

**FINAL**

A meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, April 8, 2016 at the Renaissance Providence Downtown Hotel, Providence, RI, pursuant to notice duly given. A quorum determined in accordance with the Second Restated NEPOOL Agreement was present and acting throughout the meeting. Attachment 1 identifies the members, alternates and temporary alternates attending the meeting.

Mr. Joel Gordon, Chair, presided and Mr. David Doot, Secretary, recorded. Mr. Gordon welcomed the members, alternates and guests who were present, including ISO Board members Ms. Roberta Brown and Ms. Kathleen Abernathy, and Ms. Margaret Curran, Chair of the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. Robert Stein announced that Mr. Joseph Staszowski of Eversource Energy was retiring after working 44 years in the energy industry, all of them with Eversource and its predecessor Northeast Utilities. He stated this was Mr. Staszowski's last Participants Committee meeting. The Committee acknowledged Mr. Staszowski with a standing ovation.

**APPROVAL OF MARCH 4, 2016 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the March 4, 2016 meeting that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, those preliminary minutes were approved unanimously.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Gordon referred the Committee to the Consent Agenda that was circulated in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the Consent Agenda was approved unanimously without comment.

## **REACTIVE POWER COMPENSATION REVISIONS**

Mr. Jose Rotger, Transmission Committee Chair, referred the Committee to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting regarding revisions to Section I of the ISO New England Transmission, Markets and Services Tariff (ISO Tariff), Schedule 2 of Section II of the ISO Tariff, and the associated Schedule 2 Business Procedure, which had been unanimously recommended for approval by the Transmission Committee. He explained that the primary purpose of the revisions was to provide reactive power capability auditing rules to enable asynchronous and non-generator reactive power resources to participate in the Schedule 2 Capacity Cost compensation program. He reported a companion set of changes to Operating Procedure No. 23 (OP-23) (Generator Resource Auditing) were being evaluated by the Reliability Committee and would be presented to the Committee at its May meeting. He stated the Transmission Committee-recommended revisions would have been on the Consent Agenda but for the timing of that Committee's meeting and vote.

The following motion was duly made, seconded, and unanimously approved without discussion:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the Reactive Power Compensation Revisions, as recommended by the Transmission Committee and as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its April 8, 2016 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.

## **ISO CEO REPORT**

Mr. Gordon van Welie, ISO Chief Executive Officer (CEO), opined that New England had been a nationwide leader on wholesale markets, with 95% of the region's resources in merchant hands and nearly all the revenues for those merchant resources paid through the wholesale markets. He conveyed his view that the capacity markets were a fundamental

underpinning both to the success of the wholesale power markets and to allowing retail competition at the state level. He observed that capacity markets were under a great deal of scrutiny around the country and there had been considerable debate about the success of those markets. He reported that Federal legislators from New England were now weighing in, corresponding directly with the ISO. He encouraged members to review the latest correspondence as posted on the ISO website. He reported that the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) was also looking at capacity market issues as well and had scheduled a workshop on whether resource adequacy can be achieved through the capacity markets. Mr. Gordon encouraged the Committee to review the correspondence from the ISO to the New England congressional delegation.

Mr. Gordon then referred the Committee to the summaries, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting, of ISO Board and Board Committee meetings that had occurred since the March 4 meeting. There were no questions or comments on those summaries.

### **ISO COO REPORT**

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), reviewed highlights from the April COO report, which was circulated in advance of the meeting and posted on the NEPOOL and ISO websites. Focusing on report highlights, which reflected data through March 30, he reported for March that: (i) Energy Market value was \$214 million, down \$111 million from February 2016 and down \$519,000 from March 2015; (ii) natural gas prices were 46% lower than February 2016 average values; (iii) Real-Time Hub LMPs on average were 36% lower than February 2016 LMPs; (iv) average daily (peak hour) Day-Ahead cleared physical Energy, as a percent of forecasted load, was 100.2%, up from 99.8% in February; (v) daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) totaled \$4.1 million, up \$1.3 million from February 2016 NCPC and down \$10.6 million from March 2015; (vi) first contingency payments, totaling

\$4 million, were \$1.4 million higher than February's; (vii) second contingency payments, totaling \$0, were down from \$41,000 in February; (viii) voltage support payments totaled \$76,000, down \$41,000 from February 2016; and (ix) NCPC payments were 1.9% of the total Energy Market value.

