FINAL

A meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held via teleconference beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, February 7, 2014. 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 who participated in the teleconference meeting.

Mr. Joel Gordon, Chairman, presided and Mr. David Doot, Secretary, recorded. Mr. Gordon welcomed those on the teleconference, including members, alternates and guests, and reviewed appropriate protocol for the teleconference meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 6, 2013 AND JANUARY 10, 2014 MEETINGS

Mr. Gordon referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the December 6, 2013 meeting and the January 10, 2014 meeting that were circulated and posted with the supplemental notice, and had been revised to reflect comments received in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the minutes were unanimously approved.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Gordon 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.

NESCOE REPORT ON GAS-ELECTRIC FOCUS GROUP EFFORTS AND NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS' ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE INITIATIVE

New England Gas-Electric Focus Group Efforts

At Mr. Gordon's request, Ms. Heather Hunt, Executive Director of the New England States Committee on Electricity (NESCOE), began her report by summarizing the status of

efforts of the New England Gas-Electric Focus Group, of which she was a Tri-Chair. She reported that a draft of a final report of the Focus Group had been circulated and would be discussed at the next meeting of the Focus Group scheduled for February 26. She said there were no specific deadlines associated with the issuance of the final report, so the Focus Group had time and flexibility to finalize its report, and could discuss when and how to wind up its efforts. Ms. Hunt reported that Focus Group members had been requested to provide comments by February 10 on the level of incremental gas pipeline capacity proposed by the New England Governors' December communication with the ISO, and encouraged interested Participants Committee members, who had been sent a copy of that request, to do the same.

New England Governors' Energy Infrastructure Initiative

Ms. Hunt, referring the Committee to materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting, summarized the purpose and status of the New England Governors' Infrastructure Initiative (Initiative). She stated the purpose of the Initiative was to help address immediate reliability needs and the region's economic competitive disadvantage relative to neighboring states because of limited infrastructure capacity. To that end, the States, through NESCOE, had requested ISO assistance (i) with technical support for the States' plans to advance the development of transmission infrastructure to enable delivery of clean energy to New England from no and/or low carbon emissions resources; and (ii) with obtaining FERC approval of a Tariff mechanism to recover the cost of increased firm pipeline capacity into New England. Ms. Hunt explained the States' interest in exploring with the ISO and NEPOOL a means to fund that expansion and their understanding that the discussion would need to take place in the NEPOOL stakeholder process once the States had progressed far enough in discussions amongst themselves.

The Committee then asked questions. In responding, Ms. Hunt explained that the Governors had more than a year of ongoing discussions concerning both gas/electric and climate challenges, had been briefed by NESCOE on related studies, and through their office representatives, as well as NESCOE managers and others, very closely considered the input from the Focus Group process. The Governors through the Initiative, and the States' regulatory representatives through the Focus Group efforts, shared a common goal to address expeditiously, both for reliability and for economic competitiveness reasons, the challenges being discussed. When asked for details regarding the proposal to fund new gas capacity, Ms. Hunt emphasized that the January 21 Letter was to identify at highest level a possible conceptual way forward, and many details remained to be determined. She welcomed any ideas or suggestions that would facilitate implementation of, or related to, the directives set out in the January 21 Letter. Addressing projected timelines, Ms. Hunt stated that the States all shared a sense of urgency and were seeking new pipeline capacity available to the region no later than the 2017/18 Winter.

Mr. Gordon, noting that additional in-person discussion of Initiative-related issues might be beneficial and desirable, indicated that an opportunity for further in-person discussion would be scheduled for the March 7 Committee meeting.

REPORT OF THE ISO CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Before presenting the Chief Executive Officer report, Mr. Gordon van Welie responded to a member's request for the ISO's perspective on the Governor's Initiative outlined in the January 21 Letter, particularly the reference to the development of new transmission infrastructure. Mr. van Welie indicated that the transmission development would be addressed under the ISO Tariff as an Elective Transmission Upgrade (ETU). He indicated that the ISO would, as required under the Tariff, study a proposed ETU to ensure the project could reliably interconnect to the New England System. Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer,

identified certain deficiencies with the ETU process contained in the Tariff language, and the ISO's plan (even ahead of the January 21 Letter) to address those deficiencies, the most pressing of which was solidifying the queue position of an ETU, during the third or fourth quarter of 2014.

