

## **FINAL**

A meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, May 3, 2019, at the Hilton Logan Boston 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.

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

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION: SECTOR FEEDBACK ON ISO NEW ENGLAND BOARD MEMBER SELECTION PROCESS**

The Committee began the meeting in Executive Session to afford Participants an opportunity to provide feedback on the incumbent ISO Board members eligible for re-election to the ISO Board of Directors when their terms expire in 2019. Committee members provided their views on those current Board members. Mr. Doot explained that the feedback from the Participants Committee discussion provided in Executive Session would inform the representatives of the Joint Nominating Committee (JNC) in that Committee's deliberations, along with any other feedback members might wish to share with those representatives. The JNC, based on all feedback and discussion, would then recommend a slate of three candidates for consideration by the Participants Committee later in the year.

### **GENERAL SESSION**

The Committee came out of Executive Session at 10:30 a.m. and was joined by ISO representatives and guests. Mr. Kaslow welcomed the members, alternates and guests who were present.

**APPROVAL OF MARCH 13, 2019 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Kaslow referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the March 13, 2019 meeting, as circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes of the March 13 meeting were unanimously approved, with an abstention noted by Michael Kuser.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Kaslow referred the Committee to the Consent Agenda that was circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the Consent Agenda was unanimously approved, with an abstention noted by Michael Kuser.

**REVISIONS TO OP-2, 4 AND 4A, PP-11 AND OP-18, 18A**

Ms. Mariah Winkler, Reliability Committee Chair, referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting related to the Reliability Committee-recommended revisions to Operating Procedures (OP) 2, 4 and Appendix A to OP-4 (4A) and Planning Procedure 11 (PP-11) and related changes to OP-18 and Appendix A to OP-18 (18A). She reported that the Reliability Committee had voted the changes individually but there was no opposition on any of the votes. She stated that, but for the timing of the votes on these revisions, they would have been on the Consent Agenda. The Committee was asked to consider all the changes in a single vote unless there was any objection.

No member raised an objection to considering the changes *en masse* in a single vote and the following motion was duly made, seconded and unanimously approved, with an abstention noted by Michael Kuser:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the revisions to OPs 4, 4A and 2 and to PP-11 and OP-18, 18A, as recommended by the Reliability Committee and the ISO, and as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its May 3, 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.

## **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 March 13 meeting, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting and invited questions. There were no questions on that report.

## **ISO COO REPORT**

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), reviewed highlights from the May COO report, which was circulated in advance of the meeting and posted on the NEPOOL and ISO websites. Summarizing, he reported that April conditions in New England were abnormally mild and wet. He noted that the financial data in his report was through April 24, 2019. He summarized the following: (i) Energy Market value was \$207 million, down \$202 million from March 2019 and \$230 million from April 2018; (ii) average natural gas prices in April were 36% lower than in March; (iii) average Real-Time Hub LMPs (\$28/MWh) were 24% lower than March LMPs; (iv) average daily (peak hour) Day-Ahead cleared physical Energy, as a percent of forecasted load, was 97.6% in April, down from 98.5% in March (the lowest value for the month of April was 93.2% on April 20); and (v) daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) for April totaled \$1.7 million, down \$0.6 million from March and \$10.4 million from April 2018. April 2019 NCPC was 0.8% of the total Energy Market value and was comprised of (a) \$1.7 million in first contingency payments, down \$566,000 from March, and (b) \$37,000 in second contingency payments.

He noted the prediction in the April Report that, based on planned outages and forecasts of available resources and expected loads, the region was anticipated to see increased out-of-merit commitments in the Northeast Massachusetts (NEMA)/Boston Area in April. He reported that the ISO worked closely with Eversource and National Grid to reposition outages to minimize the need

for out-of-market commitments and to maximize market efficiency. Those efforts almost eliminated the need for second contingency commitments in NEMA/Boston in April. He reported that those successful efforts were ongoing and the ISO anticipated nominal uplift for May associated with planned outages.

He reported that he had been asked ahead of the meeting about FCA14 being the first Forward Capacity Auction (FCA) where nested capacity zones would be modeled and whether those capacity zones actually include Rest of Pool, Southeastern New England, Northern New England, and Maine (nested zone within Northern New England). He stated that the answer was not yet known. He explained that creation of nested capacity zones would be a three-step process: (1) to make sure the topology and auction software was capable of handling the export constrained zones; (2) to study whether those zones would be triggered, which study was underway and the results to be shared at the May 30 Power Supply Planning Committee (PSPC) meeting and then made publicly available; and (3) to see whether price separation would occur given auction performance with resources staying in or exiting the market.