He reported that NEPOOL's economic study request received on March 31 was the only submittal for 2016. He said that the ISO was finalizing updates to the annual load, energy efficiency, and solar PV forecasts, and planned to issue the 2016-2025 Forecast Report of Capacity, Energy, Loads, and Transmission (2016 CELT Report) at the beginning of May. He reported that discussions were held on the implementation of FERC Order 1000 at the March 22 and 31 Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings.

Dr. Chadalavada reminded members of the planned natural gas pipeline outages scheduled to start shortly and to continue through October, with two pipelines out during two weeks in May. He reported that the ISO did not expect the restrictions would challenge reliability so long as other natural gas fuel sources remained available.

Updating the Committee on the 2015/16 Winter Reliability Program, Dr. Chadalavada reported that 254,845 barrels of oil were burned in March 2016, as compared to 2.75 million barrels in March 2015, with no program LNG used and one demand response event. He reported the total cost for the 2015/16 program (reflecting adjustments for unavailability penalty payments) was \$34.6 million for oil, \$2.5 million for LNG, and \$100,000 for demand response. He said that the final (trued-up) charges for unused fuel would be in the April 11 bills, with charges to customers for payments to generators for unused fuel inventory billed on May 16, 2016.

Turning to system operations, Dr. Chadalavada reported that the ISO issued a Master/Local Control Center Procedure No. 2 (M/LCC2) declaration (a notice of abnormal

systems alert) on March 31, 2016 because of a small brush fire and incendiary devices found near National Grid power lines in Tyngsboro, MA. The M/LCC2 notice, which related to events that unfolded between 2:00 a.m. and 4:00 a.m., resulted in the ISO receiving many questions and concerns regarding the event. He said the lessons learned from the event would be analyzed and reported at a future Reliability Committee meeting.

Dr. Chadalavada concluded his presentation by reviewing the circumstances of a March 13 Minimum Generation event. He explained that, on March 12, the ISO forecasted a March 13 Day-Ahead peak load of 14,100 MW, but 15,600 MW cleared in the Day-Ahead Market and actual experienced load was 13,950 MW. With the deviations between Real-Time forecast and actual loads and between the supply that cleared in excess of the forecast, negative LMPs resulted and prices hit the negative \$150/MWh administrative limit for a few hours. He reported that Market Participants responded to those negative prices and re-offered in Real-Time, with resources ultimately deciding against producing while prices were negative.

Noting the very low Day-Ahead prices, a member sought the ISO's view on the financial viability and long-term operation of New England's nuclear power plants. Dr. Chadalavada responded that the Economic Study Request would help to address that question but noted the interplay between revenues in the energy and capacity markets, and the ability to satisfy resource adequacy over the next decade or so if prices do not go back up to previous levels. Mr. van Welie added that the ISO's whitepaper issued in June 2015 and updated in December 2015 described this interplay between the energy market and capacity market revenues. He noted the additional financial challenges presented as a result of the downward pressure on energy prices being exerted by gas-fired generation now, as well as, both now and increasingly in the future, by new renewable generation. He suggested that nuclear units may suffer if, for example, state policy continues to pay only renewable energy for zero carbon attributes. He opined that, to

support policy makers' current carbon emission trajectory, the region should favor payments for the attribute sought by the states (i.e. zero carbon emissions), rather than for specific forms of generation.

### **FCM DEMAND CURVES PROPOSAL**

Ms. Allison DiGrande, Markets Committee Chair, referred the Committee to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting regarding proposed changes to the FCM demand curves recommended by the Markets and Reliability Committees. She provided background on the Markets Committee deliberations. She explained that the ISO proposal coordinated the system and the zonal curves so that they would work together and recognize substitutability of capacity across zones. She summarized that an amendment to the ISO's proposal was offered at the March 18 meeting by a representative of the Generation Sector to provide a potential transition period from the current system demand curve to the ISO's newly proposed system curve. The Markets Committee voted in favor of that amendment, with a 79.42% Vote in favor, and ultimately considered and approved a resolution to recommend Participants Committee support for the ISO's proposed Tariff revisions as modified by that Participant-sponsored amendment (MC/RC-Recommended Proposal), with a 74.05% Vote in favor. She described a second amendment offered by Exelon Generation Company LLC (Exelon), which she said was considered but not approved by the Markets Committee with a 47.48% Vote in favor (Exelon Amendment). She explained that the ISO supported the MC/RC-Recommended Proposal and, accordingly, did not request a Markets Committee vote on the unamended main motion.

