

FINAL

A meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, February 1, 2019, at the Colonnade Hotel, Boston, Massachusetts, 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.

Ms. Nancy Chafetz, Chair, presided and Mr. David Doot, Secretary, recorded. Ms. Chafetz welcomed the members, alternates and guests who were present.

Ms. Chafetz acknowledged and expressed appreciation, on behalf of NEPOOL and the Participants Committee, to Ms. Angie O'Connor, Chair of the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (MA DPU), on the completion on February 15, 2019 of her term as Chair of the MA DPU and for her longstanding collaboration with NEPOOL.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 4, 2019 MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the January 4, 2019 meeting, as circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes of the January 4 meeting were unanimously approved without change.

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 January 4 meeting, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He confirmed in response to questions that the Board Markets Committee had discussed the previous summer's operational issues with both Market Monitors and had also been updated on both Chapter 2B and Chapter 3 of the efforts to address fuel security in the region.

ISO COO REPORT

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), reviewed highlights from the February COO report, which was circulated in advance of the meeting and posted on the NEPOOL and ISO websites. He noted that the monthly report reflected data through January 23, 2019. He summarized the following: (i) Energy Market value was \$480 million, down \$50 million from December 2018 and \$860 million from January 2018; (ii) average natural gas prices in January were 16% higher than in December; (iii) average Real-Time Hub LMPs (\$53.24/MWh) were 27% higher than December LMPs; (iv) average daily (peak hour) Day-Ahead cleared physical Energy, as a percent of forecasted load, was 98.6% in January, up from 98.2% in December (minimum value for the month was 94.4% on January 22); and (v) daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) for January (based on data through January 22, 2019) totaled \$1.7 million, down \$1.5 million from December 2018 and \$18.6 million from January 2018. January 2019 NCPC was 0.3% of the total Energy Market value and was comprised of (a) \$1.6 million in first contingency payments, down \$0.6 million from December, and (b) \$49,000 in second contingency payments, down \$876,000 from December. In follow up to a request at the January meeting, he referred to information concerning the level of participation by Price Responsive Demand (PRD).

Looking forward, Dr. Chadalavada reminded the Committee that FCA13 would begin on February 4 and would include the first substitution auction under the new CASPR (Competitive Auctions with Sponsored Policy Resources) design. He reported that there was heavy participation in the mock auction on January 28, with minor connectivity issues identified and corrected.

He reported that the scope of work for the 2019 Regional System Plan (RSP) would be discussed at the February 13 Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting. He noted that there were over 20,000 MW of new project proposals in the ISO's interconnection queue,

approximately 10,000 MW of which were for offshore wind. Referring to the Vineyard Wind request for waiver of Tariff provisions necessary to participate in FCA13 as a Renewable Technology Resource (RTR), Dr. Chadalavada noted that, unless the ISO received a FERC order granting the requested waiver that day, the ISO would not treat Vineyard Wind as an RTR in FCA13. He committed to have a notice issued by the ISO by the end of the day confirming whether or not Vineyard Wind would be subject to RTR treatment in the auction.

He then reviewed an exhibit posted in advance of the meeting of the load curve on January 16, where there had been a sudden deviation of approximately 1,000 MW between the forecast and the actual load. He explained the deviation was caused by mid-day clouds which reduced photovoltaic (PV) outputs. He reported that the ISO expected to have updated PV forecasting tools in its Control Room at the end of March, which it would use both prospectively and with backcasting to better understand the performance of the system. A member noted the importance of ramping capability in those instances and urged the ISO to consider accelerating development of market tools to encourage ramping on the system. Dr. Chadalavada agreed to take that feedback back to the ISO. He also agreed to report back to the Committee on whether the ISO planned to publish its PV forecasts when the new tools were implemented.

