

FINAL

A meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, March 4, 2016 at the Colonnade Hotel, 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. Joel Gordon, Chair, presided and Mr. David Doot, Secretary, recorded. Mr. Gordon welcomed the members, alternates and guests who were present.

On behalf of NEPOOL, Mr. Gordon congratulated Ms. Abigail Krich, President of Boreas Renewables, LLC and Generation Sector representative, for being selected as the first recipient of the New England Women in Energy and the Environment (NEWIEE) Rising Star Award. He noted that the award would be presented to her at the NEWIEE Gala on April 14.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 5, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the February 5, 2016 meeting that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, those preliminary minutes were approved unanimously.

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 approved unanimously without comment.

COMMENTS OF NARUC PRESIDENT TRAVIS KAVULLA

Ms. Angela O'Connor, Chair of the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities, introduced Commissioner Travis Kavulla. Chair O'Connor provided a brief summary of his

background, noting among other titles and accomplishments that he was the President and Chairman of the Board of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC), the Vice-Chairman of the Montana Public Service Commission, and served on the California ISO's (CAISO) Energy Imbalance Market Transitional Committee.

Commissioner Kavulla opened with a standard disclaimer that his comments were his own and not those of the Montana Commission or NARUC. Following some introductory thanks and remarks, he recounted recent experience presiding over hearings and listening to expert witnesses testify about how and over what period of time property should be depreciated and the net salvage value to be used in making that determination. He expressed his hope that there were better methods for the regulation of electric service and pointed to competition as one possibility.

He noted the current and future challenges in furthering state and federal environmental policies in the context of competitive wholesale markets. He acknowledged that New England was on the front lines of this debate. He viewed as the ideal outcome for competitive wholesale markets the creation of revenues for wholesale power producers achieved through the selling of power, capacity and other products into those markets. He summarized three different business/regulatory models currently in effect for the industry: (1) markets with vertically integrated utilities that do not have an ISO to optimize the dispatch or short-to-medium procurement of their resources (most of Montana, most of the Western and Southeastern United States); (2) ISO footprints whose main players are vertically integrated utilities for whom the ISO is merely an information technology platform for the optimization of members' resources; and (3) ISOs like ISO New England that play a much larger role with respect to the entry and procurement of those resources. He stated that the first two actually have more in common than the latter two, referring by example to CAISO which is trying to expand a real-time energy

market to the Western United States. He explained that the expanded markets in the west were intended to allow resources to be optimized with one another and not to allow the competitive wholesale markets to drive new investment in supply resources. In that evolving western market, as well as MISO and other ISOs in the country, the footprint was driven primarily by resource optimization reasons, leaving decisions as to new supply resources principally to state regulation, unlike in New England. The tension between state policy advancement and competitive wholesale power markets was driving state policy makers to consider the procurement of long-term energy supply to serve customers within their jurisdiction.

Turning to climate impacts of the electric industry, he acknowledged broad support to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and control greenhouse gases. He observed that state statutes relating to this topic, though, did not generally control directly for the emissions of carbon dioxide. By way of example, he referred to Montana's renewable portfolio standard, in which a provision was inserted to require a certain number of 25MW or less wind farms, in order to provide a revenue opportunity for local farmers. Further, the legislation identified as "renewable" power generated from the burning of creosote-laced railroad ties. Such examples, he explained, demonstrated the balancing of economic efficiency and political palatability, and the challenge of passing legislation explicitly requiring the reduction of carbon dioxide.

Furthering his observations on balancing public policy with economic efficiency, Commissioner Kavulla referred to states with vertically integrated utilities where the powers of state ratemaking still controlled the procurement of new supply resources. He explained that procurement decisions often reflected compromises between environmentalists who insist on higher percentages in renewable portfolio standards (RPSs) and an end to coal-fired generation, and utilities that had made investments to serve customers for which recovery was needed. As a result, for example, state regulators may approve rates that support an outcome where the utility

converts coal plants to natural gas or builds community solar. Referring to jurisdictions traditionally regulated under that model (e.g. Oregon, Washington and Ohio), he explained those outcomes had become the premise of the bargain, with a resulting re-intervention of state policy into traditional ratemaking and police powers over regulated utilities. He noted federal tax policy also encouraged new renewables and changes to federal environmental regulation would affect the continuing viability of older capacity. He stated that these policies taken together were as persuasive on the electric power sector as were many market fundamentals (e.g. low cost natural gas).