Ms. DiGrande then reported on the Reliability Committee's consideration of this matter. She referred to the fact that the ISO's zonal demand curves and system demand curve required changes to Section 12 of Market Rule 1 and definitional changes in Section I of the ISO Tariff. She summarized the reason for those changes, highlighting that they included a requirement for

the ISO to consult with, and have an advisory vote of, NEPOOL prior to filing the Capacity Zone Demand Curves before each auction. She reported that the Reliability Committee recommended Participants Committee support for the ISO's proposed revisions with a 90.3% Vote in favor. Prior to the vote on the proposal, the Reliability Committee considered but failed to support a motion to amend that was offered by Exelon.

Ms. DiGrande then summarized developments since the Technical Committee votes, referring to a memorandum from the ISO's Internal Market Monitor (IMM), which indicated that a transition could be helpful to the markets but raised concerns with the particular transition that have been voted at the Markets Committee, and a responsive memorandum from ISO Management indicating it continued to support the transition proposal if Participant support remained. She explained that additional amendments might be offered in light of those post-meeting developments.

The following main motion (MC/RC-Recommended Proposal) was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports revisions to Market Rule 1 in connection with the FERC directive to file by April 15, 2016 a FCM zonal demand curve proposal, as recommended by the Markets Committee at its March 18, 2016 meeting and by the Reliability Committee at its March 23, 2016 meeting, and provided to this Committee in advance of this meeting, together with any changes agreed to by the Participants Committee at this meeting and such non-substantive changes as may be approved unanimously by the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the Markets and Reliability Committees.

The representative of GDF SUEZ Energy Marketing NA, Inc. (GSEMNA) referred to its memorandum that had been circulated subsequent to the Markets Committee vote. He explained that, following the issuance of the IMM memorandum, considerable time was spent with the IMM to identify changes to the MC/RC-Recommended Proposal that would address the IMM's

concerns. The results of those discussions were proposed modifications that would (1) eliminate the retirement component of the transition sunset trigger and (2) modify the transition proposal to limit the size of the horizontal section of the system demand curve (the shelf) by a specified amount for each of the next three auctions.

A motion was duly made and seconded to amend the main motion to adopt those modifications identified in materials explained by GSEMNA and circulated in advance of the meeting (the Modified Transition Proposal).

Dr. Jeffrey McDonald, the IMM, stated that the Modified Transition Proposal addressed his concerns and expressed appreciation to the representatives of GSEMNA and NESCOE for their work in coming together to reach this amendment.

Mr. Jeffrey Bentz, NESCOE Director of Analysis, stated that the six New England States supported the Modified Transition Proposal, and expressed appreciation to the IMM and to GSEMNA and other generating resource owners for their work toward this compromise and their support for this amendment. He acknowledged the possibility of increased short-term costs from a transition, but opined that the Modified Transition Proposal was in the best long-term interest of the markets and consumers. He noted that future cost concerns could arise with the erosion of investor confidence in the absence of a transition mechanism here. He also noted that this transition was important to help protect against unintended consequences of the new design especially during a time of substantial ongoing construction in New England.

Mr. Mark Karl, ISO Vice President, Market Development, stated that the ISO, separate from the IMM, supported the Modified Transition Proposal. He noted that discussions on transition took place during the Markets Committee process. There had been considerable concern about price-shock in the market if the region shifted immediately from the current to the proposed system-wide supply curves. The ISO agreed a broadly supported transition was



sensible under the circumstances. The ISO, therefore, supported the MC/RC-Recommended Proposal and also supported the changes to that transition that were worked out in response to the IMM's concerns if they also enjoyed broad stakeholder support.