Dr. Chadalavada then reviewed cold weather operations for January 20-22, 2019. He reported that temperatures in portions of New England set new record lows, with temperatures more than 20°F below normal. Those low temperatures resulted in a peak load of roughly 20,741 MW, the highest peak for Winter 2018-19. He reviewed a chart showing the natural gas schedules for the system. High liquefied natural gas (LNG) injections were noted, with some members attributing that LNG performance to improved pricing, in part because of less price suppression from earlier winter reliability programs and the ISO's commitment before the start of the season to minimize posturing.

Dr. Chadalavada encouraged everyone to note these new data points in discussing design change to address fuel security concerns. He explained that a two-day cold snap separated by two weeks produced a very different outcome on the system than one two-week cold snap. He noted that the market experiences during cold weather in Winter 2017-18 were impacted by the Winter Reliability Program, and in Winter 2018-19 the market responded well to very cold weather on January 21-22, 2019 and again on January 31, 2019, with moderate weather in between. He referred to a chart showing that approximately 50,000 barrels of oil had been consumed to that point in the winter, compared to 400,000 barrels of oil consumed the prior year. Reviewing the record high LNG injections, he questioned whether continued injections at that level could have been sustained if the cold weather continued unabated for five consecutive days. He summarized that market performance was positive, but the consistency and longevity of that performance was uncertain. He committed to discuss at a future meeting how the market performed during the cold weather on January 31 and February 1.

REPORT ON JULY 12, 2018 NETWORK OUTAGE

Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to the ISO's earlier report on the July 12, 2018 network outage, as circulated and posted with the meeting materials. She reminded the Committee that the outage had been referenced earlier, at both the December Markets Committee and January Participants Committee meetings, with members seeking more detailed information.

Dr. Chadalavada reviewed the presentation that summarized the July 12, 2018 network outage event, as well as post-outage improvements, emphasizing the rarity of such an event (experienced just twice in the prior 15 years). He explained in response to questions that the hardware/firmware that failed was in use across the manufacturer's entire equipment portfolio and would have impacted Back-up Control Center (BCC) operations as well. Continuing to respond to questions and observations, he stated that it was not feasible to build a completely fail-safe system. Mr. van Welie noted that the ISO had considered at the time switching over to the BCC but

decided not to do that before it could determine the cause of the problem. A switch from and back to the Master Control Center (MCC) would have been both time consuming and resource and data intensive. He reinforced that at no time was the power system at risk. Mr. van Welie summarized that the New England control systems had a very sophisticated level of redundancy and seeking more redundancy or protections would be very expensive.

Continuing with discussion and reaction, members expressed concern with the ISO's delay in communicating the failure. Dr. Chadalavada responded by acknowledging communications could have been better and reporting that the ISO had modified its processes to do the following, in order of priority: (1) notify Designated Entities as soon as possible; (2) declare an Master/Local Control Center Procedure No. 2 Abnormal Conditions Alert and the reason; and (3) report promptly at a subsequent Committee meeting on any future events of this magnitude.

Members also sought to assure that the ISO understood the substantial market implications to some of such an event. It was noted that, during this event, renewable resources, wind in particular, were uneconomically held to the pre-event production levels (10 MWh) even though studies showed the wind during this time had picked up to the point that the system might well have produced over 600 MWh during the event. By holding those resources to pre-event levels, wind resources experienced substantial revenue losses and consumers paid higher prices. Members urged the ISO to explore post-outage improvements to mitigate this type of market outcome. Dr. Chadalavada responded that, while the ISO appreciated the market impacts of these conditions, the ISO would maintain its priority on reliable operations. He acknowledged that manual dispatch was less than ideal and operators would benefit from more information in deciding how to operate the system reliably when in manual dispatch mode. Operators cannot, however, respond to marked, unpredictable swings in production during those circumstances. He further acknowledged that the ISO, in retrospect, should have alerted the market earlier of the problems, as soon as they understood what the operators were facing.

REVISIONS TO OP-24, OP-3, OP-5, AND OP-19

Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting related to a new Operating Procedure No. 24 (including Appendices A, B and D) (OP-24) and related revisions to OP-3, OP-5, and OP-19 (together, the OP-24 Related Revisions). She reminded the Committee that this matter had first been presented to the Committee at its December meeting and the ISO had agreed to take it back through the Reliability Committee to explore changes to address concerns raised at that meeting.