Mr. van Welie then addressed the gas pipeline investments proposed in the January 21 Letter, noting that the ISO had been highlighting the issue of gas pipeline constraints into the region since 2004 and more recently in the Strategic Planning Initiative launched in 2010. With over 3,000 MW of non-gas-fired resource announcing retirement recently, he indicated that the ISO was concerned with how precarious the operating situation would be in the next several years if all the announced retirement plans came to fruition. The planned retirements reinforced the need for additional pipeline investment into the region. He added that pipeline constraints were no longer a New England-only issue, as evidenced by the recent effects of pipeline constraints on gas-fired generation availability in the NYISO, PJM, MISO, and Southern CA. He referenced the letter from the New England Senators to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), that was circulated and posted in advance of the meeting, that highlighted the Senators' pipeline constraint concerns. In response to that letter, the Energy Secretary had committed to address those issues in the next DOE Quadrennial Energy Review and to hold the first meeting in New England associated with that review. The focus of that meeting would be "pipes and wires", which Mr. van Welie suggested fit well with the intent of the Governors' Initiative. He stated that the ISO was supportive of the Initiative and acknowledged the need for the States and the ISO to explore together with NEPOOL the concept of ISO Tariff-based pipeline investment cost recovery. He added that the process might reveal alternatives and/or modifications that had not yet been considered, and the ISO looked forward to commencing the discussions in March.

In response to members' questions and comments, Mr. van Welie clarified that the States had been clear that the transmission infrastructure they sought would be presented as ETUs under the Tariff, for that afforded the States increased decision making control over the projects. He shared his view that, given the States' policies, it was inevitable that the States would seek in years to come to put more renewable energy onto the grid, in as cost effective a way as possible. He acknowledged that such investments would likely displace existing resources and have a material economic impact on the Energy Market by reducing infra-marginal energy revenues. Accordingly, he stressed the importance of ensuring sufficient revenue in the marketplace (maintaining reliability by ensuring an appropriate resource portfolio to balance the renewable energy coming onto the System) and getting the capacity market right (which was becoming an even more important piece of the overall market), all of which aligned with the ISO's Strategic Planning Initiative.

A member, noting significant customer and industry impacts experienced in Europe under similar efforts, offered his view that it would be imperative that the ISO perform companion economic analyses that show the impact on the New England customer base and the associated economic costs of undertaking such efforts. Mr. van Welie responded that economic impact analysis would be the responsibility of those that want to make investments, but pointed to the economic study provisions of the ISO Tariff for those interested in looking at the effects of such efforts. He added that it would be unlikely that the ISO would take a lead on requesting such studies.

Mr. van Welie then concluded his report by turning to the summaries, circulated and posted in advance of the meeting, of the ISO Board and Board Committee meetings that had occurred since the January 10, 2014 meeting. There were no questions or comments on the Board summaries.

REPORT OF THE ISO CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

Dr. Chadalavada referred the Committee to the February COO report, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting and posted on the NEPOOL and ISO websites. Focusing on report highlights, he stated that in January (i) natural gas prices were 88% higher and oil prices remained the same as December 2013 average values; (ii) Real-Time Hub locational marginal prices (LMPs) were up 65% from December 2013 averages; (iii) average daily (peak hour) Day-Ahead cleared physical Energy as percent of forecasted load was 96.4% in January, versus 95.9% in December; (iv) daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC), totaling $73.3 million, was $52.9 million higher than December NCPC; (v) first contingency payments, totaling $69.8 million, were $52.2 million higher than December's; (vi) second contingency payments totaled $2.4 million, which was higher than the $2.1 million in December; and (vii) voltage support payments totaled $981,000, up $417,000 from December.