Dr. Chadalavada went on to report that the ISO implemented at the end of March a project to improve the ISO's load forecast accuracy. He reminded the Committee that forecast error was increasing with increased photovoltaic (PV) penetration, and tools were needed to better predict PV's impact on loads. He referred the Committee to a chart demonstrating noticeable improvement in forecasting accuracy with the new PV models.

Members then asked questions and commented on the May report. In response to a question as to the status of the report that the ISO had committed to issue after the winter about the impact of opportunity cost pricing on the markets, Dr. Chadalavada referred the Committee to the upcoming ISO's IMM's Quarterly Report, to be reviewed with the Markets Committee at its May meeting, which would include a discussion of the impact of opportunity cost pricing on the markets over the past winter. Responding to questions about the possible impact of increased

energy storage on the system load curve, Dr. Chadalavada stated the ISO was seeing a modest shift from 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. in the morning load pick-up. He attributed that shift more to a change to Daylight Savings Time rather than growth in energy storage, explaining that there was not yet sufficient energy storage on the system to drive a shift on its own. He said that there would undoubtedly be a shift in the system load shape as energy storage increased. Dr.

Chadalavada was asked about the ISO's intended use of the new PV modelling deployed for Day-Ahead and Real-Time forecasting in its longer-term forecasts. He responded that the ISO's long-range forecasting was more sophisticated and had more reliable data for the impact of solar resources on the 10-year load forecast. The new PV forecasting tools allowed for performance data to be captured with sufficient granularity to be used for Real-Time forecasts given the penetration of PV on the grid at any particular point in time. He committed the ISO to publish information about the PV performance output after it accumulated data through the summer. He agreed that there may be value to publishing the degree to which PV has impacted reported load and committed to assessing whether the ISO could do that comparison. Further, in response to a member's observation, he indicated that, once month-end data was available, the ISO would report on monthly net energy for load and weather-normalized net energy for load and also would report on the monthly peaks and weather-normalized seasonal peaks. He then concluded his monthly operations report and transitioned to providing an update on the 2019 Work Plan.

## **2019 WORK PLAN UPDATE**

Dr. Chadalavada then referred the Committee to the presentation of the 2019 Work Plan Update that was circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He reviewed that the 2019 Work Plan focused on the following three broad efforts: (1) winter energy security; (2) the Boston Transmission Needs Assessment and issuance of a request for proposals (RFP) under the Order 1000 competitive solicitation process (Order 1000 RFP); and (3) cyber security and GridEx V. He

highlighted the following three specific initiatives: (A) the NERC Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) standards Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits (IROL)-critical resources (CIPS IROL) Project, which the ISO planned to finish and file with the FERC by the end of 2019; (B) Energy Efficiency performance measures that were the subject of discussion at the Demand Response Working Group (DRWG) given the Labor Day shortage event, which the ISO planned to complete later in 2019; and (C) incentives for delayed commercial resources, which the ISO planned to address through the NEPOOL process and file with FERC to be in effect for FCA14.

Members then commented on the Work Plan Update. Some expressed appreciation to the ISO for agreeing to seek changes for delayed commercial resources to be in effect for FCA14. It was noted that an amended proposal on that issue was scheduled to be reviewed at the May 10 Budget & Finance Subcommittee meeting and would be aimed at altering undesirable incentives associated with a project developer's offer strategy in FCAs following the first FCA in which they clear and have their price locked. A member asked the ISO to seek ways to converge prices between the FCAs and the Annual Reconfiguration Auctions (ARAs), noting that FCAs had produced consistently higher clearing prices than those in all subsequent ARAs. As a result, capacity resources were almost ensured the possibility of getting out of a Capacity Supply Obligation awarded in an FCA at a lower price than the FCA clearing price it was assured. Dr. Chadalavada acknowledged the situation and explained that the ISO was hoping to identify and implement market improvements in time for FCA14.

