

FINAL

Pursuant to notice duly given, a meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held via teleconference beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, August 6, 2020. A quorum determined in accordance with the Second Restated NEPOOL Agreement was present and acting throughout the meeting. Attachment 1 identifies the members, alternates and temporary alternates who participated in the teleconference meeting.

Ms. Nancy Chafetz, Chair, presided and Mr. David Doot, Secretary, recorded.

APPROVAL OF JUNE 23-24, 2020 SUMMER MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the June 23-24, 2020 meeting, as circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes of the June 23-24, 2020 meeting were unanimously approved as circulated, with an abstention by Mr. Michael Kuser's alternate, Mr. Rich Heidorn, noted.

CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Chafetz 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 without comment, with an abstention by Mr. Kuser's alternate noted.

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 June 23-24, 2020 meeting, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He invited questions regarding the summaries. There were no questions or comments.

ISO COO REPORT

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), reviewed highlights from the August COO report, which was circulated in advance of the meeting and posted on the NEPOOL and ISO websites. He began by providing an update on ISO operations during the continuing COVID-19 pandemic. He reported that the ISO had pushed back the planned timing for the return of personnel to ISO facilities. As of the date of the meeting, roughly 15 percent of ISO staff, or 90 non-control room employees, had returned to work at ISO facilities, all on a voluntary basis. The ISO planned to continue to have support staff returning to the ISO facility on a voluntary basis through Labor Day. The ISO was still assessing when and how it might begin implementing a more structured re-entry. In response to a question, Dr. Chadalavada confirmed that the ISO's assessment would also cover guidance on when staff could resume traveling to and attending stakeholder meetings outside of ISO facilities. He committed to have an update on the ISO's re-entry assessment provided by the end of the month.

Operations Report

Dr. Chadalavada then continued with his regular operations report. He noted that the data in the report was through July 29. He highlighted that: (i) Energy Market value for July was \$302 million, up \$87 million from June and down \$113 million from July 2019; (ii) July 2020 average natural gas prices were 6.6 percent higher than June average values; (iii) the average Real-Time Hub Locational Marginal Prices (LMP) for July were 5.7 percent higher than June averages; (iv) average July 2020 natural gas prices and Real-Time Hub LMPs over the period were down 29 percent and 23 percent, respectively, from July 2019; (v) the average Day-Ahead cleared physical energy during peak hours as percent of forecasted load was 100.6 percent during July (up from 98.9 percent in June), with the minimum value for the month (94.9 percent) on July 11; (vi) the Daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) payments for July totaled \$1.6 million, which was down \$200,000 from June 2020 and down \$300,000 from July 2019;

(vii) NCPC payments over the period as a percentage of the Energy Market value were 0.5 percent, which he noted was one of lowest percentages in recent history; and (viii) First Contingency payments totaled \$1.5 million, which was down \$300,000 from June.

Dr. Chadalavada highlighted the status of the Order 1000 Boston 2028 Request for Proposals (Boston RFP). He stated that, following discussions with stakeholders at the June 17, 2020 Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting, the ISO had finalized and released on July 17, 2020 its report identifying the list of qualifying Phase One proposals. The ISO had initiated the solutions study process. He reminded members of the ISO's commitment to hold a "lessons-learned" discussion with respect to competitive transmission solicitations given the experience with, and feedback on, the Boston RFP. He indicated his expectation that discussion would occur in the last quarter of 2020. Overall, the ISO was pleased with the response it received to the Boston RFP and was confident that it would have a solution in place in time to offset the reliability impacts of the Mystic retirements.

Dr. Chadalavada then summarized a new section in the Report that addressed July Peak Loads. He reviewed a summary of the impacts on system loads of the COVID-19 pandemic, observing that system load was approximately 3-5 percent lower than normal at the beginning of the pandemic (March through May, 2020). In June, demand moved closer to historical levels, due to increased residential air conditioning use and the limited re-opening of businesses that had been commenced by the states, but was still approximately 1-3 percent lower than in the past. In July, he explained, demand returned to levels seen in years past, noting higher temperatures increasing air conditioning demand and further re-opening activities. Overall, load curves illustrated a slower morning ramp and higher evening peaks, likely due to air conditioning systems cycling more frequently. Loads during the night hours were consistent with past experiences. Total energy consumption in July was very close to expected values. Throughout

the pandemic, the shape of the load curve had changed, and the ISO was continuously evaluating load curve trends and refining its forecasting models.