He reported that the lowest 50/50 and 90/10 Winter Operable Capacity Margin was projected for the week beginning February 8, the lowest 50/50 Spring Operable Capacity Margin projected for the week beginning April 5, and the lowest 90/10 Spring Operable Capacity Margin projected for the week beginning May 24.

Turning to the 2013/14 Winter Reliability Program (Program) and associated oil inventory, Dr. Chadalavada reported there were 3.5 million barrels of oil as of December 1, 3.3 million barrels as of January 2, and 1.8 million barrels as of February 3, with much of the remaining oil inventory contained in a small number of units, which created limited diversity. He highlighted that another 530,000 barrels of oil inventory that cleared in the Program was unavailable during January due to forced outages of the generators with that oil. The ISO calculated that, had those units been on line, 93% of initial Program oil inventory would have been depleted as of February 3. He stressed that the Program had played an important role

during the prior three weeks in avoiding the need for emergency energy alerts or emergency actions by the System operators. He reported that, as of December 1, the Program value was $75.1 million. Total program payment reductions and penalties totaled $2.5 million as of December 31, attributable to unit availability, and various failures to test fuel-switch, to commit initial inventory, and to replenish fuel oil. He noted that, given the one-month lag in Program financial data, January data would be reported at the March meeting.

A member, noting the success of the 2013/14 Program, asked whether the ISO planned to implement the Program for the 2014/15 Winter Period. Dr. Chadalavada reported that the ISO did not plan to implement a Winter Reliability Program in subsequent winters given the combination of ISO Energy Market initiatives (especially hourly offers), upcoming changes to NCPC cost allocation, and recent FERC clarifications regarding generator performance obligations. He noted his hope to revisit with the Committee in April (following conclusion of the Winter Period) the issue of whether appropriate incentives existed under the Market Rules for oil and gas units to make the necessary arrangements to be available.

In response to questions regarding recent NCPC levels, Dr. Chadalavada explained that the single largest factor contributing to recent uplift levels was the significant fuel price inversion experienced in January. In 18 January days, gas prices were higher than oil prices and costs for first contingency protection were distributed across the System and not to a specific zone. Looking ahead to the 2014/15 Winter Period, Dr. Chadalavada noted the worsening trend, and concerns that the entire non-nuclear and coal fleet had assumed a limited energy generation profile. He stated that the ISO was actively seeking to identify and ensure the existence of appropriate market incentives, but beyond hourly offers and NCPC cost allocation, concrete incentives would only be identified after further study and analyses of the 2013/14 Winter Period and discussion in the stakeholder process. Mr. van Welie stated that he had asked Dr.

Chadalavada to reach out to suppliers and generators to find out what their plans were for the 2014/15 Winter Period, so the ISO could have an informed and productive discussion with stakeholders.

In follow up, a member asked whether she should inform her clients that there may be changes expected for the 2014/15 Winter. Dr. Chadalavada responded that it was fair to put Participants generally on notice that there were lessons to be learned from the 2013/14 Winter and a need to understand and respond to those lessons. Mr. van Welie added that, over the next three or four years, and until a new pipeline into New England is built, or other forms of electrical energy production are added to the System, the situation would be precarious from an operating point of view and very volatile from a pricing point of view.

A member pointed out that the NYISO and PJM also had very substantial issues in January, and that both of those ISOs removed or raised the offer cap on the Energy Market as a result of the high gas prices. He asked whether the ISO has considered raising the energy offer cap above $1,000 and whether the ISO has seen any implications from the very high uplift and high Real-Time prices, in terms of increased Participant Financial Assurance and Payment Defaults. Dr. Chadalavada stated the ISO was not looking to increase the Offer Price, given Tariff provisions, not available in the NYISO or PJM, that allowed for the recovery through a generator FERC filing of extraordinary fuel expenses. He indicated a willingness by the ISO to revisit those plans should compelling reasons be identified. Regarding Financial Assurance, Mr. Marc Montalvo, ISO Director, Enterprise Risk Management, reported that five Financial Assurance defaults occurred in January, noting that high volatility and high prices contributed in some part to, but was not the only cause of, the Participants' difficulty meeting their collateral requirements.