Ms. Mariah Winkler, Reliability Committee Chair, then reviewed the OP-24 Related Revisions circulated in advance of the meeting. She summarized that the ISO had agreed to retain a consultant at the outset to develop protective relay models for generators commercial on or before June 1, 2019. Generators entering commercial operation after June 1, 2019 would be required at their expense to develop appropriate protective relay models. In all circumstances, the generators were required to provide data on their facilities and to certify the results of the model. She then reported that the Reliability Committee at its January 17 meeting recommended Participants Committee support for the conforming OP-24 Related Revisions, with no opposition and three abstentions noted.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the OP-24 Related Revisions, as recommended by the Reliability Committee, and as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its February 1, 2019 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.

Ahead of voting, numerous Participants expressed appreciation to the ISO for working with NEPOOL to address concerns that had been raised. The Committee then voted and unanimously approved the motion, with an abstention noted by Jericho.

PP-10 CASPR REVISIONS

Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting on Planning Procedure No. 10 (PP-10) revisions addressing primarily changes relating to the implementation of CASPR (PP-10 CASPR Revisions). She noted that the Committee would be asked to consider and vote on two Participant-sponsored amendments to the PP-10 CASPR Revisions, which she referred to as substantive amendments, and then would be asked to consider a motion to move certain sections of those changes into the Tariff, which she referred to as a process motion.

Ms. Winkler reported that the Reliability Committee discussed the PP-10 CASPR Revisions over the course of five meetings. At its January 17, 2019 meeting the Reliability Committee voted and failed to support the ISO-proposed PP-10 CASPR Revisions with a 55.34% Vote in favor. The Reliability Committee also voted and failed to support the two Participant-sponsored amendments to the PP-10 CASPR Revisions that were to be proposed to this Committee, with both amendments receiving a 44.22% Vote in favor.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the PP-10 CASPR Revisions, as recommended by the ISO, and as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its February 1, 2019 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 PSEG representative then reviewed the two substantive amendments that had been included in materials circulated in advance of the meeting. He explained that the first amendment to be offered would change how the PP-10 CASPR Revisions treat all partial Retirement De-List Bids, Permanent De-List Bids and Substitution Auction (SA) Demand Bids and the second amendment would only address how the PP-10 CASPR Revisions treat SA Demand Bids. He further explained at highest level that the amendments were intended to ensure that the Capacity Network Resource Capability (CNRC) rating for a resource that successfully retires a portion of

its capacity in the substitution auction would be reduced only by the amount of capacity released in the substitution action. He said the ISO proposal would result in the CNRC rating, which was used in planning to calculate available interconnection service on the grid, being further reduced to the remaining qualified capacity rating of the resource, with the capability difference between those two values freed up in planning for use by other resources.

A motion to amend the main motion as follows was then duly made and seconded:

To modify the provisions for the Interconnection Service Reduction following clearing in the Forward Capacity Auction/Substitution Auction in the way identified in the materials circulated in advance of the meeting. (PSEG Amendment No. 1).

In response to clarifying questions, the proponent of PSEG Amendment No. 1 clarified that the proposal was only to address interconnection service capability changes resulting from cleared Retirement De-List Bids, Permanent De-List Bids and SA Demand Bids and would not extend to other kinds of De-List Bids. He further clarified that, under the ISO's proposal, interconnection service above the qualified capacity rating of a resource would be made available for other customers. He argued that, under the PSEG proposal, the current holder of such surplus interconnection service would have the opportunity to monetize that surplus service. He explained that, if surrendering some capacity to the substitution auction deprived a resource owner of additional interconnection service, that owner would be less likely to surrender its capacity unless the owner was able to monetize its rights through higher payment in the substitution auction.