#### **ISO'S POSITION ON RE-ENTRY OF RETIRED RESOURCES AND ORDER 1000**

Dr. Chadalavada referred the Committee to the ISO's memorandum on its position on re-entry into the market of resources that have sought to retire. Referencing the situation with the two Mystic Units that sought to retire but were retained for fuel security, he said that the ISO's plans to address the transmission and security needs posed by those retirements within the two

years contemplated by the Tariff for addressing such concerns. He reiterated the ISO's objective to rely, to the fullest extent possible, on markets to assure reliability. He noted the ISO's conclusion that a resource that seeks to retire but is retained for reliability, under the Tariff, cannot re-enter the markets as an existing resource. If it wishes to re-enter the market, he explained, it would need to qualify as a new capacity resource, which would require both that it make investments in the resource above capacity or cost thresholds specified in the Tariff and procure new interconnection service. He said the ISO did not intend on modifying its Tariff on this issue. Thus, the region must meet the transmission and fuel security needs associated with the Mystic retirements no later than June 1, 2024, which the ISO intended to do with its "Chapter 3" proposal and with a competitive process to solicit transmission solutions to meet the identified local reliability needs.

Continuing, Dr. Chadalavada explained that Mystic's retirement was more than three years out so, under the Tariff, the ISO planned to conduct its first Order 1000 competitive RFP process for solutions to those needs. He said the ISO intended to issue an RFP by the end of 2019. The ISO would select a winner based on evaluation criteria that would first be discussed at the Transmission Committee.

Dr. Chadalavada concluded his review referring the Committee to the schedule included with the memorandum.

In discussion, Dr. Chadalavada was asked whether the ISO had a backup plan if the RFP did not produce a transmission solution in time. He responded that the ISO would address such an issue closer to the time of need, noting that, if the region anticipated in 2022 that it would be exposed to 20-30 hours of overloads in NEMA/Boston in 2024, it had the authority to issue a targeted gap RFP to address that very short-duration need. He indicated in response to a question that battery storage resources were not eligible to respond to a transmission RFP, but could be a possible solution in a gap RFP scenario. The ISO was also asked whether there could be a

residual transmission security need following the two-year fuel security Cost of Service (COS) Agreement to justify an additional COS Agreement. The ISO responded that the Tariff was not clear but that the ISO viewed the Mystic retention as a two-year bridge to a more enduring solution. Dr. Chadalavada repeated that the ISO's end objective was to rely on the Capacity, Energy and Ancillary Services Markets, and just on those markets, to obtain needed reliability services. The ISO sought a bridge only until 2024 to avoid a much worse outcome. A member expressed disappointment with the ISO's Chapter 3 solution then under review at the Markets Committee, expressing concern that it would not address the longer-term needs. Members also expressed concern that a transmission solution might not be able to be constructed by 2024. The ISO explained in response to a question that the ISO would be under no obligation to file the results of the RFP.

#### **REVISIONS TO PP-10, APPENDIX I**

Ms. Winkler referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting related to revisions to PP-10, Appendix I (the PP-10 Appendix I Revisions or Revisions), which incorporated refinements to the inputs for the FCA14 fuel security review. She summarized the refinements and reported that the Reliability Committee failed to pass a motion to recommend Participants Committee support for the PP-10 Appendix I Revisions, with a 63.61% NEPOOL Vote, short of the required two-thirds vote.

At Mr. Kaslow's request, Mr. Doot explained that, reflecting input received from the Officers and the Reliability Committee, the form of motion included with the background materials added language to clarify that a vote in support of the PP-10 Appendix I Revisions was solely a vote on whether to support the specific changes proposed to PP-10 and would not be construed as support for the rest of Appendix I relating to the retention of resources for fuel security. He further clarified that, because the Planning Procedure was not on file with the FERC,



the changes would not be filed. He explained that the intent of the form of resolution presented to the Participants Committee was to permit Participants to indicate their support for the changes that were presented, or to be able to abstain on those changes, even if they disagreed with the underlying Planning Procedure or the failure of the ISO to make additional changes. He stated that the minutes could reflect other objections for the record.

The following motion was then duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the PP-10 Appendix I Revisions, as proposed by the ISO, and as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its May 3, 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; provided that a vote in support of the PP-10 Appendix I Revisions is to register support only for the changes that are currently proposed to PP-10 and shall not be construed as support for the ISO's broader planning for fuel security and resource retention reflected in PP-10, Appendix I.