A member reported over $1 million of NCPC charges allocated to a single company over a two-day period for Real-Time deviations related to External Transactions, and asked the ISO to evaluate that outcome given the seemingly counterintuitive result that a company providing needed reliability to the System by providing resources in Real-Time over and above what was committed Day-Ahead being assigned penalties of that magnitude. Dr. Chadalavada indicated that the issue would be addressed as part of planned discussions later in the year on the allocation of first contingency and NCPC costs.

Ms. Sarah Hofmann, Executive Director of the New England Conference of Public Utilities Commissioners (NECPUC), asked for a near-term prognosis on fuel availability should the region experience another cold snap during the winter. Dr. Chadalavada responded that forced outages were preventing some dual-fuel units with inventory from providing energy, and concerns that gas price spikes like those experienced in January could lead to oil units again being in-merit and running out of fuel. He reported the units were doing what they could to replenish their on-site oil inventories and were working with the Internal Market Monitor to look at how inventories could be managed while limiting market distortions.

Dr. Chadalavada then reviewed slides that showed unusually cold weather from January 1-10, mild weather from January 11-20, and then extreme cold from January 21-28. He highlighted that nine days in January were in the coldest 5% of days over the past 20 years. He then reviewed charts reflecting what the gas/oil fuel price inversion meant in terms of energy being sourced by fuel type at 3:00 a.m., 9:00 a.m., and 6:00 p.m. He explained that, for the entire week of January 20, at 3:00 a.m., 32% of the region's energy had come from oil and coal-fired resources, 12% from natural gas, and 40% from nuclear. Regarding nuclear, he reminded the Committee that Vermont Yankee would not be operating during the 2014/15 Winter Period, a loss of a large source of base load energy. He explained that, during the 6:00 p.m. hour,

approximately 33% of the region's energy had been produced by coal and oil-fired resources, and about 24% from natural gas and LNG, which meant that oil units were running as base load units throughout the week. Even during the overnight hours, a significant proportion of the energy produced was coming from oil units, which explained why their inventories were depleted so dramatically in January. Dr. Chadalavada stated that, given the fuel price inversion and the amount of energy coming from oil units, the ISO started in mid-January to ask for daily fuel surveys. Generators had largely cooperated and complied with that request.

Dr. Chadalavada reviewed a chart demonstrating substantial oil inventory, particularly in contrast to prior winters, as the region entered December, thanks in large part to the Winter Reliability Program and other actions. With regard to oil transportation, he said there was difficulty securing barge transportation, with many entities across the Northeast competing for the same ships. There was also difficulty in getting trucks properly located and made available. He reported also that the ISO was requested, and intervened with Massachusetts, to obtain an emergency declaration to lift restrictions limiting truck drivers' hours, so that they could help get oil onsite to Massachusetts' generating stations. He explained that #6 oil was very heavy and difficult to move in cold weather, and was not readily available because of the increased heating demand. He also noted that generators were hitting environmental permit limits and facing other operational issues because they were running significantly beyond their anticipated run times.

Dr. Chadalavada reported that, by the third week of January, almost the entire non-nuclear and coal fleet had become Limited Energy Resources, distorting market efficiency. He explained how this occurred and the impact on market clearing. He reviewed a challenge experienced on January 21 when two units, totaling approximately 700 MW, had forced outages. Because the ISO could not determine the cause of the forced outages and when they might return, the ISO went into the January 22 operating day assuming those units would not be

available for the peak hours and replaced the 700 MW with supplemental commitments. Dr. Chadalavada pointed out that, over the past year and towards the end of 2012, as tight gas supply conditions were more broadly known and understood, the ISO changed its operating procedures and no longer cancelled gas units that had been given a start notice.

Dr. Chadalavada continued his review of commitment challenges, explaining the impact of Day-Ahead to Real-Time changes in the forecasted interchange schedule. He noted, by way of example, the impact 800 MW of extra imports had on January 23, causing New England generation to be dispatched down, in many cases to Eco Min, and creating uplift because of the payments received by the generators at their Eco Min. He also explained the challenges associated with Energy imports from external Control Areas beyond the neighboring Control Areas.