Looking forward, Commissioner Kavulla stated his view that state, federal and environmental policies would continue to heavily influence the electric power sector. He summarized the challenges reconciling competitive markets with energy policy dictated less and less by economic efficiency and least-cost, reliable service than by vague and indirect environmental objectives.

Continuing his comparison of cost-of-service and competitive market regulation, he explained how competitive market regulation could be more complex and challenging and further complicated by state policy initiatives. Under cost-of-service regulation, state regulators could directly dictate the individual rate outcome for each of the utilities within its jurisdiction. Under competitive market regulation, however, rate recovery relies on intricate market rules, binding on and influenced by many market actors, to provide necessary revenues. State policy initiatives could further complicate competitive market regulation. By way of example, he noted how state and federal policy interventions were expanding the penetration of intermittent renewable resources, but also resulting in decreased energy clearing prices which, in turn, were leading to increased reliance on capacity and ancillary service market revenues. Renewable and other subsidized resources could also impact the capacity markets, as did behind-the-meter

generation resources, which further reduce both the observable need for capacity and wholesale energy prices (and cost recovery). Such outcomes, he asserted, demonstrated that the continued viability of competitive wholesale power markets depends on reconciling how state policy initiatives and regulations interact with federally-regulated markets.

Applying these observations to the New England markets in particular, he observed that ISO-NE had done some things to address these challenges, citing the Minimum Offer Price Rule (MOPR) as an example. He pointed out the irony that regulating competitive wholesale capacity markets through MOPR fundamentally involved the same type of issues that he faced regulating vertically-integrated utilities. He also found ironic the fact that ISO-NE was relying on planning models to identify need rather than market innovation to optimize operations.

Commissioner Kavulla concluded with brief observations on Order 1000, which he acknowledged was impacting different areas of the country differently. He suggested that Order 1000 did potentially create more opportunities for cross-regional transfers of renewable power through reliance on public policy requirements, noting that outcome too would require a careful balancing of exporting and importing regional interests. He said that further discussion of Order 1000 would take place at the NARUC Summer Meeting in July, and encouraged those interested to attend.

Following questions and further comments, Mr. Gordon, on behalf of NEPOOL, thanked Commissioner Kavulla for his comments and extended to him an open invitation to join members around the table, either for the remainder of the meeting, or anytime when he might find himself in New England.

ISO CEO REPORT

Mr. Gordon van Welie, ISO Chief Executive Officer (CEO), referred the Committee to the 2016 Regional Electricity Outlook (REO) that was circulated at the meeting and posted on the ISO website. He summarized the following four key themes of the 2016 REO:

- (1) Gas infrastructure challenges;
- (2) Hybrid grid where behind-the-meter and distributed solar will shrink demand on the bulk power system in the interim while electrification of the transportation sector will increase demand;
- (3) Renewable energy and carbon reduction, which will require more transmission; and
- (4) Compatibility between wholesale markets and states' public policy goals.

Mr. Gordon then referred the Committee to the summaries, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting, of ISO Board and Board Committee meetings that had occurred since the February 5 meeting. There were no questions or comments on those summaries.

ISO COO REPORT

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), reviewed highlights from the March COO report, which was circulated in advance of the meeting and posted on the NEPOOL and ISO websites. Focusing on report highlights, which reflected data through February 24, he reported for February that: (i) Energy Market value was \$292 million, down \$153 million from January 2016 and down \$1.1 billion from February 2015; (ii) natural gas prices were 15.1% lower than January 2016 average values; (iii) Real-Time Hub LMPs on average were 13.6% lower than January 2016 LMPs; (iv) average daily (peak hour) Day-Ahead cleared physical Energy, as a percent of forecasted load, was 99.8%, down from 100.1% in January; (v) daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) totaled \$2.5 million, down \$4.8 million from January 2016 NCPC and down \$8.8 million from February 2015; (vi) first

contingency payments, totaling \$2.4 million, were \$4.6 million lower than January's; (vii) second contingency payments, totaling \$16,000 were up from \$0 in January; (viii) voltage support payments totaled \$75,000, down \$234,000 from January 2016; and (ix) NCPC payments were 0.8% of the total Energy Market value.

He reported that 2016 economic planning studies were scheduled for discussion at the March 28 Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting and that ISO was working with NEPOOL to identify by April 1 a 2016 economic study request. He reported that the ISO was also in the process of updating the annual load, energy efficiency, and solar PV forecasts.

