

## **FINAL**

A meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, October 4, 2018, 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 who attended the meeting.

Mr. Thomas Kaslow, Chair, presided and Mr. David Doot, Secretary, recorded.

### **APPROVAL OF AUGUST 24, 2018 MINUTES**

Mr. Kaslow referred to the preliminary minutes of the August 24, 2018 meeting, as circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes of the August 24, 2018 meeting were unanimously approved without change.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Kaslow referred the Committee to the Consent Agenda that was circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. A motion was duly made and seconded to approve the Consent Agenda, with Item No. 2 (Tariff revisions related to Delayed Commercial Resource Treatment) removed for discussion later in the meeting. That motion was unanimously approved with an abstention noted by Eversource. The Eversource representative stated the abstention related to concerns identified with respect to Consent Agenda Item No. 1 (Manual Conforming Changes).

### **ISO CEO REPORT**

Mr. Gordon van Welie, ISO Chief Executive Officer (CEO), referred the Committee to the summaries of the ISO Board and Board Committee meetings that had occurred since the

August 24 meeting, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. There were no questions or comments on the summaries.

## **ISO COO REPORT**

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), referred to the October COO report, which was circulated in advance of the meeting and posted on the NEPOOL and ISO websites. He said the October COO report reflected data through September 25, 2018. During that time: (i) Energy Market value was \$355 million, down \$206 million from August 2018 and up \$80 million from September 2017; (ii) average natural gas prices were 7.8% lower than average prices in August 2018; (iii) average Real-Time Hub LMPs (\$44/MWh) were 12% higher than August 2018 LMPs; (iv) average daily (peak-hour) Day-Ahead cleared physical Energy, as a percent of forecasted load, was 99% in September, up from 97.1% in August 2018; and (v) daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) for September (based on data through September 24, 2018) totaled \$3.3 million, up \$396,000 from August 2018 and down \$320,000 from September 2017. He reported that NCPC in September represented 1% of the total Energy Market value, including: (a) \$3.1 million in first contingency payments, up \$1.2 million from August 2018; (b) \$16,000 in second contingency payments, down \$612,000 from August 2018; and (c) \$16,000 in distribution payments, down \$332,000 from August 2018.

He noted most NCPC was in first contingency, primarily on September 3 for posturing costs. He advised that numerous outages would occur in October, both for transmission and generation. The ISO projected the possibility for out-of-market commitments in NEMA/Boston given the combination of planned outages, with the uplift split between first and second contingency. The uplift would mostly occur at loads above 14,000 MW, which the ISO thought was likely to be for only a very limited number of hours.

Dr. Chadalavada noted that hot, humid weather continued into September. He reported that Day-Ahead load cleared as a function of the ISO forecast continued to trend positively, with September at about 99%, versus 95.8% in August. He noted that the percentages changed when comparing Day-Ahead loads cleared as a percent of actual load in Real-Time. He then noted the percentages for September 3 and 16, which were 89% and 93%, respectively.

Dr. Chadalavada went on to refer to a new exhibit in the Report illustrating the level of Price Responsive Demand (PRD) in the market since New England implemented rule changes for PRD on June 1. He then provided an update on FCA13, reporting that the New Capacity Resource Qualification notices were issued September 28, the renewable exemption cap was set at 481 MW, and all the filings related to the Installed Capacity Requirement (ICR) and Related Values would be made no later than November 6. He noted that the ISO had recently filed to terminate the Capacity Supply Obligation (CSO) for a resource that had cleared but for which the commercial operation date was substantially delayed. That filing would impact FCA13 and could impact the prices coming out of that auction.

Dr. Chadalavada explained in response to questions concerning NCPC and posturing on September 3 that the ISO worked to balance the system to preserve 10-minute and 30-minute spinning reserves. The posturing costs would be recovered as first contingency costs. He indicated that planned Opportunity Cost changes could impact posturing but the ISO had not assessed the details of how exactly the opportunity costs would be factored in for non-fossil-fueled, limited-energy resources. The design objective for those market improvements was to incent the right resources to be offered and to be chosen by the markets, rather than through out-of-market operator actions.