The Committee then asked questions and commented on the PP-10 Appendix I Revisions. Several members noted their concerns with the Revisions. A member stated the Revisions should have included changes to the liquefied natural gas (LNG) injection assumption to increase the amount of unused LNG supply. Another member expressed concern with the interrelationship between FCM and how the ISO was treating fuel security, noting that new gas units could clear in FCM but have no incremental reliability benefit to New England and put downward pressure on prices, driving others to retire and worsening fuel security. Dr. Chadalavada responded that the potential FCM impacts were understood but the ISO did not have an FCM-based solution, which was why the ISO was focusing on the Energy Market in its Chapter 3 market design. A member expressed opposition to the PP-10 Appendix I Revisions, asserting that, while they improved PP-10, the improvements did not go far enough. Another member objected to how the Revisions referred to Demand Response as a limited resource.

Other members, as well as a NESCOE representative, spoke in support of the Revisions and expressed appreciation to the ISO for responding with changes to earlier concerns that had been raised with PP-10 Appendix I.

The Committee then voted and approved the motion with a 69.47% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 16.79%; Transmission Sector – 16.79%; Supplier Sector – 13.43%; AR Sector – 5.67%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector – 16.79%; and End User Sector – 0%). (See Vote 1 on Attachment 2).

### **ISO PROPOSAL FOR ORDER 845 REVISIONS TO ISO TARIFF**

Ms. Winkler, the Transmission Committee (TC) Chair, referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting related to the ISO's proposed revisions to Schedule 22 of Section II of the ISO Tariff in response to FERC Order 845 on large generator interconnection reforms. She summarized the FERC Order and the ISO's proposed revisions in response. She also described two Participant amendments offered at the TC meeting. The first amendment was sponsored by the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) on behalf of RENEW Northeast (UCS/RENEW Amendment) and would modify certain provisions of the ISO's proposal for Surplus Interconnection Service to allow for more use of that service. She reported that the TC approved the motion to amend the ISO proposal with the UCS/RENEW Amendment with a 77.58% Vote in favor. She then reported on a second amendment presented by the Participating Transmission Owners (the PTO Amendment) to modify the ISO proposal so as to allow for cost recovery of the full actual costs for Transmission Owner (TO) oversight of interconnection customers exercising the option to build. The PTO Amendment was voted at the TC and was not approved by a show of hands vote. Continuing, she reported that the TC voted on the once-amended proposal and that passed. The TC also voted the unamended ISO Proposal, which failed to pass.

Finally, Ms. Winkler reported that, following the TC meeting, the Participating Transmission Owners Administrative Committee (PTO AC) voted to exercise their Section 205 rights to include the PTO Amendment in the Order 845 compliance filing package. She referred the Committee to the ISO's memorandum that was circulated and posted the evening before the meeting, which outlined the ISO's concerns with the UCS/RENEW Amendment.

The following motion to support the TC-recommended changes (which included the UCS/RENEW Amendment and not the PTO Amendment) was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the Order 845 Revisions, as recommended by the Transmission Committee and reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its May 3, 2019 meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be agreed to after the meeting by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Transmission Committee.

At the request of the Acting Chair, Mr. Al McBride of the ISO summarized the ISO's review of Order 845 and the UCS/RENEW Amendment. He noted that there was broad agreement between the ISO and NEPOOL on many of the changes identified in response to the requirements of Order 845, except with respect to certain Surplus Interconnection Service variations proposed by the ISO under the independent entity variations standard, which were the focus of the UCS/RENEW Amendment. He summarized the ISO's memorandum on this topic, and explained the ISO's concerns with the UCS/RENEW Amendment provisions. At highest level, the ISO's concerns with the USC/RENEW Amendment centered on its misalignment with the existing New England frameworks for Interconnection Service and Material Modifications.

The advocates in support of the UCS/RENEW Amendment expressed concern with the very late posting of the ISO's memorandum, providing inadequate time for a full response. Speaking for RENEW, a representative explained that RENEW read Order 845 differently than the ISO and viewed Surplus Interconnection Service differently in two key aspects: (1) Order 845 allowed for use of Surplus Interconnection Service under a variety of circumstances, including

both use on a continuous basis and on a periodic basis, but the ISO's proposal allowed for use only on a continuous basis; and (2) Order 845 required that Surplus Interconnection Service be made available through an expedited process outside of the interconnection queue, even if that would be difficult, but the ISO's proposal did not allow for that expedited process.