Focusing on operations going into the summer, he reported that information concerning gas pipeline outages during the summer are published and available in the public domain. He said there was an Algonquin gas pipeline outage scheduled from the beginning of April through October, with restrictions on that pipeline to range between 40-50%, and a Tennessee Pipeline outage with restrictions for two weeks in May. He opined that the restrictions would not challenge reliability so long as other natural gas fuel sources remained available. He reminded members that some of the region's oil units had permit restrictions limiting their operations during the summer. He also referred to an ISO-issued memorandum regarding outages on the Hydro Quebec Phase II line that would continue through Spring 2016. He said the ISO would circulate an updated memorandum on that issue within the next several weeks. In response to questions, he indicated that, except for the Algonquin work, the ISO expected most of the reported outages and maintenance to be completed ahead of the summer months. Further, he explained that the Algonquin work was aimed at expanding pipeline capacity, which could have operational benefits for Winter 2016/17, and that the pipelines have been working together and with the ISO to coordinate their outages and minimize any reliability concerns.

Turning to discussion on the Forward Capacity Market (FCM), Dr. Chadalavada reported that the ISO made a filing on February 29 to respond to FERC questions concerning the ISO's Retirement Reform filing (ER16-551). He referred members to a February 12 ISO memorandum that provided the timeline for FCA11, which identified that the Show of Interest window would remain open until April 22. Mr. Raymond Hepper, ISO General Counsel, clarified that the schedule was all in conformance with the existing Tariff, which addressed when the Show of Interest window must be opened but not when the ISO must close that window. He explained that the purpose of the ISO's notification that the window would remain open until April 22 was to give everyone additional notice in light of FERC's ongoing consideration of the Retirement Reform filing. Referring to a March 1 NEPGA request that FERC delay the retirement reforms, he explained that the ISO would oppose that request and expected retirement bids to be submitted by March 18. Participants would need to determine how to respond if the FERC did not act on the Retirement Reform filing by that time. He said that, if the entire Retirement Reform filing was rejected, then retirements submitted to the Market Monitor would become moot and the process followed in prior auctions would be followed. If the FERC modified the Retirement Reform filing, the ISO believed there would be time during the window of discussion with the Market Monitor to reflect FERC's requirements.

Turning to an update on the 2015/16 Winter Reliability Program, Dr. Chadalavada reported that 153,985 barrels of oil were burned in February, as compared to 2 million barrels in February 2015, with a cumulative total of about 250,000 barrels burned during the Winter 2015/16 period. He reported that, in February, no program LNG had been used and no DR was dispatched. He attributed the differences from the prior winter period to the warm temperatures and resulting light load conditions. In response to questions, Dr. Chadalavada reported that the December 2015 and January 2016 values were final and final replenishment information would

be available after March 15, noting that, to date, no one had yet ordered any replenishment for the December through February period.

Dr. Chadalavada concluded his presentation with a summary of operations during the cold weekend of February 13-14. He reported that, during that weekend, all LNG facilities were fully operational with adequate storage levels, gas pipelines in the Northeast were fully available, external electric transmission ties were fully available, and there were minimal generation outages/reductions entering the weekend. He reported a peak load of 19,545 MW, which was also the peak for the winter season. He reported in response to a question that there were no supplemental commitments required for that weekend.

ISO UPDATED 2016 WORK PLAN AND NEPOOL BUSINESS PRIORITIES

Dr. Chadalavada then referred the Committee to a presentation of the Updated 2016 Work Plan that was circulated and posted with the meeting materials in advance of the meeting. He summarized the development of the Plan and explained that the update highlighted only items that had been modified since the Work Plan was first issued in September 2015. He said that a new Work Plan would be discussed in Q3 2016 to cover the period from Q4 2016 through Q2 2018. He reported that the fourth quarter of 2015 was successful, with a number of projects implemented, including Coordinated Transaction Scheduling (CTS), the Generator Control Application (GCA) and the tenth Forward Capacity Auction (FCA10). He said that the ISO's primary emphasis for the remainder of the Plan was to improve price formation and the FCM.

Dr. Chadalavada noted that an item not covered in the update related to Price Responsive Demand (PRD) implementation. He explained that the ISO was considering that topic and would identify at a later point how PRD would be worked into the Plan and what other activities might be delayed due to redirection of resources to the PRD project.