Dr. Chadalavada reported on two heat waves that occurred in late July, one week apart, with peak days on July 20 and 27. Actual peak loads on both days were lower than forecast. During those heat waves, the power system operated normally, with good operational performance of transmission, generation and load assets as well as at the local control centers. He observed that load stalled at 16:00 on both peak days. The ISO reasoned that the stalls were attributable to demand side management programs and other measures that reduced load in the range of approximately 150 MW, and was working to obtain more detailed information to confirm that hypothesis.

He concluded his presentation by noting the planned August 24 informational session to dive deeper on the operational contingencies and pricing associated with supply interruptions in late May and early June that had been discussed at the Summer Meeting. The intent of the session was to provide all those interested with additional insight and information on system operations and market responses.

In discussion of his report, Dr. Chadalavada confirmed that the peak load observations were net load comparisons, rather than load reconstituted for behind-the-meter (solar) generation. It could be surmised that native load was growing, even though the load seen in the control room was not. He also confirmed that the ISO's assessment on load shifting was qualitative but the ISO could not quantify those shifts without access to retail data and additional information from the distribution utilities. The ISO planned to work with those companies to better understand how load was shifting from wholesale to behind-the-meter.

Responding to questions regarding the ISO's load forecasting during the pandemic, Dr. Chadalavada explained that the ISO's forecast error targets had remained the same (2.6 percent

for the summer months and 1.8 percent for the remaining months of the year), though accuracy had regressed during COVID-19. He reminded the Committee that the ISO had been working with Moody's and other experts to understand the potential longer term impacts on the forecasts and would continue to apprise Participants of what it learned through those efforts.

Finally, Dr. Chadalavada, in response to questions, noted that the changing load shape altered when and how reserve shortages emerge and are addressed. Notwithstanding those variations, the market had performed well in meeting the changing loads.

GROSS LOAD FORECAST RECONSTITUTION METHODOLOGY TARIFF REVISIONS

Ms. Chafetz began this item by stating that, at the request of a group of generators, the ISO had agreed to defer this matter to the next meeting in order to allow for a discussion at the August 11-13 Markets Committee meeting. She explained that the ISO had indicated that such a deferral would not change its plans to implement its proposal for the sixteenth Forward Capacity Auction. Ms. Chafetz indicated that, absent an objection, this matter would be deferred to the September meeting. There were no objections.

LITIGATION REPORT

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the August 4 Litigation Report that had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He then highlighted the following items:

(1) *Mystic 8/9 Cost of Service Agreement* – The FERC issued four separate orders that addressed in part or in whole the Mystic 8/9 Cost-of-Service Agreement. In a July 17 order, the FERC directed Mystic to submit a compliance filing to change its cost study and to correct any ministerial or typographical errors. In a July 28 order regarding the allowed return on equity (ROE), the FERC reopened the record to allow parties an opportunity to present written evidence applying the FERC's Opinion 569-A ROE methodology to the facts of the Mystic proceeding,

with initial briefs due on or before September 28, 2020 and responses to those initial briefs due October 28, 2020.

(2) ***NERA Net Metering Complaint Rejected*** – The FERC unanimously dismissed on procedural grounds the April 14, 2020 petition of the New England Ratepayers Association that asked the FERC to assert jurisdiction over certain energy sales from behind-the-meter distributed generation facilities.

(3) ***Requests for Rehearing of IEP Remand Order*** – Rehearing had been requested of the FERC’s June 18, 2020 order on remand that had accepted the ISO’s Inventoried Energy Program (IEP). Expectations were that the matter would return to the DC Circuit for further proceedings.

(4) ***FCM Pricing Rules Complaints Remand*** - In response to the February 2, 2018 remand by the DC Circuit, the FERC instituted a section 206 proceeding, finding preliminarily that ISO-NE’s new entrant rules may be unjust and unreasonable and establishing paper hearing procedures. Initial briefs addressing questions posed by the FERC in its order on remand were due on or before August 24, 2020.

(5) ***Order 841 Compliance Filing*** – the FERC conditionally accepted the compliance filing in response to the Order 841 Initial Compliance Filing Order, subject to a two further compliance filings, one due on or before November 2, 2020, and the other on or before August 4, 2021.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Markets Committee (MC). Mr. Bill Fowler, the MC Vice-Chair, reported that the MC was scheduled to meet August 11-13, with discussion largely focused on Forward Capacity Market (FCM) parameters, but would also include consideration of the proposed changes to the gross load forecast reconstitution methodology referenced earlier in the meeting. He reported

that the ISO's Internal Market Monitor would present highlights from its spring 2020 quarterly report, which would include a discussion on the reconstitution of peak loads for purposes of assessing transmission charges, and how behind-the-meter generation in particular affects those charges.