*September 3, 2018 OP-4 Event and Capacity Scarcity Conditions*

Dr. Chadalavada then referred the Committee to the September 3, 2018 OP-4 Event and Capacity Scarcity Condition presentation that was circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He explained that two primary factors led to the OP-4 (Action During A Capacity Deficiency) Event: (1) almost 1,650 MWs of generation outages and reductions occurring during the dispatch day; and (2) a load forecast that was almost 2,300 MWs too low because of temperatures and dew points higher than forecasted. The 30-minute and 10-minute Reserve Constraint Penalty Factors (RCPF) were violated for 32 intervals during the late afternoon and early evening. Those conditions required the implementation of Master/Local Control Center Procedure No. 2 (M/LCC 2) (Abnormal Conditions Alert) and OP-4.

Providing more detail, he reported the ISO's load forecast for the peak hour on September 3 was 20,590 MWs, versus an actual peak load of 22,956 MWs. Referring to information in the presentation, he explained that the Temperature Humidity Index (THI) was higher than projected. He said that THI was a major factor driving load accuracy. He provided historic context for the past 10 Labor Days and provided more detail on the RCPF intervals, the LMPs charted through the day, the interchange in aggregate, and statistics on the output of wind and photovoltaic (PV) forecasts versus actuals.

A member noted that the interchange graph suggested that imports on the New York (NY) AC Tie exceeded an earlier posted import limit (roughly 1,400 MWs), but that limit stepped up later in the day. Dr. Chadalavada explained that, under accepted protocols among PJM, NYISO and the ISO, import limits are adjusted as appropriate based on events, temperatures and system conditions during the day. Both ISO-NE and NYISO must approve the limit adjustments. Concern was expressed on the market impact of changes like that on both prices and market-driven imports. Dr. Chadalavada responded that import limit adjustments for

short times in extreme events have been made previously, with the potential for such adjustments highly fact-specific. He agreed more could be learned by analyzing those events. He explained how the pricing model worked with the implementation of Coordinated Transaction Scheduling (CTS), with great care taken to receive NY information before finalizing and publishing prices at the interface node.

There was discussion of the fact that performance of energy imports does not necessarily provide useful information to compare the performance of New England and New York resources. A member also noted the very substantial Peak Energy Rent (PER) penalties that resulted from the load forecast errors. Dr. Chadalavada acknowledged the importance of an accurate load forecast and explained that accuracy depends on the accuracy of weather inputs. He said the ISO had plans by March 2019 to implement improved load forecast models with updated historic and real-time information for better estimating PV production. He noted that the Control Room updated protocols with lessons learned and was working to respond more quickly in the Control Room to forecast errors. Further, there was an opportunity here for the ISO to work with retail load servers and compare experiences. He committed the ISO to follow up on these matters with the Reliability Committee to discuss progress in addressing the issues raised.

In response to a prior question regarding Emergency Energy Purchases, Dr. Chadalavada referred in his presentation to a chart showing Emergency Energy Purchases from New Brunswick and New York. He noted that the purchase costs of about \$300,000 were offset by related collections of more than \$800,000 in the energy settlement, resulting in more than \$500,000 in refunds in October.

Turning to Forward Capacity Market (FCM) results, he highlighted that the resources that were available during this event all showed up and performed well, including the interface flows

which reflected a significant excess on the interface compared to what happened prior to the event. He reported the net capacity payment for September was \$335 million, with a shortfall in performance payments of about \$8 million, largely because of a FERC-required exemption for how Energy Efficiency (EE) resources are used in the calculation of these performance scores. He reported for PER there were about 4 hours when the Real-Time LMP was north of the strike price, somewhere in the order of a few hundred dollars, and that there would be a \$7 million charge for the next 8 months, from October 2018 to May 2019, retiring on June 1, 2019.

In response to a request, Dr. Chadalavada committed to report back on the breakdown of the \$7.8 million under-collection and the over-collection versus the EE piece. He further committed, if and as required, for the ISO to present at a future Markets Committee meeting the details on the balancing ratio calculations.

### ***2019 Work Plan***

Dr. Chadalavada then referred the Committee to the presentation, circulated and posted in advance of the meeting, identifying objectives and highlights of the 2019 Work Plan. He explained that the 2019 Work Plan was primarily focused on developing a market-based solution to meet the region's Winter Energy Security needs. He also highlighted the continued assessment of improvements to Day-Ahead procurement and pricing of reserve products (Day-Ahead Enhancements).

In response to questions, Dr. Chadalavada clarified that the ISO viewed Winter Energy Security as potentially reducing the scope of, but not necessarily eliminating the need for, Day-Ahead Enhancements. He hoped that the technical sessions exploring Day-Ahead Enhancements, which were to begin later in the year during Winter Energy Security discussions, would provide a clearer sense of the work to be done and implementation timing. He also confirmed that the presentation highlighted items whose scope was more clearly defined and

additional projects (such as further energy storage changes) might be included in the periodic updates as the scope of the projects becomes better defined.