Some members, arguing in favor of the amendment, noted that the ISO's proposal would provide some financial disincentive for existing resources to partially retire their capacity in the substitution auction, which could reduce the effectiveness of CASPR. Others, opposing the amendment, argued that the transmission system properly should be considered a common carrier system that does not assign property rights to customers on the system. Such a change might better be considered as the Committee reviewed proposed revisions in response to Order 845 (the FERC's rule on generator interconnection reform) but not at that time. The NESCOE

representative stated NESCOE did not support PSEG Amendment No. 1, and agreed that available interconnection headroom on the system should be available to all customers. Focusing on process, one member expressed concern that this topic was not discussed at the Markets Committee, with a chance for any lost opportunity costs to be includable in FCM bids. Another member noted that this matter related to a Planning Procedure and any concerns about lost opportunity cost should be addressed separately from the consideration of the Planning Procedure change.

The ISO directed the Committee to the ISO memorandum circulated and posted with the meeting materials outlining its reasons why it opposed PSEG Amendment No. 1.

The PSEG representative concluded the arguments in support by discussing why a resource might want to retire part of its resource but retain additional interconnection service. He identified the possibility of a resource wanting to add energy storage to its facility that could use the interconnection service applying for new service. He argued that PSEG Amendment No. 1 adhered to the most basic fundamental market principle that a Market Participant should be able to decide what it was selling and not have rights taken away without compensation. He noted that PSEG's issue was with how the PP-10 CASPR Revisions affect interconnection rights and that PSEG's focus was not on how PP-10 already applies to Retirement De-List Bids and Permanent De-List Bids. He further argued that PSEG Amendment No. 1 would advance public policy goals of integrating public policy resources.

Following further discussion and comment, the Committee voted the motion to amend the main motion (PSEG Amendment No. 1), which failed to pass with a 41.97% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 11.19%; Transmission Sector – 0%; Supplier Sector – 14.39%; AR Sector – 0%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector – 14.85%; and End User Sector – 1.53%). (See Vote 1 on Attachment 2).

A second motion to amend the main motion as follows was then duly made and seconded:

To address, as identified in the PSEG materials circulated in advance of the meeting, treatment of Interconnection Service Reduction only for Demand Bids that clear in the Substitution Auction. (PSEG Amendment No. 2).

The proponent explained that PSEG Amendment No. 2 would apply only to how interconnection service related to SA Demand Bids were treated and would make no change to how PP-10 treated Retirement De-List Bids and Permanent De-List Bids. There was no separate discussion on this motion and the Committee determined that the second motion to amend the main motion failed to pass with the same votes for all members on PSEG Amendment No. 2 as they cast on PSEG Amendment No. 1.

The Committee then returned to discussion of the unamended main motion. The PSEG representative stated that PSEG would oppose the motion because the ISO's formula for calculating winter rating was not accurate and should be improved to be more accurate. Other members expressed opposition to the main motion arguing that surplus interconnection service had value that the ISO should not be able to take without compensation. The ISO responded that its proposal for treating substitutions in CASPR was consistent with how Retirement De-List Bids and Permanent De-List Bids were then being treated under the Tariff.

The Committee voted the main motion. The main motion required a 66.67% Vote to pass, but failed to pass with a 58.69%¹ Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 9.6%; Transmission Sector – 16.79%; Supplier Sector – 5.04%; AR Sector – 13.57%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector – 1.94%; and End User Sector – 11.75%¹). (See Vote 2 on Attachment 2).

The Chair then reminded the Committee that it needed to consider the procedural motion, and the following motion was duly made and seconded:

¹ The NEPOOL Vote tally has been corrected to reflect the fact that at the meeting the vote of one End User Participant (Utility Services Inc.) was cast as an abstention (rather than in favor as initially recorded), lowering the total vote tally and End User Sector vote tally as announced at the meeting.

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee directs NEPOOL Counsel, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chairs of this Committee, to work with the ISO to include the elements of Sections 7.7 and 7.8 of the PP-10 CASPR Provisions in the Tariff.

The PSEG representative, who had advanced this proposal, argued in support of the motion by stating that PP-10 was an unfiled procedure that changes interconnection service and affects participation in the markets. He argued that the provisions of Section 7.7 and 7.8 were properly treated as rates, terms or conditions of service that should be filed with the FERC.