Referring to slides addressing fuel price inversion, Dr. Chadalavada explained the challenges presented by the heavy utilization of the Internal Combustion Units (ICUs), whose primary purpose is to be available to System operators in case there are contingencies on the System -- to come on-line within 10 minutes, help recover from a disturbance, and avoid a Reliability Standard violation. In January, however, there were days when the ICUs, even with their high offers, were in-merit. With small on-site storage tanks, if ICUs run 10-15 hours a day, they quickly deplete their on-site inventory and replenishment, which must occur in Real-Time, becoming a challenge. He went on to explain slides illustrating the dramatic shift underlying the fuel price inversion, noting that, in the beginning of January, gas prices were about the same as oil prices, but the deviation and impact on uplift was noticeable at the end of January.

In response to a question, Dr. Chadalavada stated that the commitment of out-of-merit gas-fired generation on January 22 and 23 averaged between 3,000 MW to 3,500 MW. The reasons for that included committing to the gas in what cleared physically in the Day-Ahead

Energy Market versus the forecast, deviations on the interchange schedule, forced outages of units, extremely high costs associated with gas units, and load forecast error between 3% and 5% for the peak hours. He concluded his presentation by noting that the pipelines from the West and the North were almost fully subscribed on January 22 and 23, but there was only about 3,600 MW of gas-fired generation online. He stressed the need to understand, following discussions with the pipelines, the Participants and the LDCs, where the gas was being consumed. Mr. van Welie reported that the ISO would update its ICF studies based on the 2013/14 Winter operational experience to have a more refined picture of what the constraints looked like.

The Committee then commented and asked clarifying questions on the COO report. A member commented on the substantial under-clearing of demand in the Day-Ahead Energy Market on January 23, with a 3,000 MW difference between the Day-Ahead Commitment and Real-Time requirements. He asked whether there would be a discussion on this to minimize the possibility of or avoid such a reoccurrence next winter. Dr. Chadalavada agreed that there was a big gap and going forward he would like to add slides to the presentation that reflect Day-Ahead demand bidding levels. A member commented that the oil units had an interest apart from the Winter Program to replenish and asked about ISO assumptions as to replenishment. Dr. Chadalavada responded that the slide that showed the dramatic drop off of three days was based on on-site oil inventory information, but still left the ISO with questions about replenishments based on what they have heard from various assets. If replenishments actually happened, barges came through, and trucks were available, the picture would be noticeably improved. He noted that the recent change in fuel survey frequency should provide the ISO better data with which to evaluate on-site oil inventories.

A member commented that the Day-Ahead load bidding and Day-Ahead load clearing dropping low on critical days heightened the importance of the ISO's upcoming technical

sessions on LMP price formation. He requested that those sessions seek to provide stakeholders a clear understanding of how the ISO calculates its Real-Time prices under different scenarios. Since the ISO was going to twice-weekly fuel surveys there was a request that the ISO update Market Participants for the rest of February on the oil inventory. Dr. Chadalavada noted that such reports could not reasonably be tied to the Winter Reliability Program, but the ISO would consider what useful information could be provided.

A Supplier Sector representative asked whether the April lessons-learned discussions would address increased market efficiency, maximizing the inclusion of costs in LMP formation and lowering NCPC. Dr. Chadalavada indicated that the Spring discussions would include those topics, and would also benefit from information gleaned from planned ISO-asset owner debrief discussions that would cover unit-specific and other confidential information. He explained, as noted earlier, that the information from the de-brief sessions and committee discussion would be used to inform the region as to whether there were sufficient incentives in the market and what else might be done to ensure more secure fuel arrangements. In response to a follow-up question, he confirmed gas-related challenges, in addition to overall constraints, experienced by generators the prior month. He highlighted examples that included pipeline-mandated shut-downs and generator inability to source gas, particularly overnight, which contributed directly to the high ICU utilization. Mr. van Welie observed that operational risks were being pushed around the System, complicating the System operators' jobs, and ultimately driving up uplift costs.

