Inc.	A	F
Fairchild Semiconductor Corp.	A	F
Food City, Inc.	A	F
Hardwood Products Company	A	F
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	A	F
High Liner Foods (USA) Inc.	A	F
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	A	F
LaBree's Inc.	A	F
Maine Public Advocate Office	O	O
Maine Skiing, Inc.	A	F
Marden's Inc.	A	F
Mass. Attorney General's Office	F	O
MoArk, LLC	A	F
NH Office of Consumer Advocate	O	O
PalletOne of Maine	A	F
PowerOptions, Inc.	O	O
Praxair, Inc.	F	A
Shipyard Brewing Co.	A	F
St. Anselm College	A	F
The Energy Consortium	A	F
Union of Concerned Scientists	A	O
Utility Services	A	A
Westerly Hospital	A	F
Z-TECH, LLC	A	F
IN FAVOR (F)	2	21
OPPOSED (O)	3	6
TOTAL VOTES	5	27
ABSTENTIONS (A)	24	2