Turning to a review of efforts for FCA12, Dr. Chadalavada reported discussions on zonal issues would be ongoing in Q4 2016. Based on stakeholder feedback, and to improve the timing of the Capacity Zone modeling process, the ISO would continue its early stakeholder dialogue in advance of FCA12. He said that the ISO would present an overview of the power system topology expected for FCA12 in Q4 2016. Mr. Gordon reminded the Committee that the zone formation question, the persistence of the zones and how zonal formation is evaluated year-to-year, was an important NEPOOL priority. Dr. Chadalavada reported the discussion of treatment of resources retained for reliability was moved back one quarter, from Q2/Q3 2016 to Q3/Q4 2016, with implementation targeted no earlier than FCA12. He stated the ISO was evaluating potential modifications and planned to engage stakeholders in discussion on that topic in the latter half of 2016.

Dr. Chadalavada reported that the ISO would hold a second scoping discussion on the FCM auction format in Q3 2016, as requested by NEPOOL, and that the ISO was evaluating the FCA's descending clock auction (DCA) format and alternatives, including whether stakeholder concerns with the DCA format might be alleviated by a sealed-bid auction (closed auction) format. He reported that the ISO would schedule a meeting in July 2016 for that continued dialogue. Responding, Mr. Gordon noted that this additional discussion was in furtherance of NEPOOL's priorities. Ahead of the July meeting, he committed to work with the NEPOOL Vice-Chairs, who in turn would work with their Sectors, to clarify concerns with the current auction format.

With respect to Financial Transmission Rights (FTR) and Long-Term Transmission Rights (LTTR), Dr. Chadalavada reported that the ISO had worked over the past several years on a solution to transfer awarded FTRs onto the Nodal Exchange, and that financial assurance associated with FTR market activity had been a major concern for the ISO. He stated that many

regulatory and administrative hurdles still existed with respect to the proposed design so that it would function consistently with both FERC and CFTC jurisdiction. Given these challenges, the ISO planned to refocus its efforts to implement Balance of Payment Period (BOPP) in the near-term and LTTRs in the long-term. He reported that Mr. Robert Ludlow would present the ISO's thinking at the March 31 NEPOOL Budget & Finance Subcommittee meeting and encouraged anyone with feedback to contact Mr. Ludlow in advance of or at that meeting. Dr. Chadalavada responded to a question stating that the ISO could implement BOPP in the middle of the calendar year if it needed to.

Dr. Chadalavada said that work was continuing on generator interconnection reforms. An additional stakeholder session would occur in 2016 and the ISO was actively working on a cluster study that was expected to be completed by Q4 2016. In response to questions, Dr. Chadalavada reported that the cluster study would begin immediately and would run in parallel with the additional stakeholder session. He also clarified that the redetermination of Cost of New Entry (CONE) for FCA11 was just a mechanical adjustment and more thorough CONE analysis would be performed for FCA12. He reported that changes to a biennial RSP cycle had been reviewed with NEPOOL, filed with the FERC, and would be implemented in 2016.

Dr. Chadalavada concluded his presentation reporting on the status of NEPOOL Scenario Analysis efforts, which Mr. Gordon noted was one of NEPOOL's key priorities for 2016. Dr. Chadalavada stated that all Sectors had been actively engaged in a scoping discussion. He reminded members that study requests were due April 1 and, so long as the initial request was sufficiently detailed, the ISO would accept additional guidance on, and refinement of, those requests during May/early June.

On this topic, Mr. Gordon reported that a special meeting was held after the February Reliability Committee meeting to discuss the scenarios being considered by NEPOOL and the

different inputs for those scenarios. He said that Mr. Robert Stein chaired that meeting, at which the request was made that any comments/questions or suggestions be forwarded to Mr. Stein or Mr. Eric Runge, NEPOOL Counsel. That input was due by March 9. A redraft would then be circulated for further discussion at a meeting scheduled for March 17 at the DoubleTree Milford Hotel. Mr. Stein explained that he did not expect there to be unanimous agreement on every scenario or assumption, but would be exploring differing suggestions and trying to reach agreement on how to handle them. He said that there would be an additional discussion at the next PAC meeting as well.

Continuing with discussion about scenario planning, the End User Sector Vice-Chair explained that Sector's view that scenario analysis needed to provide information that would inform the question as to whether there was an actual conflict between efficient markets and public policy, and not to critique public policy or advocate for changes to that policy. That Sector requested that the Scenario Analysis adopt as a base case a resource mix that reasonably reflects satisfaction of public policy requirements and from that base modify a variety of variables to define how those changes would impact revenues to resources in the market. Other members expressed agreement.