The GSEMNA representative clarified the Modified Transition Proposal in response to questions.

Turning to comments, a representative of the Publicly Owned Entity Sector indicated that his Sector did not support the transition proposal in the MC/RC-Recommended Proposal, but acknowledged that the Modified Transition Proposal was superior to that earlier Proposal. He noted, however, that the projected significant incremental cost of the transition in the early years as compared to immediate implementation of the Marginal Reliability Impact (MRI) curve at the system level was just too great and his Sector would not support the Modified Transition Proposal.

The representative of the Maine Office of Public Advocate and the New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate indicated those members supported the proposal but not the reasoning identified by some proponents, and asked that the filing letter not reflect all of the various reasons for support. Mr. Doot responded that NEPOOL Counsel committed as part of the region's compliance with FERC's Order 719 that NEPOOL would report the views and sentiments expressed in the stakeholder process by both those who supported and those who opposed changes voted by NEPOOL. He went on to explain, however, that NEPOOL only votes on the changes and not the rationales that motivated the vote outcome and NEPOOL's filing would clearly reflect that distinction. He said NEPOOL would clearly indicate the institutional support for the changes as a package if they pass, but it was uncertain whether NEPOOL would be able to join in the filing given the procedural nature of the filing in response to a FERC directive. He committed to share with interested members a draft of NEPOOL's proposed

inserts for a joint filing ahead of the filing and would consider any concerns expressed with that portion of the filing. On behalf of the ISO, Mr. Raymond Hepper stated the ISO's intent for the changes to be part of a joint filing with NEPOOL. He acknowledged the challenge inherent in balancing the desire just to identify the transition and the degree of support with the need to explain to FERC why there was to be a transition so that the FERC would have a basis in the record to accept the changes.

Some members opposed to the transition explained their opposition, stating their belief that the transition would interfere with market signals provided by a system-wide curve based solely on the MRI. Others explained their opposition to any changes to the current system-wide demand curve.

Among both those who supported and those who opposed the transition, there was general appreciation expressed to the ISO for its work on the proposal, both on the underlying MRI curves and on the transition.

Following further discussion, the Committee then voted and approved the motion to amend the main motion with the Modified Transition Proposal with a 79.9 % Vote in favor (Generation Sector -15.22%; Transmission Sector - 17.125%; Supplier Sector - 17.125%; Alternative Resources Sector -14.38%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector - 0%; and End User Sector - 16.06%). (See Vote 1 on Attachment 2).

The representative of the Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative (CMEEC), representing the Publicly Owned Entity Sector, referred the Committee to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting regarding their desire to amend the proposal to remove the transition provisions altogether and instead fully implement the MRI system-wide curve in time for FCA11. He explained that his Sector was initially very skeptical of the ISO-proposed MRI curves, but the ISO had been very effective in explaining and justifying its proposal and

responding to questions. As a result, the Publicly Owned Entity Sector members concluded that the MRI curve design would provide a practical, logical, and theoretically sound way of determining capacity to be procured and resulting prices in order to meet the region's resource adequacy needs. He disagreed with the view that the immediate adoption of the MRI curve presented large risks to the market that warranted the added costs the transition could impose on consumers.

A motion was duly made and seconded to amend the once-amended main motion to remove the transition provisions and to allow the full system-wide MRI demand curve to become effective for FCA11, as proposed by the Publicly Owned Entity Sector (Publicly Owned Entity Sector Amendment).

In support of this second motion to amend, one representative explained that, while the Participants he represented could support the Modified Transition Proposal as a marked improvement over the MC/RC-Recommended Proposal, their preference was to eliminate the additional transition costs given the impact higher prices were having on consumers, particularly in his State of Maine. He concluded that those customers could not accept the added transition costs.

On behalf of NESCOE, Mr. Bentz stated the States were opposed to the Publicly Owned Entity Sector Amendment, which would effectively undo the Modified Transition Proposal that had been worked out among many and diverse parties. The States collectively were in favor of a transition. A vote in support of the Modified Transition Proposal was, indeed, support for full implementation of the MRI curves, but with a willingness to transition to that new curve over a reasonably short period of time.