## **2019 ISO AND NESCOE BUDGETS**

Mr. Ken Dell Orto, Budget & Finance Subcommittee (B&F) Chair, referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting related to the proposed 2019 ISO Capital and Operating Budgets and the 2019 NESCOE Budget. He described the review process followed to that point and reported that no material concerns or objections had been raised in the NEPOOL meetings. He noted the questions and comments on the ISO Budgets of certain New England state regulators and consumer advocates, and the ISO responses, all of which had been posted. He summarized at high level changes made since the review by B&F, including: the 2019 operating budget, prior to true-ups, reflected a 1.5% increase over the 2018 operating budget; after accounting for the true-ups, the revenue requirement to fund the 2019 operating budget (i.e., the amount projected to be collected under the ISO administrative cost tariff) would decrease by 3.5% over the amount projected to be collected in 2018; and the ISO capital budget for 2019 was \$28 million, which reflected no change from the amount of the 2018 capital budget. He reported that the ISO Board was expected to vote on the 2019 ISO Budgets following the meeting, taking into consideration the results of the vote at this meeting and all other input. He said that a Tariff filing, following Board action, was expected to be submitted to the FERC on or about October 16, with a requested January 1, 2019 effective date. Summarizing the 2019 NESCOE Budget, he noted that the requested 2019 budget was \$2.35 million, which was slightly less than the \$2.39 million that had been included in the five-year *pro forma* budget supported by the Participants Committee and accepted by the FERC in 2017.

Following motion duly made and seconded, the Committee considered and, in a single vote, without objection, approved the following two motions, with an abstention noted by Cross-Sound Cable (CSC):

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the Year **2019 ISO operating budget and capital budget** proposed by the ISO, as presented at this meeting.

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the Year **2019 NESCOE budget**, as proposed by NESCOE at this meeting, as the Year 2019 operating budget for NESCOE.

### **CASPR SUBSTITUTION AUCTION SUPPLY ELIGIBILITY**

Mr. Alex Kuznecow, Markets Committee Chair, referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting concerning Publicly Owned Entities-proposed revisions to Market Rule 1 to modify the Competitive Auctions with Sponsored Policy Resources (CASPR) Substitution Auction supply eligibility provisions to include resources developed to address local resilience policy objectives (Resilience CASPR Changes), to be effective for FCA14 (2023/24 Capacity Commitment Period). He reported that the Markets Committee considered the Resilience CASPR Changes at its September 12-13 meeting and failed to recommend Participants Committee support by a 37.91% Vote in favor.

The Publicly Owned Entities' representative explained those entities' belief that the disparate treatment of resources developed to meet clean energy and local resilience objectives was unduly discriminatory and would ultimately undermine the participation by those resources in CASPR. The representative also acknowledged that the issue had been fully discussed at the Markets Committee. He went on to say that, so long as NEPOOL and the ISO would not raise stakeholder process objections at the FERC if the Publicly Owned Entities did not pursue a vote at the Participants Committee, the Publicly Owned Entities would forego having the Participants Committee also vote the matter. NEPOOL Counsel confirmed that NEPOOL would not raise



process objections at the FERC if there was not a vote at the Participants Committee and the matter was not moved for further consideration.

### **DELAYED COMMERCIAL OPERATION OF NEW CAPACITY RESOURCES**

Mr. Kuznecow then referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting concerning Markets Committee-recommended changes to Market Rule 1 regarding the treatment of delayed commercial operation of new capacity resources in the Forward Capacity Market (FCM). He reported the Markets Committee considered the changes at its September 12-13 meeting, and recommended Participants Committee support based on show of hands vote, with 23 oppositions and 33 abstentions noted. Mr. Kaslow stated that this item was originally Item #2 on the Consent Agenda and was pulled at the request of PSEG for presentation of an amendment at the meeting.

The PSEG representative explained that PSEG did not make an amendment at the Markets Committee primarily because its concerns were not with the Market Rules as proposed, but instead with the implementation timeline. He asserted that the proposed implementation timeline would impose entirely new obligations, risks, and potential costs on PSEG's new resource that had bid and cleared in a prior Forward Capacity Auction (FCA) with no opportunity for PSEG to adjust its bid for those added obligations, risks or potential costs. The PSEG representative reviewed a proposed amendment that had been circulated to the Committee just prior to the meeting and was posted. He described the proposal as a compromise, under which each new resource would be provided a three-month transitional grace period before it incurs additional costs associated with a delay in commercial operation. He added that the proposed grace period would only be available for new resources whose initial CSO begins in a Capacity Commitment Period from June 2019 through May 2022.