Dr. Chadalavada responded to questions as to the timing for revisiting out-of-market payment cost allocation issues, explaining that the project schedule had not changed but remained outside the window of time covered by the Plan. He said that the recent FERC NOPR on price formation, which focused heavily on uplift and cost causation, could materially affect that discussion and timing. He explained efforts on PRD continued to take priority ahead of the cost allocation issue. He reminded members that the External Market Monitor had highlighted the need to address this previously and again in the current year.

LITIGATION REPORT

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the March 2 Litigation Report that had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He highlighted the continued high-level of activity, particularly in the federal courts. He reported that the Dominion complaint regarding the handling of bidding in FCA10 was still ongoing. He reported that FCA9 results had been appealed to the courts by UWUA Local 464, the trade union for workers at Brayton Point station. A filing by Algonquin to modify capacity release for new natural gas capacity into the region had been filed at the FERC, and protests were submitted by numerous New England entities. Mr. Hepper confirmed that the ISO would be filing later that day its response to the price formation questions asked by the FERC in Docket No. AD14-14.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Stein reported that the Reliability Committee would meet on March 23 to vote on FCA11 zones and demand curves and, as previously reported, there would be a NEPOOL Scenario Analysis Planning meeting on March 17 in Milford. Mr. Jose Rotger reported that the Transmission Committee would meet on March 29 by teleconference to vote on reactive capability testing and auditing procedures and changes to the Schedule 2 Compensation Program. Mr. Kenneth Dell Orto reported that the Budget & Finance Subcommittee would meet on March 31, and as previously noted, would review an ISO update concerning its efforts to accelerate the implementation of the FTR market BOPP proposal, to continue discussion on GIS cost allocation, and to ask the Committee for feedback on the changes that stem from the SRECTrade's proposal to modify the GIS interface. Mr. Gordon followed up that the SRECTrade proposal would also be considered by the Markets Committee meeting. Ms. Allison DiGrande reported that the Markets Committee was scheduled to meet on March 8 in Westborough to review zonal demand curves and vote on sub-hourly Real-Time settlement, and

on March 18 to vote on zonal demand curves. Ms. Krich reported that the Variable Resource Working Group would meet by teleconference on March 7 regarding the FCM wind qualification tool, wind power forecast integration and, pursuant to a Markets Committee referral, FCM commercial operation audits for intermittent generators.

Ms. Rachel Goldwasser, NECPUC Executive Director, reported that she had recently sent out a “save-the-date” invitation to the June 5-8, 2016 NECPUC Symposium and encouraged members to visit the NECPUC website for further information regarding registration and reservations (which would be open in the next month).

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Gordon reported that the next Participants Committee meeting was scheduled to be held on April 8 at the Renaissance Providence Hotel in Providence, Rhode Island; the May 6 meeting, at the Colonnade Hotel in Boston; the June 3 meeting, back at the Renaissance Providence Hotel; and the June 21-23 Summer Meeting, at the Mount Washington Resort in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire. He encouraged members to mark their calendars and attend accordingly.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David T. Doot, Secretary

