

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, April 2, 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 MARCH 5, 2020 MINUTES

Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the March 5, 2020 meeting, as circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes of the March 5, 2020 meeting were unanimously approved as circulated, with an abstention by Mr. Michael Kuser noted.

CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to the Consent Agenda that was circulated and posted in advance of the meeting, noting that the ISO had agreed to adopt and file if supported the changes identified in Consent Agenda Item 4, which recommended Market Rule changes for treating the Capacity Supply Obligations of Energy Efficiency Resources during Scarcity Conditions. Following motion duly made and seconded, the Consent Agenda was approved, with Jericho and PSEG opposing the Consent Agenda because they disagreed with the changes identified in Consent Agenda Item 4. Mr. Kuser and Enel X abstained on the vote to approve the Consent Agenda, with Enel X abstaining also because of disagreement with Item 4.

ECONOMIC LIFE DETERMINATION COMPLIANCE AND PROSPECTIVE REVISIONS

Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to Tariff revisions that, in response to a recent FERC order, had been proposed by the ISO and unanimously recommended by the Markets Committee. The FERC order had rejected proposed changes to the Internal Market Monitor's (IMM) calculation of the economic life of existing generators in the FCM (called the Economic Life Revisions). She explained that this matter would have been on the Consent Agenda but for the timing of the Markets Committee's consideration and vote.

The following motion was duly made, seconded, and unanimously approved, with abstentions noted by VEIC, Maple Energy and Mr. Kuser:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the revisions to Market Rule 1 to address the directives set forth in the FERC's March 10, 2020 Order Granting Rehearing in Docket No. ER18-1770-002, as recommended by the Markets Committee at its March 24, 2020 meeting and as circulated to this Committee in advance of this meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Markets Committee.

ISO CEO REPORT

Ahead of the CEO report, Ms. Chafetz, on behalf of NEPOOL, expressed appreciation for the ISO's efforts to maintain reliability and markets during these extraordinary times of the COVID-19 coronavirus outbreak. She also acknowledged and thanked the transmission, distribution and generation operators for their service during the pandemic.

Mr. Gordon van Welie, ISO Chief Executive Officer (CEO), began his report describing the ISO's activities in response to the COVID-19 outbreak. He said the ISO had decided to activate its business continuity and pandemic response plan beginning on March 13, 2020, smoothly transitioning about 95 percent of its work force to work from home. The ISO's operators and dispatchers remained in the control room and back-up control center to maintain operations, and the ISO was prepared if needed to sequester personnel to minimize the risk of

exposure to the pandemic. He explained how the broader region had come together to address the challenges from the pandemic, with frequent calls among local control centers, the control rooms in the Eastern Interconnection, the Northeast Power Coordinating Council, and the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). He noted that transmission, distribution and power plant operators had all performed well.

Mr. van Welie completed his remarks referring the Committee to the summaries of the ISO Board and Board Committee meetings that had occurred since the March 5, 2020 Participants Committee meeting, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. There were no questions or comments on the summaries.

ISO COO REPORT

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), reviewed highlights from the April COO report, which was circulated in advance of the meeting and posted on the NEPOOL and ISO websites. He began by summarizing his report on ISO operations during the COVID-19 pandemic. He noted that approximately 95 percent of the ISO workforce was working remotely but that a select number of ISO personnel were working in the main or back-up control centers. He summarized protective measures being used to minimize risk to control room staff. He expected this operational posture to continue at least through early- to mid-May. Dr. Chadalavada noted with appreciation the collaborative sharing of best practices within the industry, identifying numerous communication protocols implemented, including frequent conference calls organized by EPRI to provide experiences and measures undertaken in other control centers around the globe.

He then discussed the impact of COVID-19 on system loads. He explained that system-wide demand was down by about three to five percent with the load curve more characteristic of loads on snow days when many New Englanders stay home and businesses operate at less than

full capacity. He referenced load charts that showed loads ramping a few hours later in the morning and peaking later in the afternoon and evening. Load forecasts were less accurate given the changes, but the ISO was working to train the computer models to improve forecasting during and following these times. He expected it would be at least late April before the bulk of this work could be undertaken. He explained in response to a question that the ISO expected load to be impacted also by the projected recession once employees could return to their workplaces. He committed to keep the Committee apprised of corresponding changes in load forecasts as a result of developments during and after the business shutdowns for COVID-19.

In response to follow-up questions, Dr. Chadalavada opined that the region may see more negative prices with lower loads. He also explained that transmission owners had deferred or canceled non-critical outages during this time so there would be less spring maintenance with which to contend.