The following motion to amend the main motion was then duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports revisions to Market Rule 1 to improve incentives for a Participant to cover its Capacity Supply Obligation if a new resource is or may be delayed, as recommended by the Markets Committee, and circulated to this Committee in advance of this meeting, together with such other non-substantive changes as may be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Markets Committee.

Members then asked clarifying questions and commented on the amendment. While the description of what PSEG was seeking to accomplish seemed clear, there was some concern that the just-circulated language might not do what was intended. Some members spoke in favor of the amendment, pointing out that resources who are three months late from a June 1 commercial operation date would already face considerable lost opportunity costs because the resources would miss summer months when energy revenues would be greatest. Those resources also risked pay-for-performance penalties. Thus, there already was every motivation to achieve commercial operation on time. Those opposing the amendment argued that delayed resources should not get paid for capacity when they are not operational, nor should they be penalized in the capacity market.

The ISO noted its opposition to the amendment. The ISO further noted its opposition to sending the amendment back to the Markets Committee for recommendation because the ISO was seeking an effective date in December in order to provide Participants time to decide how to cover any exposures and because the proposal effects the mandatory demand bid construct that needs to be in place in December. The ISO argued that it was not fundamentally changing the existing expectations in the market that new resources must cover their CSOs if they are delayed in achieving commercial operation. The current Market Rules required a new resource to cover for the month in which it would not be commercial so that the CSO can be adequately addressed in the third Annual Reconfiguration Auction. The proposed Market Rule changes would

eliminate those provisions. The ISO argued that Participants should expect if they were going to be delayed that they have an obligation to cover their CSO. Imposing a charge rate in lieu of the mandatory demand bid construct would not fundamentally change the risk profile that the Participant currently has for its new CSO.

A member reiterated his frustrations raised at the Markets Committee that mid-stream changes in capacity rules continue to reinforce the advisability of shortening the FCM from three years to one year, similar to New York's capacity market.

The CT PURA representative expressed support for the PSEG Amendment, which it considered a reasonable compromise. Other representatives argued in favor of the amendment for reasons of equity.

Following final comments by the PSEG representative, the Committee voted the motion to amend the main motion and that motion failed with a 47.77% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 14.68%; Transmission Sector – 6.71%; Supplier Sector – 15.48%; AR Sector – 5.23%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector – 0%; End User Sector – 5.59%; and Provisional Group Member – 0.067%). (See Vote 1 on Attachment 2).

The Committee then voted the main motion by a show of hands vote. The main motion passed, with opposition noted by many of the Publicly Owned Entities (Belmont, Braintree, Chester, CMEEC, Concord, Danvers, Georgetown, Groveland, Hingham, Littleton (MA), MA Bay Transportation, Merrimac, Middleton, NHEC, North Attleborough, Pascoag, Reading, Rowley, Stowe, Taunton, VPPSA, Village of Hyde Park, Wallingford, Wellesley, and Westfield) and by Block Island, PSEG and Stonepeak; and abstentions noted by: AR Small RG Group Member, Brookfield, ConEd, CSC, Cypress, DTE, EnerNOC, Enerwise, Entergy, Generation Group Member, Mercuria, NextEra, NRG, and Utility Services.

**REVISIONS TO OP-21 AND APPENDIX A TO OP-21**

Ms. Mariah Winkler, Reliability Committee Chair, referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting related to revisions to OP-21 (Energy Inventory Accounting and Actions During an Energy Emergency) and Appendix A to OP-21 (Generator Survey) (collectively, the “OP-21/21A Revisions”). She described the OP-21/21A Revisions and reported that, at its September 26 meeting, the Reliability Committee voted based on a show of hands to recommend Participants Committee support for the OP-21/21A Revisions, with two Participants opposing and one abstaining. She stated this matter would have been on the Consent Agenda but for the timing of the Reliability Committee vote.

The following motion was then duly made, seconded and unanimously approved by a show of hands vote, with no questions or discussion, and abstentions noted by: CSC, DTE, Mercuria, and NextEra:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the OP-21/21A Revisions, as recommended by the Reliability Committee, and as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its October 4, 2018 meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be agreed to after the meeting by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Reliability Committee.