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN
MARCH 4, 2016 MEETING**

| PARTICIPANT NAME | SECTOR/ GROUP | MEMBER NAME | ALTERNATE NAME | PROXY |
|--|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---|
| American PowerNet Management | Supplier | | | Mary Smith |
| Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Belmont Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| Boylston Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| BP Energy Company | Supplier | | | Nancy Chafetz |
| Calpine Energy Services, LP | Supplier | John Flumerfelt | Brett Kruse | |
| Central Maine Power/United Illuminating Company | Transmission | | | Alan Trotta (tel) |
| Chester Municipal Electric Light Department | Publicly Owned | Phil Smith | | |
| Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| CLEAResult Consulting, Inc. | AR | Doug Hurley (tel) | | |
| Concord Municipal Light Plant | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Coop. | Publicly Owned | Brian Forshaw | | |
| Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel | End User | | | Dave Thompson |
| Conservation Law Foundation | End User | Jerry Elmer (tel) | | |
| Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc. | Supplier | Jeff Dannels | | |
| Danvers Electric Division | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| Dominion Energy Marketing, Inc. | Generation | Jim Davis | | |
| DTE Energy Trading, Inc. | Supplier | | | Nancy Chafetz |
| Emera Maine | Transmission | | Jose Rotger | Stacy Dimou Andrew McCullough Sandi Hennequin |
| Energy America, LLC | Supplier | | | Nancy Chafetz |
| EnerNOC, Inc. | AR | Herb Healy (tel) | | |
| Entergy Nuclear Power Marketing, LLC | Generation | | Ken Dell Orto | |
| Essential Power, LLC | Generation | M.Q. Riding (tel) | | |
| Eversource Energy | Transmission | James Daly | Joe Staszowski | |
| Exelon Generation Company | Supplier | Steve Kirk | | |
| Galt Power, Inc. | Supplier | Nancy Chafetz | | |
| GDF SUEZ Energy Marketing NA, Inc. | Generation | Thomas Kaslow | | |
| Generation Group Member | Generation | | Abby Krich (tel) | Bob Stein |
| Georgetown Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| Groton Electric Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Groveland Electric Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc. | Supplier | Louis Guilbault | Bob Stein | |
| Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited | End User | Mary Smith | | Paul Peterson Doug Hurley Sarah Jackson |
| High Liner Foods (USA) Incorporated | End User | | William P. Short III | |
| Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| Holden Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Holyoke Gas & Electric Department | Publicly Owned | | | Michael Lynch (tel) |
| Hull Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Industrial Energy Consumer Group | End User | Don Sipe | | |
| Ipswich Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Long Island Lighting Company (LIPA) | Supplier | | William Killgoar | |
| Littleton (MA) Electric Light & Water Department | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Craig Kiemy (tel) | |
| Maine Skiing, Inc. | End User | Don Sipe | | |
| Mansfield Municipal Electric Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Marblehead Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Massachusetts Attorney General's Office (MA AG) | End User | Fred Plett | | |
| Mass. Development Finance Agency | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Company (MMWEC) | Publicly Owned | Michael Lynch (tel) | | |
| Merrimac Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| Middleborough Gas and Electric Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN
MARCH 4, 2016 MEETING**

| PARTICIPANT NAME | SECTOR/ GROUP | MEMBER NAME | ALTERNATE NAME | PROXY |
|--|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Middleton Municipal Electric Department | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| National Grid | Transmission | | Timothy Martin | |
| New Hampshire Electric Cooperative (NHEC) | Publicly Owned | Steve Kaminski | | Brian Forshaw David Mullett Michael Lynch (tel) |
| New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate (NH OCA) | End User | Paul Peterson (tel) | Sarah Jackson | |
| NextEra Energy Resources, LLC | Generation | Michelle Gardner | | |
| NRG Power Marketing LLC | Generation | Dave Cavanaugh | | |
| Pascoag Utility District | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| Paxton Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Peabody Municipal Light Plant | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Princeton Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC | Supplier | Joel Gordon | | |
| Repsol Energy North America Company | Supplier | Sam Moreton (tel) | Nancy Chafetz | |
| Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| Russell Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Operations | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Small Load Response Group Member | AR | Doug Hurley | Brad Swalwell (tel) | |
| Small Renewable Generation Group | AR | Erik Abend (tel) | | |
| South Hadley Electric Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Sterling Municipal Electric Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Stowe Electric Department | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| SunEdison (First Wind Energy Marketing, Inc.) | AR | John Keene | | Bob Stein |
| Talen Energy Marketing, LLC | Supplier | Tom Hyzinski (tel) | | |
| Taunton Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| The Energy Consortium | End User | | Mary Smith | Paul Peterson (tel) Doug Hurley (tel) Sarah Jackson |
| Union of Concerned Scientists | End User | | Francis Pullaro | |
| United Illuminating Company (UI) | Transmission | | Alan Trotta (tel) | |
| Utility Services, Inc. | End User | | | Paul Peterson |
| Vermont Electric Cooperative | Publicly Owned | Craig Kiemy (tel) | | |
| Vermont Electric Power Company | Transmission | Frank Etori | | |
| Vermont Energy Investment Corporation | AR | | Doug Hurley | |
| Vermont Public Power Supply Authority | Publicly Owned | David Mullett (tel) | | |
| Wakefield Municipal Gas and Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Wallingford DPU Electric Division | Publicly Owned | Phil Smith | | |
| Wellesley Municipal Light Plant | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned | | Michael Lynch (tel) | |
| Westfield Gas & Electric Light Department | Publicly Owned | | Phil Smith | |
| Wheelabrator North Andover Inc. | AR | | Jim Ginnetti (tel) | |