The GSEMNA representative stated his company had already provided its feedback and perspectives in a memorandum circulated with the meeting materials. He refuted a concern

expressed by the CMEEC representative that transition costs increase if loads decrease, saying that the Modified Transition Proposal adjusts for that possibility. If the Installed Capacity Requirement (net of HQICCs) decreases for any reason, the system-wide demand curve shifts accordingly to account for that decrease.

The NRG representative noted that the Modified Transition Proposal provided both upside and downside protection against moving from the existing system-wide demand curve to the MRI-based curve. He opined that the system-wide demand curve that was in place for each of the past two Forward Capacity Auctions worked very well and there was a substantial risk in moving immediately from the current system-wide demand curve to the MRI curve without some financial protection for resource owners and load. He said NRG would oppose the Publicly Owned Entity Sector Amendment.

The Committee, following further discussion, then voted on the Publicly Owned Entity Sector motion to amend the once-amended main motion, and that motion to amend failed with a 43.14% Vote (Generation Sector - 1.91%; Transmission Sector - 5.7%; Supplier Sector - 1.91%; Alternative Resources Sector - 7.94%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector - 17.12%; and End User Sector - 8.56%). (See Vote 2 on Attachment 2).

The Exelon representative stated his company was willing to forego a Participants Committee vote on the two amendments that were unsuccessful at the Technical Committees, but only with the understanding that Exelon would not be challenged procedurally for failing to seek a Participants Committee vote if/when it pursues its desired changes at the FERC. Mr. Doot confirmed that, consistent with past precedent, no procedural objection would be raised for Exelon electing not to force a Participants Committee vote on the motions to amend.

At the request of the Exelon representative, Mr. Mark Karl confirmed the commitment by the ISO to address later in the year or early in 2017 many, if not most, of the issues identified by

Exelon's prior motions to amend, including price formation and reliability reviews of bilaterals and for Annual Reconfiguration Auctions. The NESCOE representative noted that the States looked forward to those efforts as well.

Finally, the Committee then considered and approved the once-amended main motion (FCM Demand Curves Proposal with the Modified Transition Proposal) with a 75.94% Vote in favor (Generation Sector - 11.42%; Transmission Sector - 17.12%; Supplier Sector - 17.12%; Alternative Resources Sector - 14.38%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector - 0%; and End User Sector - 5.9%). (See Vote 3 on Attachment 2).

#### **PROVISIONAL MEMBER ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION: ANBARIC MANAGEMENT LLC**

Mr. Patrick Gerity, NEPOOL Counsel, referred the Committee to materials circulated in advance of the meeting regarding a Membership Subcommittee-recommended determination in connection with the membership application of Anbaric Management LLC. He summarized materials circulated in advance of the meeting and there were no questions or comments on the recommended response to that request.

The following motion was duly made, seconded, and unanimously approved:

RESOLVED, that in accordance with Section 1.68A(b)(vi) of the Second Restated NEPOOL Agreement, the Participants Committee determines that Anbaric Management LLC is eligible to be a Provisional Member.

#### **LITIGATION REPORT**

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the April 4 Litigation Report that had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He highlighted the continued high-level of activity, particularly in the federal courts. He reported that the Order 745-related appeals had all been resolved. The FERC order accepting the results of FCA8 and FCA9 continued to be pending on

appeal before the federal courts and the results of FCA1 (on remand from the DC Circuit Court of Appeals) and FCA10 were pending before the FERC.

In response to a question on the implementation schedule for price retirement reforms, Mr. Hepper summarized the activities at the FERC, including the ISO filing of a response to a deficiency letter in February, that restarted a 60-day deadline for FERC action of the filing. He explained that the ISO had requested a March 1 effective date and expected a FERC order on the filing to be issued in April. Mr. Doot added that, absent a FERC order by the deadline, the original filing would be deemed accepted and would go into effect as requested.