The ISO representative responded that the ISO proposal accommodated Surplus Interconnection Service in a manner that minimized disruption to the queue process by relying on the existing Material Modification framework, which the FERC had already accepted for New England. The ISO contended that the proposed changes in the UCS/RENEW Amendment to the Surplus Interconnection Service proposal would conflict with those previously-accepted variations.

Members then discussed the TC-recommended changes. Members speaking in support observed variously that RENEW's reading of Order 845 seemed the better reading and the concerns raised by the ISO seemed manageable. They expressed appreciation to the ISO for its efforts to address Participant concerns and queried whether more time might allow the opportunity to work with the ISO to address its implementation issues. The ISO responded that it must make its compliance filing by May 22, 2019.

A member noted that it would abstain on the TC-recommended proposal because of continued uncertainty over the right policy for Surplus Interconnection Service, how changes would affect the interconnection process and the ISO's ability to implement the service without undue disruption to planning and markets. Responding to those observations, members disagreed with each other over whether the TC-recommended proposal would actually affect the ISO's ability to manage the system if new resources were to interconnect using Surplus Interconnection Service. The ISO representative explained that the ISO would conduct the necessary studies in response to new interconnection requests to ensure that it could manage the system.

Following final comments by RENEW, the Committee voted the motion to support the Tariff changes recommended by the TC, which passed with a 67.58% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 11.19%; Transmission Sector – 0%; Supplier Sector – 9.6%; AR Sector – 13.21%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector – 16.79%; and End User Sector – 16.79%). (See Vote 2 on Attachment 2).

The Committee then turned to a vote on the ISO's proposal without the UCS/RENEW Amendment, but including the PTO Amendment as approved by the PTO AC. A representative of the PTOs referred the Committee to their memorandum circulated and posted with the meeting materials, summarizing the intent of the PTO Amendment to permit TOs to recover their actual oversight costs rather than estimates of those costs, which would conform recovery of these costs to how other interconnection-related costs are treated in New England. He stated that the PTO Amendment resolved concerns with the potential over- or under-recovery of oversight costs, provided consistency across all of the TOs, avoided lengthy negotiations, and did not affect customer audit, true-up and dispute provisions related to the oversight costs.

The following motion to approve the ISO proposed changes, along with the changes approved by the PTO AC, was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the ISO's unamended proposed revisions to Schedule 22 of Section II of the ISO-NE Tariff in response to Order 845, but including the Participating Transmission Owners' proposal for oversight costs related to the option to build, as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its May 3, 2019 meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be agreed to after the meeting by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Transmission Committee.

The Committee then discussed the motion. The ISO clarified, in response to a member's question, that the proposed changes would only apply to interconnections agreements that are entered into after the revisions becomes effective and to the extent that the interconnection customer exercises the option to build interconnection facilities and certain network upgrades

rather than rely on the TO. One member opposing the motion commented that the TOs should be required to provide a reliable and binding estimate of oversight costs. Another member indicated support for the ISO's proposed changes without the PTO changes, but had no position on the TOs' language. The member explained the Participant vote would be in support because there was no practical way otherwise to distinguish its view other than through comments.

The Committee then voted the motion which failed to pass with a 53.21% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 8.4%; Transmission Sector – 16.79%; Supplier Sector – 8.4%; AR Sector – 2.83%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector – 16.79%; and End User Sector – 0%). (See Vote 3 on Attachment 2).

## **MARKET RULE 1 ORDER 841 REVISIONS**

Mr. Alex Kuznecow, Markets Committee Chair, referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting concerning the ISO's proposed clarifying revisions to Market Rule 1 in response to FERC Staff's April 1, 2019 letter requesting additional information on certain aspects of New England's jointly-filed Order 841 compliance package. The FERC directed the ISO to respond to FERC Staff questions on or before May 1, 2019. The clarifying revisions were unanimously recommended by the Markets Committee at its April 23 meeting and would have been on the Consent Agenda but for timing of the vote. The ISO filed the clarifying revisions in its responsive filing to the FERC on May 1, 2019.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee support clarifying revisions to Market Rule 1 proposed by ISO-NE in response to FERC staff's April 1, 2019 letter in Docket No. ER19-470, as recommended by the Markets Committee at its April 23, 2019 meeting and as circulated to this Committee in advance of this meeting, together with those changes agreed to by the Participants Committee at this meeting and such non-substantive changes as may be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Markets Committee.