Transmission Committee (TC). Mr. José Rotger, the TC Vice-Chair, reported that the TC was scheduled to meet jointly with the Reliability Committee for a virtual summer meeting August 18-19. He highlighted a planned presentation by the Transmission Owners on the outlook and forecast for the Regional Network Service (RNS) rate for the next five years or so.

Budget & Finance Subcommittee – Ms. Michelle Gardner, Subcommittee Chair, noted two Subcommittee meetings scheduled during August. On August 10, the Subcommittee was scheduled to review the ISO and NESCOE 2021 budgets, as well as progress with respect to the 2020 ISO and NEPOOL budgets. In addition, the Subcommittee would consider a proposed change to the ISO's Self-Funding Tariff true-up mechanism related to the treatment of special purpose funding. On August 21, the Subcommittee would consider a Participant proposal to exclude Energy Efficiency Resources from FCM delivery Financial Assurance requirements and would revisit the proposed "Know Your Customer" (KYC) changes to the Financial Assurance Policy. She encouraged those interested in revisions to the KYC changes to reach out to the ISO and her in advance of that meeting.

Generation Information System (GIS) Agreement Working Group. Mr. Dave Cavanaugh, Working Group Chair, reported that the Working Group had completed its work on determining a path forward, having decided, after consideration of other service providers and following consultation with the NEPOOL officers, to continue with NEPOOL's current provider, APX, as the GIS administrator. He indicated that work on the terms of a new service contract would begin the following week.

Joint Nominating Committee (JNC) – Ms. Chafetz reported that the JNC had completed its interview process and had identified a candidate for the seat on the slate to be filled by a non-incumbent director. Confidential materials had been distributed to Participants Committee members and alternates earlier that week. Action on a proposed slate was expected to be taken at the September meeting.

POTENTIAL FUTURE MARKET FRAMEWORKS IN LIGHT OF EXPECTED CHANGES TO NEW ENGLAND’S GRID

Ms. Chafetz introduced the discussion by describing the process, begun in June, to explore potential future pathways to New England’s future grid, a process which was being run in parallel to, but separate from, the ongoing future grid study process. She indicated that, for the remainder of the meeting, there would be educational-focused presentation and discussion on two possible pathways previously identified – a forward clean energy market and carbon pricing. She encouraged members to ask questions, but to defer any related advocacy to a later meeting at which specific opportunities for advocacy would be provided.

Forward Clean Energy Market (FCEM)

Ms. Chafetz introduced Dr. Kathleen Spees, Principal of The Brattle Group, who provided an overview of the FCEM construct. Dr. Spees referred the Committee to, and proceeded to review, a presentation that had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. After identifying its underlying design objectives (to provide reliability, at low cost, and carbon-free), Ms. Spees’ presented an overview of the design of the FCEM, including its key design features and choices, regulatory risk sharing and a comparison to other constructs for achieving state goals.

In response to questions and discussion throughout her presentation, Dr. Spees clarified a number of aspects of the FCEM construct, including that the FCEM would be separate and distinct from the FCM, and need not be, but could be, co-optimized with that market. She

acknowledged in her presentation that FCEM was flexible enough to be implemented with or without carbon pricing. She explained that there would be a true-up mechanism for reconciling committed versus clean energy attributes on an annual basis. She opined that, even with FCEM, the region would require some amount of natural gas-fired resources for reliable system operations, particularly in the absence of some technological breakthrough off-setting the need for those balancing resources. She explained that the ability to incorporate energy storage into FCEM would depend on the definition established for a clean energy attribute credit, which would have to be different from the current definitions for renewable energy credits. She emphasized the importance to the overall feasibility of the FCEM construct of ensuring states have flexibility and control over their participation. And, with respect to pricing in a market with a marginal emissions approach, Dr. Spees explained the advantages that an FCEM construct could provide in most scenarios. She acknowledged, however, that in system with very few hours of carbon emitting resources on the margin (discussed conceptually at 20 percent or less), marginal prices would become increasingly prohibitively high, an outcome that would have to be addressed.