On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Gordon asked whether Dr. Chadalavada could commit to further discussion of January operations at the Technical Committees in the following month or so. Dr. Chadalavada indicated that the ISO would be willing to do so, but wished to avoid presentation of duplicative information (because the level of detail at which January operations

could be discussed would for Information Policy reasons be similar in content and level to that provided during the meeting). He requested additional, specific questions be submitted in writing so that the ISO could better evaluate whether and how additional discussion at a Technical Committee meeting (or the already-scheduled special market price technical sessions) before the Spring would be useful and not duplicative.

RISK MANAGEMENT POLICIES-RELATED FAP CHANGES

Mr. Peter Fuller, Budget & Finance Subcommittee (Subcommittee) Chairman, referred the Committee to the materials posted in advance of the meeting concerning a change to the ISO New England Financial Assurance Policy (FAP) that would reduce the annual submission requirements for certain Market Participants in the Financial Transmission Rights (FTR) market. At that point, the FAP required Market Participants with aggregate open FTR transactions greater than 1,000 MW in any month to submit their risk management policies to the ISO for review annually (by April 30 of each year), which was consistent with FERC Order 741. The ISO proposed to revise the FAP to permit a Market Participant to certify that there had been no changes to its previously filed risk management policies or to submit revised policies with the changes clearly identified, rather than submit its entire risk management policy each year. Mr. Fuller reported that the Subcommittee discussed the proposed FAP change at its January 24 teleconference meeting with no objection noted. During that discussion, Participants asked the ISO to create a materiality standard for changes to be submitted, but the ISO indicated that all changes to policies should be submitted annually in order to avoid a judgment call on materiality. He stated the ISO expected to request that the FAP changes become effective prior to April 30, 2014, so that they would apply to the 2014 submission requirements.

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

> RESOLVED, that the NEPOOL Participants Committee supports the changes to the ISO New England Financial Assurance Policy related to the annual submission of risk management policies for Financial Transmission Rights (FTR) transactions, 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.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Fuller announced that the next meeting of the Subcommittee would be held on February 13, and would address (i) a draft of the ISO's fourth quarterly 2013 Capital Projects Report, which would provide an opportunity to review progress on priorities set out in the annual Work Plan, (ii) NEPOOL's year-end budget results, and (iii) recent default activity and related suspensions and FERC notice filings.

LITIGATION REPORT

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the February 5 Litigation Report that had been posted in advance of the meeting and encouraged anyone with comments or questions on the Report to please contact him or any of NEPOOL's Counsel. He highlighted that February 12 was the comment date for the performance incentives Jump Ball proceeding; and February 21 was the date for comments on the ISO's Capacity Zones filing.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the NEPOOL calendar for February and March. He reported that the next regularly-scheduled meeting of the Participants Committee would be held on March 7 at the Colonnade Hotel in Boston. He highlighted that, because of a required filing regarding the FCM Sloped Demand Curve, there would be a Participants Committee meeting for consideration of that issue on March 21, also at the Colonnade, and urged the Committee to mark their calendars and plan their schedules accordingly.

There being no further business, the teleconference meeting adjourned at 11:58 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

David T. Doot, Secretary

ATTACHMENT 1

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PARTICIPATING IN
FEBRUARY 7, 2014 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCE MEETING