Dr. Chadalavada then continued with his regular operations report. He noted that, based on data through March 25, 2020 (except where otherwise noted): (i) Energy Market value was \$142 million, down \$90 million from February 2020 and down \$267 million from March 2019; (ii) average natural gas prices over the period were 28 percent lower than February average values; (iii) average Real-Time Hub LMPs (\$16.58/MWh) were 18 percent lower than February averages; (iv) average daily (peak hour) Day-Ahead cleared physical Energy, as a percent of forecasted load, was 98.8 percent in March, down from 99.9 percent in February; and (v) daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) for March totaled \$1.4 million, up \$300,000 from February 2020 and down \$900,000 from March 2019. March 2020 NCPC, which was 1.0 percent of total Energy Market value, was comprised of (a) \$1.1 million in first contingency payments, up \$200,000 from February, (b) \$100,000 in second contingency payments, up \$43,000 from February (but remaining low because the loads, particularly in SEMA, were not

hitting the thresholds that typically trigger the need for second contingency payments), and (c) the remaining NCPC for distribution payments, compared to no such NCPC in February.

He noted that the April 23 Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting would include discussion of economic studies, a transmission study, and the Marginal Emissions Analysis Report (expected to be published on April 14). The agenda also included PAC review of the 2020 load forecast. He said the 2020 Capacity, Energy, Loads, and Transmission (CELT) Report was scheduled to be released on May 1, 2020 and would include for the first time seasonal and annual demand from heating and transportation electrification. He also reported that the Order 1000 RFP for transmission for Boston in 2028 received 36 Phase One Proposals from eight Qualified Transmission Project Sponsors that ranged from \$49 million to \$745 million, with in-service dates ranging from March 2023 through December 2026. He said that the ISO was expediting its review of those proposals.

Dr. Chadalavada flagged for the Committee the current status of the Forward Capacity Market, highlighting specifically that the zones for the FCA15 would be the same as for FCA14.

Following his presentation, he responded to numerous questions and observations. He agreed that total energy market value may be at an all-time low, a fact that he would investigate following the meeting. He indicated that, based on early analysis, the ISO did not anticipate the need to enhance financial assurance or other risk mitigation measures as a result of COVID-19 or the recession, but monitoring and discussion would continue and additional changes or measures would be considered with stakeholders if and when appropriate. He noted that asset owners were not reporting supply chain issues. He confirmed that the ISO was working to analyze the Order 1000 RFP responses expeditiously with a goal of having selected projects in service for the FCA15 delivery period.

ISO ENERGY SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS (ESI) PROPOSAL

Ms. Chafetz began this item summarizing for the Committee the materials circulated in advance of the meeting and reviewing how she intended to conduct this portion of the teleconference meeting. She then invited Ms. Mariah Winkler, the Chair of the Markets Committee, to summarize that Committee's deliberations on this item. Ms. Winkler did so noting the three motions to amend the ISO's proposal that had been voted at the Markets Committee, one of which had passed and two that had failed. She then reported on the specific voting results, noting that the Markets Committee did not have enough votes in favor to recommend either the ISO proposal with the amendment that had passed or the unamended ISO proposal.

Following this introduction, Ms. Chafetz explained that the ISO's base proposal would be the starting point for Committee deliberations. She acknowledged the substantial history and discussions leading up to the Markets Committee votes on this matter. She explained that, rather than repeating themselves for the Participants Committee, members if they wished could merely reference their positions at the Markets Committee if they were unchanged. The following main motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the revisions to the Tariff to effect the Energy Security Improvements (ESI) design, as proposed by ISO New England, and as circulated 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 by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Markets Committee

Ms. Chafetz invited Mr. Jeff Bentz, Director of Analysis for the New England States Committee on Electricity (NESCOE), to describe the three amendments that had been sponsored by NESCOE and voted by the Markets Committee. Mr. Bentz began by explaining NESCOE's

view that, without modifications, the ISO proposal puts consumers at great risk, especially during extended cold snaps and would impose unjustified costs on consumers. He said NESCOE was of the view that the ISO had failed to provide an assessment of the marginal reliability value attached with the substantial added costs from its proposal and elements of that proposal. He summarized NESCOE's understanding of the conclusion of the ISO's external market monitor that the proposal would result in load being required to pay for more incremental energy and operating reserves than are likely to be needed in Real-Time. He reminded the Committee that NESCOE had proposed other alternatives to more directly link quantities of purchases with incremental reliability gains, but those were not part of the ISO's proposal. Further, NESCOE questioned whether existing elements of markets, such as the FCM pay-for-performance rate and Reserve Constraint Penalty Factor values, needed to be reconsidered with the ISO's proposal. Failure to do so, he said, could potentially subject consumers to even more unjustified costs. He explained that NESCOE's three amendments were intended individually and collectively to reduce ESI costs to consumers without materially reducing reliability benefits.

NESCOE's first amendment would limit the provisions to acquire Replacement Energy Reserves (RER) solely to the winter months. Mr. Bentz reminded the Committee that, as discussed at the Markets Committee, this NESCOE amendment was designed specifically to support fuel security objectives, as there was no demonstrated need to procure RER for fuel security in non-winter months.