**HQICC/ICR VALUES FOR FCA13**

Ms. Winkler referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting related to the HQICC Values and ICR Values for FCA13. She explained that, due to the timing of the ISO’s September 20 FERC filing to terminate Invenenergy Energy Management LLC’s Clear River Unit 1 CSO, the Reliability Committee at its September 26 meeting voted separately on two different sets of ICR Values, one without the Clear River Unit 1 included, and one with. HQICCs were also voted separately. She reported that the HQICC Values passed on a

show of hands, the ICR Values without Clear River Unit 1 passed with 65.11% Vote in favor, and the ICR Values with Clear River Unit 1 failed with a 50.01% Vote in favor.

***FCA13 HQICCs***

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the proposed **FCA13 HQICC Values**, as recommended by the Reliability Committee and as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its October 4, 2018 meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be agreed to after the meeting by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Reliability Committee.

A number of members expressed opposition. The representatives for CSC and LIPA opposed the HQICC Values because they do not take into account the reliability benefits and capacity import capability of the Cross-Sound Cable. They explained that these are long-standing concerns, raised every year, and should be addressed. The FirstLight representative expressed concern about inconsistent assumptions for tie benefits for use in ICR and for fuel security studies, and he indicated FirstLight would oppose the HQICC Values and ICR Values because of this inconsistency.

The Committee then considered the motion and approved the HQICCs motion based on a show of hands vote, with opposition noted for the record by: CSC, FirstLight and LIPA; and abstentions noted by: AR Small LR Group Member, AR Small RG Group Member, Brookfield, CES, CLF, CPV, ConEd, Cypress Renewables, DTE, EDF, Entergy, High Liner, IECG, Jericho, MA AG, Maine Skiing, Mercuria, NRDC, NextEra, Stonepeak, and Verso.

***FCA13 ICRs (Without Clear River 1)***

Ms. Winkler then referred to and summarized the ICR Values without Clear River Unit 1.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the proposed **FCA13 ICR Values without Clear River Unit 1**, as

recommended by the Reliability Committee and as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its October 4, 2018 meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be agreed to after the meeting by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Reliability Committee.

The Committee proceeded to discuss the motion. One representative noted concern about declining Maximum Capacity Limit (MCL) for Maine values and requested the opportunity for further discussion of this concern at the Technical Committees. Another representative echoed concern, previously noted, that the ISO appeared to be using different tie benefits assumptions for ICR than it proposed to use for fuel security purposes. He explained, nonetheless, that he would still vote in favor of these values for FCA13 because they appeared to be calculated consistent with the rules and the Tariff. The CSC representative reiterated opposition regarding the treatment of Cross-Sound Cable. An AR representative explained many AR members would oppose the ICR Values because they continued to be in their view too high, as evidenced by ICR reductions in the progressive reconfiguration auctions. He also argued that the ICR Values did not adequately reflect energy efficiency effects on load, and the increase to the minimum operating reserve requirements has not been justified. An End User representative agreed with those concerns. The Brookfield representative noted Brookfield's concern about the declining MCL in the ICR calculation for Maine.

Following further discussion, the Committee considered the motion on the ICR Values without Clear River Unit 1. The motion was approved with a 60.16% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 8.40%; Transmission Sector – 16.79%; Supplier Sector – 10.07%; AR Sector – 6.11%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector – 16.79%; End User Sector – 0%; and Provisional Group Member – 0%). (See Vote 2 on Attachment 2).

***FCA13 ICRs (With Clear River 1)***

Finally on this matter, Ms. Winkler then referred the Committee to the ISO's recommended ICR Values with Clear River Unit 1. The following motion was then duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the proposed **FCA13 ICR Values with Clear River Unit 1**, as proposed by the ISO and reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its October 4, 2018 meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be agreed to after the meeting by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Reliability Committee.

The motion was voted without further discussion and was determined to have failed by assessment of those votes that changed from the just-completed vote on ICR Values without Clear River Unit 1.

**ICR ASSUMPTION-RELATED ISO TARIFF REVISIONS**

Ms. Winkler referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting concerning revisions to Section III of the ISO Tariff (the ICR Revisions), which related to assumptions used in the ICR calculation and are based on review of those assumptions by the ISO and NEPOOL during the preceding year. She stated that the revisions would reduce from 1.5% to 1.0% the amount of load relief assumed in the ICR calculations that result from a 5% voltage reduction and would change the assumption used for availability of peaking resources. She reported the Reliability Committee, at its September 26, 2018 meeting, voted unanimously to recommend Participants Committee support for the ICR Revisions and this would have been on the Consent Agenda but for the timing of the vote.