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Associated Industries of Massachusetts	End User			Roger Borghesani
Boylston Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
BP Energy Company	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
Braintree Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Brookfield Energy Marketing / Cross-Sound Cable	Supplier	Aleksandar Mitreski	Jose Rotger	
Calpine Energy Services, LP	Supplier	John Flumerfelt		
Central Maine Power Company (CMP)	Transmission	Eric Stinneford		
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Cianbro Companies	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Comverge	AR	John Driscoll		
Concord Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Coop.	Publicly Owned	Brian Forshaw		
Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel (CT OCC)	End User		Joe Rosenthal	Dave Thompson
Conservation Law Foundation (CLF)	End User	Seth Kaplan		
Conservation Services Group (CSG)	AR			Doug Hurley
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	Supplier	Jeff Dannels		
Dominion Energy Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Ronald Hart		
Dragon Products Company LLC	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Dynegy Marketing and Trade, LLC	Supplier			William Fowler
Elektrisola, Inc.	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Emera Maine, Inc.	Transmission	Jeffrey Jones	Stacy Dimou	
Energy America, LLC	Supplier	Ron Carrier		Nancy Chafetz
EnerNOC, Inc.	AR		Greg Geller	
Entergy Nuclear Power Marketing Inc.	Generation	Marc Potkin	Chad Cooper	
EquiPower Resources Management, LLC	Generation	Jim Ginnetti	William Fowler	
Essential Power, LLC	Generation	M.Q. Riding	William Fowler	
Exelon Generation Company	Supplier		William Fowler	
Fairchild Semiconductor Corporation	End User	Gus Fromuth		
First Wind Energy Marketing, Inc.	AR	John Keene		Bob Stein
Food City, Inc.	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Galt Power, Inc.	Supplier	Nancy Chafetz	Jon Dempsey	
GDF SUEZ Energy Marketing NA, Inc.	Generation	Thomas Kaslow		
Generation Group Member	Generation	Dennis Duffy	Abby Krich	
Georgetown Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Granite Ridge Energy, LLC	Supplier		William Fowler	
Groton Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Groveland Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	Supplier	Louis Guilbault	Robert Stein	
Hardwood Products Company	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User	Mary Smith		
Hess Corporation	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
High Liner Foods (USA) Incorporated	End User		William P. Short III	
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
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	
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	End User	Donald Sipe		

ATTACHMENT 1

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PARTICIPATING IN
FEBRUARY 7, 2014 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCE MEETING

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Integrys Energy Services Inc.	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
Kimberly-Clark Corporation	Supplier			Vicki Karandrikas
LaBree's Inc.	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Linde Energy Services	Supplier			Vicki Karandrikas
Littleton (MA) Electric Light & Water Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Long Island Lighting Company (LIPA)	Supplier	William Killgoar		
Maine Skiing, Inc.	End User	Donald Sipe		
Mansfield Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Marblehead Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Marden's Inc.	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Mass. Attorney General's Office	End User	Fred Plett	Christina Below	
Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric C. (MMWEC)	Publicly Owned	Gary Will		
Merrimac Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Middleborough Gas and Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
MoArk, LLC	End User	Gus Fromuth		
New England Power Company (National Grid)	Transmission	Timothy Brennan		
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative (NHEC)	Publicly Owned		Steve Kaminski	Brian Forshaw
New Hamp. Office of Consumer Advocate (NH OCA)	End User	Paul Peterson		
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	Generation	Michelle Gardner		
NU / NSTAR	Transmission	James Daly	Calvin Bowie	Joe Staszowski
NRG Power Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Peter Fuller		
PalletOne of Maine	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Pascoag Utility District	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Paxton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
PowerOptions, Inc.	End User	Cynthia Arcate		
PPL EnergyPlus, LC	Supplier		Sharon Weber	
Praxair, Inc.	End User			Vicki Karandrikas
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Provisional Group Member - Load Response Sub-Sector	AR	Brad Swalwell		
Provisional Group Member	Transmission	Steve Conant		
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC	Supplier	Joel Gordon		
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
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		
South Hadley Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
St. Anselm College	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Taunton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
The Energy Consortium (TEC)	End User	Roger Borghesani	Mary Smith	
TransCanada Power Marketing Ltd.	Generation		Mike Hachey	
Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS)	End User	Paul Peterson		

ATTACHMENT 1

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PARTICIPATING IN
FEBRUARY 7, 2014 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCE MEETING

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
United Illuminating Company (UI)	Transmission	Rich Peters	Alan Trotta	
Utility Services Inc.	End User			Paul Peterson
Vermont Electric Power Company, Inc. (VELCO)	Transmission	Frank Ettori	Bill Ryan	Marc Sciarrotta
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	
Wallingford DPU Electric Division	Publicly Owned	Dave Cavanaugh		
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Westerly Hospital, The	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Westfield Gas & Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Z-TECH LLC	End User		Gus Fromuth	