The Committee considered and unanimously approved the motion by a show of hands vote, with abstentions noted by Michael Kuser, IECG and Maine Skiing.

## **LITIGATION REPORT**

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the May 1 Litigation Report circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He asked that anyone with questions on that Report contact NEPOOL Counsel.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Mr. William Fowler, Markets Committee Vice-Chair, reported that Committee was scheduled to meet on May 7-8 in Westborough. He noted that the Markets Committee had added a third meeting day each month starting in June through the remainder of the summer in order to address the fuel security issues under discussion. He stated the potential additional dates and proposed process for that discussion would be covered at the May 7-8 meeting.

Mr. Robert Stein, Reliability Committee Vice-Chair, reported that Committee was scheduled to meet on May 22 in Westborough to begin discussing clarification to the process for assessing competitive transmission solutions in FCM auctions beginning with FCA15.

Mr. José Rotger, Transmission Committee Vice-Chair, reported that Committee was scheduled to meet on May 16 in Westborough. The agenda for that meeting included the ISO's proposal for compensating for costs of complying with CIPS IROL-critical resources. The Committee also would consider whether NEPOOL should file comments on two FERC Notice of Inquiries on transmission incentives and return on equity, noting the preliminary conclusion that NEPOOL would not file comments absent suggestions from the Participants. A third item for consideration by the Committee would be the evaluation process for the solicitation of transmission solutions for the Boston Area Needs Assessment. Also, the Committee was

scheduled to consider changes to the Schedules 22 and 23 Interconnection Procedures to clarify how interconnection capability is adjusted following a partial exit or retirement.

Mr. Ken Dell Orto, Budget & Finance Subcommittee Chair, reported the Subcommittee was scheduled to meet on May 10 to review two initiatives that seek to make changes to the Financial Assurance Policy (FAP): (1) to expand the pool of acceptable forms of financial assurance to include parent guarantees and surety bonds, advanced by a group of Market Participants; and (2) to consider changing the FAP requirements for delayed or non-commercial resources, which had been referred to earlier in the meeting. He expected the Subcommittee's review to be completed soon and that one or both initiatives would be presented for Participants Committee consideration at its June Summer Meeting. He noted the Subcommittee might add another meeting in early June to ensure there was enough time to review the proposals, and encouraged interested members to participate.

On behalf of the Membership Subcommittee, Mr. Patrick Gerity, NEPOOL Counsel, reviewed that the Subcommittee was considering a membership application for the American Petroleum Institute (API), with members concluding that the recommendations from the Subcommittee would need to be considered by the Participants Committee. He reported API applied for membership as a Gas Industry Participant, but did not meet the existing definition for such a Participant. He said further information would be provided to the Subcommittee at its May 13 teleconference meeting. Following full Subcommittee consideration, any recommendation would be presented to the Participants Committee. He encouraged interested members to participate in the Subcommittee meeting.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Ms. Rachel Goldwasser, NECPUC Executive Director, reported that the 2019 NECPUC Symposium was scheduled for June 2-5 in Hartford, CT. She highlighted the planned panel



discussion on Monday morning concerning the State regulators' consideration of the future of the wholesale market. She referred interested members to the NECPUC website for registration and invited members to contact her with any questions on the Symposium.

Mr. Kaslow reported that the June 7 Participants Committee meeting was cancelled. Mr. Doot reminded the Committee that the NEPOOL Summer Meeting was scheduled for June 25-27 at Gurney's Resort in Newport, RI and urged members both to register for the meeting and to make their hotel reservations early. He referred the Committee to the Summer Meeting page on the NEPOOL website for links to registration and reservations. He also reminded Participants of the need to plan for the upcoming meeting with the ISO Board and State Officials at the Summer Meeting. He encouraged Participants to work with their Sector Vice-Chairs to prepare for those discussions.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