In response to a question on the expected timing and form of filing for the capacity demand curves approved earlier in the meeting, Mr. Hepper explained that ISO had a FERC-ordered April 15 deadline and, with NEPOOL support, it will be filed in compliance with the FERC order. Mr. Doot identified discussions concerning the procedural posture of that entire filing, and explained that NEPOOL Counsel would work with the ISO to try and address those concerns.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Mr. Stein reported that the Reliability Committee would meet on April 20 to review several large I.3.9 applications and changes to OP-23. Mr. William Fowler reported the Markets Committee meeting was scheduled on April 12 as a one-day meeting in Milford. Mr. Jose Rotger reported that the Transmission Committee would meet on April 26 by teleconference to review settlement discussions in the Section 206 proceeding on the RNS and LNS formula rates. Mr. Kenneth Dell Orto reported that the Budget & Finance Subcommittee would meet on April 25, and effort was underway to finalize the agenda.

Ms. Rachel Goldwasser, NECPUC Executive Director, reported that she had recently sent out the invitation to the June 5-8, 2016 NECPUC Symposium and encouraged members to visit

the NECPUC website for further information regarding registration and reservations (which would be open in the next month).

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Doot reported that the next Participants Committee meeting was scheduled on May 6 at the Colonnade Hotel in Boston, but may be held as a teleconference meeting given the expected agenda. He said that the June 3 meeting was scheduled at the Renaissance Providence Hotel. He reported that the registration for the June 21-23 Summer Meeting, at the Mount Washington Resort in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire would be open with the initial notice of the May 6 meeting and posted on the Summer Meeting Information Page on the NEPOOL website. He encouraged members to mark their calendars and attend accordingly.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

David T. Doot, Secretary

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN  
APRIL 8, 2016 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
American PowerNet Management	Supplier			Mary Smith (tel)
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Belmont Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
Boylston Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
BP Energy Company	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
Brookfield Energy Marketing	Supplier	Aleks Mitreski		Tom Kaslow
Calpine Energy Services, LP	Supplier		Brett Kruse	Bill Fowler
Central Maine Power/United Illuminating Company	Transmission			Alan Trotta
Chester Municipal Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned	Phil Smith		
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
CLEARresult Consulting, Inc.	AR	Doug Hurley		
Concord Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Coop.	Publicly Owned	Brian Forshaw		
Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel	End User		Joe Rosenthal	
Conservation Law Foundation	End User	Jerry Elmer		
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	Supplier	Jeff Dannels		
CPV Towantic, LLC	Generation	Dan Pierpont		
Danvers Electric Division	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
DC Energy, LLC	Supplier	Bruce Bleiweis		
Dominion Energy Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Jim Davis		
DTE Energy Trading, Inc.	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
Dynegy Marketing and Trade, LLC	Supplier			Bill Fowler
Elektisola, Inc.	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Emera Maine	Transmission		Jose Rotger	Stacy Dimou (tel) Andrew McCullough Sandi Hennequin (tel)
Energy America, LLC	Supplier	Ron Carrier		Nancy Chafetz
EnerNOC, Inc.	AR	Herb Healy (tel)		Doug Hurley
Entergy Nuclear Power Marketing, LLC	Generation		Ken Dell Orto	
Essential Power, LLC	Generation	M.Q. Riding	Bill Fowler	
Eversource Energy	Transmission	James Daly	Joe Staszowski	
Exelon Generation Company	Supplier	Steve Kirk	Bill Fowler	
Fairchild Semiconductor Corporation	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Galt Power, Inc.	Supplier	Nancy Chafetz		
GDF SUEZ Energy Marketing NA, Inc. (GSEMNA)	Generation	Tom Kaslow		
Generation Group Member	Generation		Abby Krich (tel)	Bob Stein
Georgetown Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
Granite Ridge Energy, LLC	Supplier		Bill Fowler	
Groton Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Groveland Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	Supplier		Bob Stein	Abby Krich (tel)
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User	Mary Smith (tel)		Paul Peterson Doug Hurley
High Liner Foods (USA) Incorporated	End User		William P. Short III	
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
Holden Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Holyoke Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned			Michael Lynch
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	End User	Don Sipe		
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Long Island Lighting Company (LIPA)	Supplier		Bill Killgoar	
Littleton (MA) Electric Light & Water Department	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department	Publicly Owned		Craig Kieny	
Maine Public Advocate Office	End User			Paul Peterson