The following motion was duly made, seconded, and unanimously approved, without discussion and with abstentions noted by: CSC, DTE, LIPA, Mercuria, and NextEra:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the ICR Revisions to Section III of the ISO-NE Tariff, as recommended by the Reliability Committee and as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its October 4, 2018 meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be agreed to after the meeting by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Reliability Committee.

## **LITIGATION REPORT**

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the October 3 Litigation Report circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He asked that anyone with questions on that summary to contact NEPOOL Counsel. He noted that the FERC had just issued an order that deferred the deadline for a compliance filing in response to Order No. 845 to 90 days following its action on the pending requests for rehearing of that Order. Ms. Winkler said that the ISO planned, accordingly, to delay action on its proposed compliance changes pending issuance of that Order.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Mr. José Rotger reported that the Transmission Committee was scheduled to meet on October 23. The agenda would include votes on changes related to CASPR and Order 841. He stated that because action on the proposed Order 845 compliance changes had been deferred, the October 23 meeting would likely be held as a teleconference.

Mr. William Fowler reported that the Markets Committee was scheduled to meet on October 9-10. The first day would cover Markets Committee general business; the second day would be dedicated to discussion of proposals to address fuel security concerns.

Mr. Dell Orto reported that B&F was scheduled to meet on October 10.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Doot reported that the next Participants Committee meeting was on November 2 at the Seaport World Trade Center in Boston. He reminded the Committee that NEPOOL Sector



meetings with the ISO Board and State officials would be held the morning of November 2. He urged Sector members to work with their Vice-Chairs to assemble proposed agendas and supporting materials for those meetings, which the ISO had asked be sent to them on or before October 16. He also reminded the Committee of the 2019 Officer election process and that each Sector needed to identify the voting member chosen to be that Sector's Vice-Chair no later than October 26.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

David Doot, Secretary

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN  
OCTOBER 4, 2018 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
AR Small Load Response (LR) Group Member	AR-LR	Doug Hurley	Brad Swalwell (tel)	
AR Small Renewable Generation (RG) Group Member	AR-RG	Erik Abend (tel)		
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
AVANGRID: CMP/UI	Transmission		Alan Trotta (tel)	
Belmont Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Block Island Power Company	Supplier	Dave Cavanaugh		
Boylston Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
BP Energy Company	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
Braintree Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned			Dave Cavanaugh
Brookfield Energy Marketing	Supplier	Aleks Mitreski		
Chester Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Citigroup Energy Inc.	Supplier	Barry Trayers (tel)		
CLEARresult Consulting, Inc.	AR-DG	Doug Hurley		
Competitive Energy Services, LLC	Supplier			Glenn Poole (tel)
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 (tel)	Dave Thompson (tel)
Conservation Law Foundation	End User	David Ismay		
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc. (ConEd)	Supplier	Jeff Dannels		
CPV Towantic, LLC	Generation	Daniel Pierpont		
Cross-Sound Cable Company (CSC)	Supplier		Jose Rotger	
Cypress Creek Renewables, LLC	Provisional Group		Miles Hovis	
Danvers Electric Division	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Direct Energy Business, LLC	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
Dominion Energy Generation Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Michael Purdie		
DTE Energy Trading, Inc.	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
Dynergy Marketing and Trade, LLC	Supplier			Bill Fowler
Emera Maine	Transmission	Lisa Martin (tel)		
Emera Energy Services Subsidiaries (Emera Energy)	Transmission	Sandi Hennequin		Bill Fowler
Enerwise Global Technologies (d/b/a CPower Corp)	AR-LR		Herb Healy (tel)	
EnerNOC, Inc.	AR-LR		Herb Healy (tel)	
Entergy Nuclear Power Marketing, LLC	Generation	Ken Dell Orto		Bill Fowler
Environmental Defense Fund	End User	Liz Delaney		
Eversource Energy	Transmission	James Daly	Cal Bowie	
Exelon Generation Company	Supplier	Steve Kirk	Bill Fowler	
FirstLight Power Resources Management	Generation	Tom Kaslow		
Galt Power, Inc.	Supplier	Nancy Chafetz		
Generation Group Member	Generation		Abby Krich	Bob Stein
Georgetown Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Great River Hydro, LLC	AR-RG			Bill Fowler
Groton Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Groveland Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	Supplier	Louis Guilbault	Bob Stein	Abby Krich
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User			Paul Peterson
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		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN  
OCTOBER 4, 2018 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Holyoke Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	End User	Kevin Penders (tel)		
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Jericho Power LLC (Jericho)	AR-RG	Mark Spencer (tel)	James D'Andrea (tel)	
Littleton (MA) Electric Light and Waster Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Long Island Lighting Company (LIPA)	Supplier		William Killgoar	
Maine Public Advocate Office (ME OPA)	End User			Paul Peterson
Maine Skiing, Inc.	End User	Kevin Penders (tel)		
Mansfield Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Marblehead Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Marble River, LLC	Supplier		John Brodbeck (tel)	
Massachusetts Attorney General's Office (MA AG)	End User	Christina Belew	Sarah Bresolin Silver	Rebecca Tepper
Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Company	Publicly Owned	Brian Thomson		Brian Forshaw
Merrimac Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Middleborough Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
National Grid	Transmission	Tim Brennan	Tim Martin	
Natural Resources Defense Council	End User	Bruce Ho (tel)		
Nautilus Power, LLC	Generation	Chris Sherman	Bill Fowler	
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned	Steve Kaminski (tel)		Brian Forshaw
New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate (NH OCA)	End User	Paul Peterson (tel)		
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	Generation			Joel Gordon
NRG Power Marketing LLC	Generation		Pete Fuller	
Pascoag Utility District	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Paxton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Peabody Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
PowerOptions, Inc.	End User			Paul Peterson (tel)
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC	Supplier	Joel Gordon		
Reading Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned			Brian Forshaw
Repsol Energy North America Company	Gas Industry Part.		Nancy Chafetz	
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Russell Municipal Light Dept.	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Operations	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
South Hadley Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Stonepeak Kestrel Energy Marketing, LLC	Supplier	Marty Collins		
Stowe Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Sunrun Inc.	AR-DG	Chris Rauscher		
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
The Energy Consortium	End User			Paul Peterson (tel)
Utility Services Inc.	End User			Paul Peterson (tel)
Vermont Electric Power Company	Transmission	Frank Ettori		
Vermont Energy Investment Corp	AR-LR		Doug Hurley	
Vermont Public Power Supply Authority	Publicly Owned			Brian Forshaw
Verso Energy Services LLC	Generation	Glenn Poole (tel)		
Wakefield Municipal Gas & Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN  
OCTOBER 4, 2018 MEETING**