David T. Doot, Secretary

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN  
MAY 3, 2019 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
AR Small Load Response (LR) Group Member	AR-LR	Doug Hurley		
AR Small Renewable Generation (RG) Group Member	AR-RG	Erik Abend (tel)		
American PowerNet Management	Supplier			Mary Smith
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
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
Braintree Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned			Dave Cavanaugh
Brookfield Energy Marketing	Supplier	Aleks Mitreski		
Calpine Energy Services, LP	Supplier	Brett Kruse		Bill Fowler
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)		
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		
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	
DC Energy, LLC	Supplier	Bruce Bleiweis (tel)		
Dynergy Marketing and Trade, LLC	Supplier			Bill Fowler
Emera Energy Services Subsidiaries (Emera Energy)	Transmission	Sandi Hennequin		Bill Fowler
Emera Maine	Transmission	Lisa Martin (tel)		C. Bowie
Enel X North America, Inc.	AR-LR		Herb Healy	
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	Vandan Divatia
Exelon Generation Company	Supplier	Steve Kirk	Bill Fowler	
FirstLight Power Resources Management	Generation	Tom Kaslow		
Generation Group Member	Generation	Dennis Duffy		Bob Stein, Susan Muller
Georgetown Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Great River Hydro	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 (tel)	Bob Stein	Susan Muller
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User	Mary Smith		Paul Peterson (tel)
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
Industrial Energy Consumer Group (IECG)	End User	Kevin Penders		Liz Delaney
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
Littleton (MA) Electric Light and Waster Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department	Publicly Owned			Dave Cavanaugh

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN  
MAY 3, 2019 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
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	Kevin Penders		Liz Delaney
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	
Michael Kuser	End User	Michael Kuser	Rich Heidorn	
Middleborough Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	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		Bill Fowler	
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned	Steve Kaminski		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	
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		
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC	Supplier	Joel Gordon		
Reading Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned			
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			Bob Stein
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		Mary Smith	Paul Peterson (tel)
Union of Concerned Scientists	End User		Francis Pullaro	Bob Stein
Utility Services Inc.	End User			Paul Peterson (tel)
Vermont Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned			Dave Cavanaugh
Vermont Electric Power Company	Transmission	Frank Etori		
Vermont Energy Investment Corp (VEIC)	AR-LR		Doug Hurley	
Vermont Public Power Supply Authority	Publicly Owned			Brian Forshaw
Verso Energy Services LLC	Generation	Glenn Poole (tel)		
Village of Hyde Park (VT) Electric Department	Publicly Owned	Dave Cavanaugh		
Wakefield Municipal Gas & Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	Brian Forshaw

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN  
MAY 3, 2019 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 North Andover Inc.	AR-RG		Bill Fowler	

VOTES TAKEN AT  
MAY 3, 2019 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING

**TOTAL**

Sector/Group	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
GENERATION	16.79	11.19	8.40
TRANSMISSION	16.79	0.00	16.79
SUPPLIER	13.43	9.60	8.40
ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES	5.67	13.21	2.83
PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY	16.79	16.79	16.79
END USER	0.00	16.79	0.00
<b>% IN FAVOR</b>	<b>69.47</b>	<b>67.58</b>	<b>53.21</b>

**GENERATION SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
CPV Towantic, LLC	A	A	A
Energy Nuclear Power Marketing	A	A	F
FirstLight Power Resources	F	O	F
Generation Group Member	F	F	O
Nautilus Power LLC	F	O	F
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	F	F	O
NRG Power Marketing, LLC	A	F	F
Salem (Footprint Power Salem)	A	A	O
Verso Energy Services LLC	A	F	O
IN FAVOR (F)	4	4	4
OPPOSED (O)	0	2	4
TOTAL VOTES	4	6	8
ABSTENTIONS (A)	5	3	1

**TRANSMISSION SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
AVANGRID (CMP/UI)	F	A	F
Emera Maine	S <sup>1</sup>	S	S
<i>Emera Maine</i>	--	O	F
<i>Emera Energy Services Subsidiaries</i>	F	O	F
Eversource Energy	F	O	F
National Grid	F	O	F
Vermont Electric Power Co.	F	A	F
IN FAVOR (F)	4.5	0	5
OPPOSED (O)	0	3	0
TOTAL VOTES	4.5	3	5
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	2	0

**ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
<b>Renewable Generation Sub-Sector</b>			
Great River Hydro	F	O	F
Wheelabrator North Andover	F	F	O
Small RG Group Member	A	A	A
<b>Load Response Sub-Sector</b>			
Enel X North America, Inc.	A	F	O
VT Energy Investment Corp.	O	F	O
Small LR Group Member	O	F	O
IN FAVOR (F)	2	4	1
OPPOSED (O)	2	1	4
TOTAL VOTES	4	5	5
ABSTENTIONS (A)	2	1	1

**SUPPLIER SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
American PowerNet Management	A	O	O
Block Island Power Company	F	F	F
Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc.	O	A	A
Calpine Energy Services, LP	F	--	--
Citigroup Energy Inc.	F	--	--
Competitive Energy Services	A	F	O
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	A	A	A
Cross-Sound Cable Company	A	F	F
Dynegy Marketing and Trade, LLC	F	O	A
Exelon Generation Company	A	O	F
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	A	A	O
Long Island Power Authority (LIPA)	A	--	--
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade	A	F	--
IN FAVOR (F)	4	4	3
OPPOSED (O)	1	3	3
TOTAL VOTES	5	7	6
ABSTENTIONS (A)	8	3	3

<sup>1</sup> 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  
MAY 3, 2019 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

**END USER SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Conservation Law Foundation	O	F	O
Environmental Defense Fund	A	F	O
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	O	F	O
High Liner Foods (USA) Inc.	O	F	O
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	A	F	O
Maine Public Advocate Office	A	F	O
Maine Skiing, Inc.	A	F	O
Mass. Attorney General's Office	O	F	O
Michael Kuser	A	A	A
Natural Res. Defense Council	A	F	O
NH Office of Consumer Advocate	O	F	O
PowerOptions, Inc.	O	F	O
The Energy Consortium	O	F	O
Union of Concerned Scientists	O	F	O
Utility Services Inc.	A	A	A
IN FAVOR (F)	0	13	0
OPPOSED (O)	8	0	13
TOTAL VOTES	8	13	13
ABSTENTIONS (A)	7	2	2

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

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Mansfield Municipal Electric Dep't	F	F	F
Marblehead Municipal Light Dep't	F	F	F
Mass. Bay Transportation Authority	F	F	F
Mass. Mun. Wholesale Electric Co.	F	F	F
Merrimac Municipal Light Dep't	F	F	F
Middleborough Gas & Elec. Dep't	F	F	F
Middleton Municipal Electric Dep't	F	F	F
New Hampshire Electric Coop.	F	F	F
North Attleborough Electric Dep't	F	F	F
Norwood Municipal Light Dep't	F	F	F
Pascoag Utility District	F	F	F
Paxton Municipal Light Dep't	F	F	F
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	F	F	F
Princeton Municipal Light Dep't	F	F	F
Reading Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F	F
Russell Municipal Light Dep't	F	F	F
Shrewsbury's Elec. & Cable Ops.	F	F	F
South Hadley Electric Light Dep't	F	F	F
Sterling Mun. Elec. Light Dep't	F	F	F
Stowe (VT) Electric Department	F	F	F
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F	F
Templeton Mun. Lighting Plant	F	F	F
Vermont Electric Cooperative	F	F	F
VT Public Power Supply Authority	F	F	F
Village of Hyde Park Electric Dep't	F	F	F
Wakefield Mun. Gas & Light Dep't	F	F	F
Wallingford, Town of	F	F	F
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	F	F	F
West Boylston Mun. Lighting Plant	F	F	F
Westfield Gas & Elec. Light Dep't	F	F	F
IN FAVOR (F)	50	50	50
OPPOSED (O)	0	0	0
TOTAL VOTES	50	50	50
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	0	0

**PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	F	F	F
Belmont Municipal Light Dep't	F	F	F
Boylston Municipal Light Dep't	F	F	F
Braintree Electric Light Dept.	F	F	F
Chester Municipal Light Dep't	F	F	F
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F	F
Concord Municipal Light Plant	F	F	F
Conn. Mun. Electric Energy Coop.	F	F	F
Danvers Electric Division	F	F	F
Georgetown Municipal Light Dep't	F	F	F
Groton Electric Light Department	F	F	F
Groveland Electric Light Dep't	F	F	F
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F	F
Holden Municipal Light Dep't	F	F	F
Holyoke Gas & Electric Dep't	F	F	F
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F	F
Ipswich Municipal Light Dep't	F	F	F
Littleton (MA) Electric Light Dep't	F	F	F
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Dep't	F	F	F