Carbon Pricing

Ms. Chafetz then introduced Mr. Joseph Cavicchi, Vice President, Analysis Group, who reviewed a presentation that had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting on the potential for carbon pricing in New England. The presentation was based on an Analysis Group report that had been prepared for NEPGA (AG Report). To set the stage, Mr. Cavicchi described the experience and evolution in markets that include the cost of carbon, highlighting those in Western Europe. He then proceeded to summarize and review slides illustrating the key findings of the AG Report, which included: (i) achieving greenhouse gas emission (GHG) reductions on the trajectory envisioned by the New England states would require significant growth in the use

of electricity for transportation and heating; (ii) an effective multi-sector price on carbon could help guide the region through a challenging transformation; and (iii) a progressively increasing price on CO₂ emissions that falls in a range of \$25–35/short ton CO₂ in 2025 and \$55–70/short ton CO₂ in 2030 and 2035 could support market-based investment in clean-energy technologies going forward. The pathway chosen would be the most important driver of the cost, technological, and reliability challenges facing customers and industry stakeholders.

Mr. Cavicchi then reviewed the AG Report's modeling analysis, including the production cost modeling, resource mixture and electrification assumptions used, and the detailed modeling results. The modeling results showed a substantial growth in Winter peak demand and a significant growth in renewable resources needed to support New England's objectives. He opined from the study that a progressively increasing price on CO₂ emissions would produce increased wholesale energy prices that would support investment in renewable resources. He highlighted additional observations from AG Report, including the view that the region's reliance on some efficient fossil fuel resources would likely need to continue notwithstanding the addition of significant amounts of off-shore wind and battery storage. Such continued reliance would be driven by the reliability need for resources that can support loads during multi-day periods of sustained reduced renewable generation, the current battery charge/discharge patterns, and the additional operating capacity that the most efficient gas-fired resources add to maintain reliability during periods of peak demand.

In response to questions and comments, Mr. Cavicchi clarified that the Energy Security Improvements had not been included in the AG's modeling of LMP assumptions. He suggested that the financial hedges required to support financings based on carbon pricing would likely be provided by large banks, similar to the hedges they currently provide to wind resources, while issues of volatility in energy prices would be absorbed generally by corporate entities investing

in renewable facilities. Mr. Cavicchi referred to publicly available literature that could be reviewed by those interested in additional, more basic insight on how pricing, quantity, and the implementation of collections might be addressed with carbon pricing. He emphasized that the complexity of collections and returns of revenues for carbon would be minimized by keeping to the least number possible the number of entities charged with that responsibility, particularly if collections of revenues for carbon emissions are handled outside of the administered power markets.

Next Steps. Ms. Chafetz stated that, at the September 3 meeting, there would be an additional educational session on the remaining two additional potential alternative pathways identified in the March 2020 presentation by Mr. van Welie entitled “The Clean Energy Transition and Future Pathways.” She encouraged members to advise Mr. Sebastian Lombardi, NEPOOL counsel, of any additional pathways that stakeholders might want to be explored or examined. Following the identification and education on the various pathways, the plan was to begin discussing the relative advantage and disadvantages of those pathways at the October Participants Committee meeting. Ms. Heather Hunt, NESCOE Executive Director, highlighted the broad interest by the New England states collectively in exploring any viable pathway.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Doot highlighted that the next Participants Committee meeting would be held by teleconference on September 3, 2020. As noted earlier in the meeting, expectations for how the October, November and December meetings would be scheduled (in person or by teleconference) would be shared as soon that information became available. He indicated that, in either case, modified Sector meetings with ISO Board panels, as well as opportunities for discussions with state regulators and officials, would be planned in connection with the November meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Doot, Secretary