**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN  
APRIL 8, 2016 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Maine Skiing, Inc.	End User	Don Sipe		
Mansfield Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Marblehead Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Marble River, LLC	Supplier		John Brodbeck (tel)	
Massachusetts Attorney General's Office (MA AG)	End User	Fred Plett		
Mass. Development Finance Agency	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Company (MMWEC)	Publicly Owned	Michael Lynch		
Merrimac Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
Middleborough Gas and Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
National Grid	Transmission	Timothy Brennan	Timothy Martin	
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative (NHEC)	Publicly Owned	Steve Kaminski		Brian Forshaw David Mullett Michael Lynch
New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate (NH OCA)	End User	Paul Peterson		
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	Generation	Michelle Gardner		
NRG Power Marketing LLC	Generation	Dave Cavanaugh		
Pascoag Utility District	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
Paxton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
PowerOptions, Inc.	End User	Cindy Arcate		
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC	Supplier	Joel Gordon		
Repsol Energy North America Company	Supplier		Nancy Chafetz	
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
Russell Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
St. Anselm College	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Shipyards Brewing LLC	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Operations	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Small Load Response Group Member	AR	Doug Hurley	Brad Swalwell (tel)	
Small Renewable Generation Group	AR	Erik Abend (tel)		
South Hadley Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Stowe Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
SunEdison (First Wind Energy Marketing, Inc.)	AR			Bob Stein Abby Krich (tel)
Talen Energy Marketing, LLC	Supplier	Tom Hyzinski (tel)		
Taunton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
The Energy Consortium	End User		Mary Smith	Paul Peterson Doug Hurley
TransCanada Power Marketing Ltd.	Generation	Daniel Congel		
Union of Concerned Scientists	End User		Francis Pullaro (tel)	
United Illuminating Company (UI)	Transmission		Alan Trotta	
Utility Services, Inc.	End User			Paul Peterson
Vermont Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned	Craig Kiemy		
Vermont Electric Power Company	Transmission	Frank Etori (tel)	Mark Sciarrotta (tel)	
Vermont Energy Investment Corporation	AR		Doug Hurley	
Vermont Public Power Supply Authority	Publicly Owned	David Mullett		
Vitol Inc.	Supplier	Joe Wadsworth		
Wakefield Municipal Gas and Light Department	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Wallingford DPU Electric Division	Publicly Owned	Phil Smith		
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	
West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Michael Lynch	
Westfield Gas & Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Phil Smith	

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN  
APRIL 8, 2016 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Wheelabrator North Andover Inc.	AR	Bill Fowler	Jim Ginnetti (tel)	
Z-TECH, LLC	End User		Gus Fomuth	

**VOTES TAKEN AT  
APRIL 8, 2016 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

**TOTAL**

Sector/Group	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
GENERATION	15.22	1.91	11.42
TRANSMISSION	17.12	5.70	17.12
SUPPLIER	17.12	1.91	17.12
ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES	14.38	7.94	14.38
PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY	0.00	17.12	0.00
END USER	<u>16.06</u>	<u>8.56</u>	<u>15.90</u>
<b>% IN FAVOR</b>	<b>79.90</b>	<b>43.14</b>	<b>75.94</b>

**GENERATION SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
CPV Towantic, LLC	F	O	F
Dominion Energy Marketing, Inc.	F	O	O
Entergy Nuclear Power Marketing	F	O	F
Essential Power, LLC	F	O	F
GDF SUEZ Energy Marketing NA	F	O	F
Generation Group Member	F	O	F
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	O	F	O
NRG Power Marketing, LLC	F	O	O
TransCanada Power Marketing	F	O	F
IN FAVOR (F)	8	1	6
OPPOSED (O)	1	8	3
TOTAL VOTES	9	9	9
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	0	0

**TRANSMISSION SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Central Maine/United Illuminating	F	O	F
Emera Maine	S	S	S
<i>Emera Maine</i>	F	O	F
<i>Emera Energy Services</i>	F	O	F
Eversource Energy	F	A	F
National Grid	F	F	A
Vermont Electric Power Company	F	A	F
IN FAVOR (F)	5	1	4
OPPOSED	0	2	0
TOTAL VOTES	5	3	4
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	2	1

**ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
<b>Renewable Generation Sub-Sector</b>			
SunEdison (First Wind)	F	O	F
Small RG Group Member	F	O	F
Wheelabrator North Andover Inc.	F	O	F
<b>Distributed Generation Sub-Sector</b>			
CLEAResult Consulting, Inc.	F	F	F
<b>Load Response Sub-Sector</b>			
EnerNOC, Inc.	F	O	F
VT Energy Investment Corp.	F	F	F
Small LR Group Member	F	F	F
IN FAVOR (F)	7	4	7
OPPOSED	0	3	0
TOTAL VOTES	7	7	7
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	0	0

**SUPPLIER SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
American PowerNet Management, LP	F	F	F
BP Energy Company	A	A	A
Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc.	F	O	F
Calpine Energy Services	A	A	A
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	F	O	F
DC Energy, LLC	A	A	A
DTE Energy Trading, Inc.	A	A	A
Dynegy Marketing and Trade, LLC	F	O	F
Energy America, LLC	A	A	A
Exelon Generation Company	A	A	A
Galt Power, Inc.	A	A	A
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	F	O	F
LIPA (Long Island Power Authority)	F	O	F
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade	F	O	F
Repsol Energy North America	F	O	F
Talen Energy Marketing, LLC	F	O	F
Vitol Inc.	A	A	A
IN FAVOR (F)	9	1	9
OPPOSED	0	8	0
TOTAL VOTES	9	9	9
ABSTENTIONS (A)	8	8	8

**VOTES TAKEN AT  
APRIL 8, 2016 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

**END USER SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Conn. Office of Consumer Counsel	O	F	O
Conservation Law Foundation	F	O	F
Elektrisola, Inc.	F	O	F
Fairchild Semiconductor Corp.	F	O	F
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	F	F	F
High Liner Foods (USA) Inc.	F	O	F
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	F	F	A
Maine Public Advocate Office	F	F	F
Maine Skiing, Inc.	F	F	A
Mass. Attorney General's Office	F	O	F
NH Office of Consumer Advocate	F	F	F
PowerOptions, Inc.	F	F	F
St. Anselm College	F	O	F
Shipyards Brewing Co., LLC	F	O	F
The Energy Consortium	F	F	F
Utility Services Inc.	A	A	A
Z-TECH, LLC	F	O	F
IN FAVOR (F)	15	8	13
OPPOSED	1	8	1
TOTAL VOTES	16	16	14
ABSTENTIONS (A)	1	1	3

**PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR**

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

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

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Littleton (MA) Electric Light Dep't	O	F	O
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Dep't	O	F	O
Mansfield Municipal Electric Dep't	O	F	O
Marblehead Municipal Light Dep't	O	F	O
Mass. Development Finance Agc'y	O	F	O
Mass. Mun. Wholesale. Elec. Co.	O	F	O
Merrimac Municipal Light Dep't	O	F	O
Middleborough Gas & Elec. Dep't	O	F	O
Middleton Municipal Electric Dep't	O	F	O
New Hampshire Electric Coop.	O	F	O
Pascoag Utility District	O	F	O
Paxton Municipal Light Dep't	O	F	O
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	O	F	O
Princeton Municipal Light Dep't	O	F	O
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	O	F	O
Russell Municipal Light Dep't	O	F	O
Shrewsbury's Elec. & Cable Ops.	O	F	O
South Hadley Electric Light Dep't	O	F	O
Sterling Mun. Elec. Light Dep't	O	F	O
Stowe (VT) Electric Department	O	F	O
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	O	F	O
Templeton Mun. Lighting Plant	O	F	O
VT Electric Cooperative	A	F	O
VT Public Power Supply Authority	O	F	O
Wakefield Mun. Gas & Light Dep't	O	F	O
Wallingford (CT) Div. Pub. Utils.	O	F	O
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	O	F	O
West Boylston Mun. Lighting Plant	O	F	O
Westfield Gas & Elec. Light Dep't	O	F	O
IN FAVOR (F)	0	45	0
OPPOSED	44	0	45
TOTAL VOTES	44	45	45
ABSTENTIONS (A)	1	0	0