In response, Ms. Monica Gonzalez, ISO Counsel, confirmed that the ISO considered the PP-10 Revisions as merely clarifying what was already set forth in the Tariff, but did not oppose including the requested provisions in the Tariff, although their inclusion could not happen in advance of the upcoming capacity auction. She said the ISO would undertake to make that change whether or not NEPOOL acted on the motion and committed the ISO to work with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the appropriate Technical Committee to bring the Tariff change through the NEPOOL stakeholder process.

The Committee then voted and unanimously approved the procedural motion, with abstentions noted by AVANGRID, CPV, Emera Maine, Entergy, and NRDC. NEPOOL Counsel committed to work with ISO Counsel to facilitate stakeholder review before the additional provisions were filed with the FERC.

SUPPORT FOR THE ISO’S MOTION TO EXTEND THE FILING DATE FOR THE “CHAPTER 3” FUEL SECURITY FILING

Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting related to the ISO’s January 18 request of the FERC for an extension of time (Extension Request) to submit the filing of a longer-term market solution(s) to address regional fuel security concerns (the Chapter 3 Filing). She noted earlier discussions at the Participants Committee and Markets Committee and summarized the ISO request. She noted that comments on that request were due on or before February 4, 2019.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee (i) supports the ISO's request to the FERC to extend the "Chapter 3" filing deadline set forth in the FERC's July 2, 2018 order from July 1, 2019 to November 15, 2019 and (ii) authorizes and directs NEPOOL Counsel to work with the Chair and Vice-Chairs of this Committee to reflect the substance of NEPOOL's support and feedback in a pleading to be filed with the FERC.

In discussion, one member expressed his intent to abstain on the motion because of concern that a deferral would delay the implementation date, notwithstanding ISO assurances otherwise. He agreed that more time would help to address the first two elements of the ISO's conceptual proposal and urged that time during the extension be dedicated to define the forward element of Chapter 3. Other representatives spoke in favor of the extension, urging diligence throughout the period before the filing, including diligence in defining the forward element. One representative urged that the forward element be included in the filing when it is made, even if details had not yet been fully defined, in order to emphasize the interrelated nature of the changes.

Following further comment, the Committee voted and unanimously approved the motion, with abstentions noted by CLF, CSC and NRG.

LITIGATION REPORT

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the January 30 Litigation Report that had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He highlighted and summarized the following:

- 1) The FERC's January 29 order rejecting the 132nd Agreement to the NEPOOL Agreement. Following his summary, he explained that the Membership Subcommittee was scheduled to meet later that month to discuss the pending application from Mr. Kuser, the RTO Insider press reporter. The results of the Membership Subcommittee deliberations would be presented to the Participants Committee for its discussion and action.
- 2) The FERC's January 29 order on remand from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (D.C. Circuit) concerning the treatment of Retirement De-List Bids.
- 3) The FERC's January 29 order regarding the permissible CASPR bids and test price formation.

Ms. Maria Gulluni, ISO General Counsel, concurred with the summaries and noted that the D.C. Circuit was expected to issue a further order relating to the Retirement De-List Bids matter. She noted that the IMM must determine how it would address the FERC's direction in its annual filings. She said that the FERC did not address the question of whether generator bids are properly considered rates, terms or conditions of service. In her view, the last paragraph of the CASPR order was probably the best direction for the region, where FERC effectively said the IMM would submit its proposed test price together with the Market Participant's bid, along with the IMM's views on that bid, and the FERC would make a determination as to what is controlling.

Mr. Bruce Anderson, NEPGA Counsel, agreed that the FERC left some issues undecided, including whether a Market Participant has a Section 205 Filing right over its bids and whether a Retirement De-List Bid is a rate, term or condition of wholesale power service. He opined that it followed from the order that a Market Participant's Retirement De-List Bids would effectively be treated as a filing under Section 205, even though filings of those bids would be submitted by the ISO and would include both the Retirement De-List Bids and the test prices.