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN AUGUST 6, 2020 TELECONFERENCE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Acadia Center	End User	Deborah Donovan		
Advanced Energy Economy	Fuels Industry Participant	Caitlin Marquis		
AR Small Load Response (LR) Group Member	AR-LR	Doug Hurley	Brad Swalwell	
AR Small Renewable Generation (RG) Group Member	AR-RG	Erik Abend		
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Associated Industries of Massachusetts (AIM)	End User			Roger Borghesani
AVANGRID: CMP/UI	Transmission		Alan Trotta	
Avangrid Renewables	Transmission	Kevin Kilgallen		
Belmont Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Block Island Utility District	Publicly Owned Entity	Dave Cavanaugh		
Borrego Solar Systems Inc.	AR-DG	Liz Delaney		
Boylston Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
BP Energy Company	Supplier			José Rotger
Braintree Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity			Dave Cavanaugh
Brookfield Renewable Trading and Marketing	Supplier	Aleks Mitreski		
Calpine Energy Services, LP	Supplier	Brett Kruse		Bill Fowler
Castleton Commodities Merchant Trading	Supplier			Bob Stein
Central Rivers Power	AR-RG		Dan Allegretti	
Chester Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
CLEAResult Consulting, Inc.	AR-DG	Tamera Oldfield		
Competitive Energy Services, LLC	Supplier	Rich Silkman		
Concord Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Coop.	Publicly Owned Entity	Brian Forshaw		
Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel	End User		Dave Thompson	
Conservation Law Foundation (CLF)	End User	Phelps Turner		
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	Supplier	Norman Mah		
Cross-Sound Cable Company (CSC)	Supplier		José Rotger	
Danvers Electric Division	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Direct Energy Business, LLC	Supplier	Nancy Chafetz		
Dominion Energy Generation Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Mike Purdie	Weezie Nuara	
DTE Energy Trading, Inc.	Supplier			José Rotger
Dynergy Marketing and Trade, LLC	Supplier	Andy Weinstein		Bill Fowler
Emera Energy Services Companies	Supplier		Bill Fowler	
Enel X North America, Inc.	AR-LR		Herb Healy	
Energy Harbor LLC	Supplier	David Griffing		
ENGIE Energy Marketing NA, Inc.	AR-RG	Sarah Bresolin		
Environmental Defense Fund	End User	Natalie Karas		
Eversource Energy	Transmission	James Daly	Dave Burnham	
Exelon Generation Company	Supplier	Steve Kirk	Bill Fowler	
FirstLight Power Management, LLC	Generation	Tom Kaslow		
Galt Power, Inc.	Supplier	José Rotger		
Generation Group Member	Generation	Dennis Duffy	Abby Krich	Bob Stein
Georgetown Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Great River Hydro	AR-RG			Bill Fowler
Groton Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Groveland Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc. (HQUS)	Supplier		Bob Stein	
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User	Mary Smith	Michael Macrae	

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN AUGUST 6, 2020 TELECONFERENCE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
High Liner Foods (USA) Incorporated	End User		William P. Short III	
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Holden Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Holyoke Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	End User		Todd Griset	
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Jericho Power LLC (Jericho)	AR-RG	Mark Spencer		
Littleton (MA) Electric Light and Water Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Craig Kienny	
Long Island Power Authority (LIPA)	Supplier		Bill Killgoar	
Maine Public Advocate's Office	End User	Drew Landry		
Maine Skiing, Inc.	End User		Todd Griset	
Mansfield Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Maple Energy LLC	AR-LR			Doug Hurley
Marblehead Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Mass. Attorney General's Office (MA AG)	End User	Tina Belew	Ben Griffiths	
Mass. Bay Transportation Authority	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Company	Publicly Owned Entity	Brian Thomson		
Mercuria Energy America, LLC	Supplier			José Rotger
Merrimac Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Michael Kuser	End User		Rich Heidorn	
Middleborough Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
National Grid	Transmission	Tim Brennan	Tim Martin	
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)	End User	Bruce Ho		
Nautilus Power, LLC	Generation		Bill Fowler	
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned Entity			Brian. Forshaw; Dave. Cavanaugh; Brian Thomson
New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate (NHOCA)	End User		Erin Camp	
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	Generation	Michelle Gardner		
North Attleborough Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Norwood Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
NRG Power Marketing LLC	Generation	Neal Fitch	Pete Fuller	
Pascoag Utility District	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Paxton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Peabody Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
PowerOptions, Inc.	End User	Heather Takle		Erin Camp
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Priogen Power LLC	Supplier	Michel Soucy		
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC	Supplier	Joel Gordon		
Reading Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Russell Municipal Light Dept.	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Shell Energy North America (US), L.P.	Supplier	Matt Picardi		
Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Operations	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
South Hadley Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Stowe Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN AUGUST 6, 2020 TELECONFERENCE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Sunrun Inc.	AR-DG			Pete Fuller
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
The Energy Consortium	End User	Roger Borghesani	Mary Smith	Michael Macrae
Vermont Electric Power Co. (VELCO)	Transmission	Frank Ettori		
Vermont Energy Investment Corp (VEIC)	AR-LR		Doug Hurley	
Vermont Public Power Supply Authority	Publicly Owned Entity			Brian Forshaw
Village of Hyde Park (VT) Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Vitol Inc.	Supplier	Joe Wadsworth		
Wakefield Municipal Gas & Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Wallingford DPU Electric Division	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Westfield Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Wheelabrator North Andover Inc.	AR-RG		Bill Fowler	