<b>PARTICIPANT NAME</b>	<b>SECTOR/ GROUP</b>	<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	<b>ALTERNATE NAME</b>	<b>PROXY</b>
Wallingford DPU Electric Division	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Westfield Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Wheelabrator/Calpine	AR-RG	Brett Kruse	John Flumerfelt	Bill Fowler

**OCTOBER 4, 2018 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING  
ROLL CALL VOTES**

**TOTAL**

Sector	Vote 1	Vote 2
GENERATION	14.68	8.40
TRANSMISSION	6.71	16.79
SUPPLIER	15.48	10.07
ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES	5.23	8.11
PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY	0.00	16.79
END USER	5.59	0.00
PROVISIONAL GROUP MEMBER	<u>0.067</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<b>% IN FAVOR</b>	<b>47.77</b>	<b>60.16</b>

**GENERATION SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
CPV Towantic, LLC	F	A
Dominion Energy Generation Mktg.	F	F
Entergy Nuclear Power Marketing	F	A
FirstLight Power Resources Mgmt.	A	O
Generation Group Member	F	F
Nautilus Power, LLC	O	F
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	F	A
NRG Power Marketing, LLC	F	O
Verso Energy Services LLC	F	O
IN FAVOR (F)	7	3
OPPOSED (O)	1	3
TOTAL VOTES	8	6
ABSTENTIONS (A)	1	3

**TRANSMISSION SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Avangrid (CMP/UI)	A	F
Emera Maine	Split	Split
Emera Maine	A	F
Emera Energy Services Subsidiaries	O	F
Eversource Energy	O	F
National Grid	F	F
Vermont Electric Power Company	A	F
IN FAVOR (F)	1	5
OPPOSED	1.5	0
TOTAL VOTES	2.5	5
ABSTENTIONS (A)	2.5	0

**ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
<b>Renewable Generation Sub-Sector</b>		
Great River Hydro	O	F
Jericho Power	A	A
Calpine/Wheelabrator	F	A
Small RG Group Member	A	A
<b>Distributed Generation Sub-Sector</b>		
CLEAResult Consulting	O	O
Sunrun Inc.	A	A
<b>Load Response Sub-Sector</b>		
CPower (Enerwise Global Tech.)	F	F
EnerNOC, Inc.	F	F
Vermont Energy Investment Corp.	O	O
Small LR Group Member	O	Split
Energy Federation Inc.		O
Tangent Energy Solutions, Inc.		F
IN FAVOR (F)	3	3.5
OPPOSED	4	2.5
TOTAL VOTES	7	6
ABSTENTIONS (A)	3	4

**SUPPLIER SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Block Island Power Company	O	F
BP Energy Company	F	F
Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc.	F	O
Citigroup Energy Inc.	F	--
Competitive Energy Services, LLC	F	O
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	F	A
Cross-Sound Cable Company	A	O
Direct Energy Business, LLC	F	F
DTE Energy Trading, Inc.	A	A
Dynegy Marketing and Trade, LLC	A	F
Exelon Generation Company	F	A
Galt Power, Inc.	F	F
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	A	F
LIPA	F	O
Marble River, LLC	F	A
Mercuria Energy America, Inc.	A	A
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC	F	A
Stonepeak Kestrel Energy Marketing	F	A
IN FAVOR (F)	12	6
OPPOSED	1	4
TOTAL VOTES	13	10
ABSTENTIONS (A)	5	7

OCTOBER 4, 2018 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING  
ROLL CALL VOTES

**END USER SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Conn. Office of Consumer Counsel	F	O
Conservation Law Foundation	A	O
Environmental Defense Fund	A	A
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	O	O
High Liner Foods (USA) Inc.	A	O
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	F	O
Maine Public Advocate Office	O	O
Maine Skiing, Inc.	F	O
Mass. Attorney General's Office	O	A
Natural Resources Defense Council	A	O
NH Office of Consumer Advocate	O	O
PowerOptions, Inc.	O	O
The Energy Consortium	O	O
Utility Services Inc.	A	A
IN FAVOR (F)	3	0
OPPOSED	6	11
TOTAL VOTES	9	11
ABSTENTIONS (A)	5	3

**PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	A	F
Belmont Municipal Light Dept.	O	F
Boylston Municipal Light Dept.	A	F
Braintree Electric Light Dept.	O	F
Chester Municipal Light Dept.	O	F
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	A	F
Concord Municipal Light Plant	O	F
Conn. Mun. Electric Energy Coop.	O	F
Danvers Electric Division	O	F
Georgetown Municipal Light Dept.	O	F
Groton Electric Light Dept.	A	F
Groveland Electric Light Dept.	O	F
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	O	F
Holden Municipal Light Dept.	A	F
Holyoke Gas & Electric Dept.	A	F
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	A	F
Ipswich Municipal Light Dept.	A	F
Littleton (MA) Electric Light Dept.	O	F
Mansfield Municipal Electric Dept.	A	F
Marblehead Municipal Light Dept.	A	F
Mass. Bay Transportation Authority	O	F
Mass. Mun. Wholesale Electric Co.	A	F
Merrimac Municipal Light Dept.	O	F
Middleborough Gas and Elec. Dept.	A	F
Middleton Municipal Electric Dept.	O	F

**PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR (cont.)**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	O	F
North Attleborough Elec. Dept.	O	F
Pascoag Utility District	O	F
Paxton Municipal Light Dept.	A	F
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	A	F
Princeton Municipal Light Dept.	A	F
Reading Municipal Light Dept.	O	F
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	O	F
Russell Municipal Light Dept.	A	F
Shrewsbury's Elec. & Cable Ops.	A	F
South Hadley Electric Light Dept.	A	F
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Dept.	A	F
Stowe (VT) Electric Dept.	O	F
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	O	F
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	A	F
VT Public Power Supply Authority	O	F
Village of Hyde Park (VT) Elec. Dept.	O	F
Wakefield Mun. Gas and Light Dept.	A	F
Wallingford, Town of	O	F
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	O	F
West Boylston Mun. Lighting Plant	A	F
Westfield Gas & Electric Light Dept.	O	F
IN FAVOR (F)	0	47
OPPOSED	25	0
TOTAL VOTES	25	47
ABSTENTIONS (A)	22	0

**PROVISIONAL MEMBER GROUP**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Cypress Creek Renewables, LLC	F	A
IN FAVOR (F)	1	0
OPPOSED	0	0
TOTAL VOTES	1	0
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	1