Mr. Doot concluded the Litigation Report by noting that the FERC had not yet ruled on the Vineyard Wind request and members would need to await ISO direction on how the auction would be administered in the absence of a FERC order on that request. He encouraged anyone with questions on the Report to contact NEPOOL Counsel.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Alex Kuznecow, Markets Committee Chair, reported that Committee was scheduled to meet on February 5-6 in Westborough. The Committee would discuss interim compensation treatment and winter energy security improvements with stakeholder input on their thoughts on Chapter 3.

Mr. José Rotger, Transmission Committee Vice-Chair, reported that Committee was scheduled to meet on February 20 in Westborough. The primary topics would be a new Tariff

schedule to cover compensation for interconnection reliability operating limits, proposed changes to the pro forma interconnection agreement in Schedules 22 and 23 regarding requirements for solar forecast data, and discussion of the Reactive Compensative Schedule 2 of the Tariff, with revisions related to electric storage facilities and the audit of those facilities.

Ms. Sarah Bresolin, Membership Subcommittee Chair, reported that Subcommittee was scheduled to meet by teleconference on February 11 at 2:30 p.m. to discuss general membership issues and then to begin discussion of the membership application of Mr. Kuser at 3:00 p.m. She reported the Subcommittee materials for that meeting were available on the NEPOOL website.

Mr. Patrick Gerity, NEPOOL Counsel, reported that the Budget & Finance Subcommittee was scheduled to meet on February 14. He said the main agenda item would be continued discussion of a Participant proposal to expand permissible forms of financial assurance beyond cash and letters of credit, which discussion began in November. He encouraged participation by all interested members.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Doot reported that the March 13 Participants Committee meeting would be at the Colonnade Hotel in Boston. Looking ahead, he noted there were no Technical Committee meetings scheduled to take place between March 13 and the planned April 5 Participants Committee meeting. Accordingly, he urged members to pay attention to notices to determine whether that April 5 meeting would still be held and, if so, whether it would be in-person or by teleconference. He reported that FERC Commissioner Cheryl LaFleur's term with the Commission would end on June 30, 2019, though she had indicated an intention to continue to serve as a Commissioner until her position was filled. With the expiration of her term, the administration had two FERC vacancies to fill.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David T. Doot, Secretary

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN
FEBRUARY 1, 2019 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
AR Small Load Response (LR) Group Member	AR-LR	Doug Hurley (tel)	Brad Swalwell (tel)	
AR Small Renewable Generation (RG) Group Member	AR-RG	Erik Abend (tel)		
American PowerNet Management	Supplier			Mary Smith Michael Macrae
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Associated Industries of Massachusetts	End User			Roger Borghesani
AVANGRID: CMP/UI	Transmission		Alan Trotta	
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
CLEAResult Consulting, Inc.	AR-DG	Tamera Oldfield (tel)		
CPV Towantic, LLC	Generation	Daniel Pierpont		
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	End User			Dave Thompson (tel)
Conservation Law Foundation (CLF)	End User	David Ismay		
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc. (ConEd)	Supplier	Jeff Dannels		
Cross-Sound Cable Company (CSC)	Supplier		José Rotger	
Danvers Electric Division	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Direct Energy Business, LLC	Supplier	Ron Carrier		Nancy Chafetz
Dominion Energy Generation Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Michael Purdie		
DTE Energy Trading, Inc.	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
Emera Energy Services Subsidiaries (Emera Energy)	Transmission	Sandi Hennequin (tel)		
Emera Maine	Transmission			Cal Bowie
Enel X North America, Inc.	AR-LR		Herb Healy (tel)	
Entergy Nuclear Power Marketing, LLC	Generation			Daniel Pierpont
Environmental Defense Fund	End User	Liz Delaney		
Eversource Energy	Transmission	James Daly	Cal Bowie	
Exelon Generation Company	Supplier	Steve Kirk		
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	
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 (tel)	Bob Stein	Abby Krich
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User	Mary Smith	Michael Macrae	Roger Borghesani
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
Holyoke Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN
FEBRUARY 1, 2019 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Industrial Energy Consumer Group (IECG)	End User		Todd Griset (tel)	
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Jericho Power LLC (Jericho)	AR-RG	Mark Spencer		
Littleton (MA) Electric Light and Waster Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Long Island Lighting Company (LIPA)	Supplier		William Killgoar (tel)	
Maine Power LLC	Supplier	Jeff Jones (tel)		
Maine Public Advocate Office	End User			Paul Peterson (tel)
Maine Skiing, Inc.	End User		Todd Griset (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)	
Mass. Attorney General's Office	End User	Christina Belew	Sarah Bresolin Silver	
Mass. Bay Transportation Authority	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
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		Dave Cavanaugh	Brian Forshaw
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
National Grid	Transmission		Tim Martin	
Natural Resources Defense Council	End User			Liz Delaney
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned			Brian Forshaw
New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate (NH OCA)	End User	Paul Peterson (tel)		
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	Generation	Michelle Gardner		
North Attleborough Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
NRG Power Marketing LLC	Generation		Pete Fuller (tel)	
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	Cindy Arcate (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			
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
Salem (Footprint Power Salem Harbor Development LP	Generation			Nancy Chafetz
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
Stowe Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
The Energy Consortium	End User	Roger Borghesani	Mary Smith	Paul Peterson (tel)
Utility Services Inc.	End User			Paul Peterson (tel)
Vermont Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned		Katie Orost (tel)	
Vermont Electric Power Company	Transmission	Frank Etori		
Vermont Energy Investment Corp (VEIC)	AR-LR		Doug Hurley (tel)	
Vermont Public Power Supply Authority	Publicly Owned			Brian Forshaw
Verso Energy Services LLC	Generation	Glenn Poole (tel)		

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN
FEBRUARY 1, 2019 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Village of Hyde Park (VT) Electric Department	Publicly Owned	Dave Cavanaugh		
Wakefield Municipal Gas & Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
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		

**VOTES TAKEN AT
FEBRUARY 1, 2019 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

TOTAL

Sector/Group	Vote 1	Vote 2
GENERATION	11.19	9.60
TRANSMISSION	0.00	16.79
SUPPLIER	14.39	5.04
ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES	0.00	13.57
PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY	14.86	1.94
END USER	1.53	11.75
% IN FAVOR	41.97	58.69

GENERATION SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
CPV Towantic, LLC	F	O
Dominion Energy Marketing	A	O
Energy Nuclear Power Marketing	O	F
FirstLight Power Resources	O	F
Generation Group Member	F	A
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	F	F
NRG Power Marketing, LLC	A	A
Salem (Footprint Power Salem)	A	F
Verso Energy Services LLC	F	O
IN FAVOR (F)	4	4
OPPOSED (O)	2	3
TOTAL VOTES	6	7
ABSTENTIONS (A)	3	2

TRANSMISSION SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
AVANGRID (CMP/UI)	O	F
Emera Maine	S ²	S ²
<i>Emera Maine</i>	O	F
<i>Emera Energy Services Subsidiaries</i>	O	F
Eversource Energy	O	F
National Grid	A	F
Vermont Electric Power Co.	A	A
IN FAVOR (F)	0	4
OPPOSED	3	0
TOTAL VOTES	3	4
ABSTENTIONS (A)	2	1

ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Renewable Generation Sub-Sector		
Jericho Power	A	--
Small RG Group Member	A	A
Wheelabrator North Andover Inc.	O	F
Distributed Generation Sub-Sector		
CLEAResult Consulting, Inc.	A	A
Load Response Sub-Sector		
Enel X North America, Inc.	A	A
VT Energy Investment Corp.	A	A
Small LR Group Member	O	F
IN FAVOR (F)	0	2
OPPOSED	2	0
TOTAL VOTES	2	2
ABSTENTIONS (A)	5	4

SUPPLIER SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
American PowerNet Management	O	A
BP Energy Company	A	A
Block Island Power Company	A	A
Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc.	A	A
Competitive Energy Services	F	O
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	F	O
Cross-Sound Cable Company	A	A
Direct Energy Business, LLC	F	O
DTE Energy Trading, Inc.	A	A
Exelon Generation Company	A	O
Galt Power, Inc.	A	F
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	A	F
Long Island Power Authority (LIPA)	F	O
Maine Power, LLC	A	F
Marble River, LLC	F	O
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade	F	O
IN FAVOR (F)	6	3
OPPOSED	1	7
TOTAL VOTES	7	10
ABSTENTIONS (A)	9	6

² Pursuant to Section 6.2 of the NEPOOL Agreement, Participants and their Related Persons are for voting purposes together permitted to join only one Sector to which any of them is eligible to join, but are permitted to split the vote in that Sector as they see fit. Emera Maine and the Emera Energy Services Subsidiaries, as Related Persons, are collectively members of the Transmission Sector, but sometimes split their vote evenly between the companies' transmission (Emera Maine) and generation (Emera Energy) interests.

**VOTES TAKEN AT
FEBRUARY 1, 2019 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

END USER SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Associated Industries of Mass.	O	A
Conn. Office of Consumer Counsel	O	F
Conservation Law Foundation	A	A
Environmental Defense Fund	A	A
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	O	A
High Liner Foods (USA) Inc.	F	O
Maine Public Advocate Office	O	F
Mass. Attorney General's Office	O	F
Natural Resources Defense Council	O	F
NH Office of Consumer Advocate	O	F
PowerOptions, Inc.	O	F
The Energy Consortium	O	F
Utility Services Inc.	O	A
IN FAVOR (F)	1	7
OPPOSED	10	3
TOTAL VOTES	11	10
ABSTENTIONS (A)	2	5

PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	F	O
Belmont Municipal Light Dep't	A	A
Boylston Municipal Light Dep't	F	O
Braintree Electric Light Dept.	F	O
Chester Municipal Light Dep't	A	A
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	F	O
Concord Municipal Light Plant	A	A
Conn. Mun. Electric Energy Coop.	O	F
Danvers Electric Division	A	A
Georgetown Municipal Light Dep't	A	A
Groton Electric Light Department	F	O
Groveland Electric Light Dep't	A	A
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	A	A
Holden Municipal Light Dep't	F	O
Holyoke Gas & Electric Dep't	F	O
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	F	O
Ipswich Municipal Light Dep't	F	O

PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR (cont.)

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Littleton (MA) Electric Light Dep't	A	A
Mansfield Municipal Electric Dep't	F	O
Marblehead Municipal Light Dep't	F	O
Mass. Bay Transportation Authority	A	A
Mass. Mun. Wholesale. Elec. Co.	F	O
Merrimac Municipal Light Dep't	A	A
Middleborough Gas & Elec. Dep't	A	A
Middleton Municipal Electric Dep't	A	A
New Hampshire Electric Coop.	O	F
North Attleborough Electric Dept.	A	A
Norwood Municipal Light Dept.	A	A
Pascoag Utility District	A	A
Paxton Municipal Light Dep't	F	O
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	F	O
Princeton Municipal Light Dep't	F	O
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	A	A
Russell Municipal Light Dep't	F	O
Shrewsbury's Elec. & Cable Ops.	F	O
South Hadley Electric Light Dep't	F	O
Sterling Mun. Elec. Light Dep't	F	O
Stowe (VT) Electric Department	A	A
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	F	O
Templeton Mun. Lighting Plant	F	O
Vermont Electric Cooperative	A	A
VT Public Power Supply Authority	O	F
Village of Hyde Park Electric Dep't	A	A
Wakefield Mun. Gas & Light Dep't	F	O
Wallingford, Town of	A	A
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	A	A
West Boylston Mun. Lighting Plant	F	O
Westfield Gas & Elec. Light Dep't	A	A
IN FAVOR (F)	23	3
OPPOSED	3	23
TOTAL VOTES	26	26
ABSTENTIONS (A)	22	22