Referencing NESCOE's second amendment, Mr. Bentz explained NESCOE's view that the ISO's proposal to increase energy procured and related costs on account of potential load forecast error was not adequately justified or explained at the Markets Committee and, again, would increase costs without any material increase in reliability.

On NESCOE's third and final amendment, NESCOE proposed to increase the strike price by \$10/MWh from levels proposed by the ISO. He explained such an adder would reduce risks and associated costs of the energy call option. He acknowledged that this change might weaken the financial incentive for some resources to acquire fuel to meet the call option but opined any reduction of such incentives would be very modest at best.

NESCOE Amendment No. 1 -- (Setting Day-Ahead RER to Zero for Non-Winter Months)

Following NESCOE's introduction, the Committee discussed each of the changes, beginning with NESCOE's Amendment No. 1 to amend the main motion so as to revise the ESI proposal so RER quantities would only be calculated for the months of December through February. Many commenters began their remarks by expressing appreciation for the ISO's efforts and willingness to consider many suggested changes. Other commenters, as suggested by the Chair, referred throughout the discussions to their positions at the Markets Committee rather than repeating them.

Focusing on the amendments themselves, beginning with comments from representatives of the Transmission Sector, one Participant representative explained that the Participant generally supported the new ancillary services as a good first step to improve the markets and agreed with NESCOE's amendments which would reduce customer costs that seemed to be unnecessary or unjustified while still allowing ESI to address demonstrated reliability concerns during the winter months. This Participant could not support and would abstain on a vote on the ISO proposal at this time because it did not yet include a seasonal forward market and a strong market mitigation construct, both of which the ISO committed to consider in the future.

Continuing, all the representatives of the Publicly Owned Entity (POE) Sector expressed broad support for the NESCOE amendments, referring in some cases to supportive positions that

had been expressed fully at the Markets Committee. They said that they could not support the ISO proposal because it included costs that they did not find to be needed.

The representatives of the End User Sector were called on next. Those who spoke expressed support for NESCOE Amendment No. 1 and the other proposed NESCOE amendments. They noted that the Commission had directed the region to address demonstrated fuel security concerns, which had only been for the winter months. They expressed the view that there was no demonstrated need for RER to ensure reliability, especially during non-winter months. They objected to the substantial additional costs that would be imposed on consumers. One member cited analysis that suggested that the procurement of RER in non-winter months could impose an additional \$51-61 million in costs on consumers that they believed to be unnecessary and unjustified. This Participant representative expressed support for the NESCOE amendments because they would reduce inappropriate costs to consumers.

Members of the Alternative Resources (AR) Sector who spoke were generally supportive of the NESCOE amendments for reasons previously identified in the discussion. The RER product was characterized in the discussion by one AR member as reserves for reserves and not a necessary product to preserve reliability. The member also expressed concern that the ISO did not analyze the impact ESI would have on the Forward Capacity Market. Another member suggested that the NESCOE amendments would properly remove optional costs from the ISO's proposal that were not demonstrably necessary now, without prejudice to making those or similar changes in the future if they were to be demonstrated to be needed.

Representatives of the Generation Sector and Supplier Sector that spoke expressed general support for the ESI design and opposition to the amendments that were viewed as reducing necessary incentives to achieve the results sought by ESI. Referencing, for example, the \$10 adder to the strike price proposed by NESCOE's third amendment, a member cited very

recent operational challenges that resulted from the loss of a major nuclear generator that caused less than a \$10/MWh increase in clearing prices. Consequently, he explained, the energy option would not have been available to address the drop in load. Another member similarly expressed concern that the \$10 adder would reduce incentives that were necessary to ensure reliability. A member explained more broadly that the financial incentives from ESI, even without the amendments, at best provided marginal support for liquefied natural gas (LNG) for the winter months, and would be insufficient to support LNG arrangements with the amendments. One member explained that ESI more broadly addressed long-recognized problems with price formation in the energy market and should be supported for that reason. Another member, referring to NESCOE Amendment No. 1, expressed the view that RER was needed year round in order to address known issues that were resulting in year-round uplift.

NESCOE, taking the opportunity to make closing comments, focused on the suggestion that ESI was addressing long-standing problems with the markets other than fuel security. Mr. Bentz opined that the issue before the group was to address winter fuel security concerns and this was not the right design to accomplish that objective.

Following that discussion, NESCOE Amendment No. 1 was voted in a roll call and passed with a 63.76% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 0%; Transmission Sector – 16.79%; Supplier Sector – 5.60%; AR Sector – 7.79%; POE Sector – 16.79%; and End User Sector – 16.79%). (See Vote 1 on Attachment 2).

NESCOE Amendment No. 2 (Remove Accounting for the Load Forecast Error)

With the once-amended main motion now before the Committee, a motion was duly made and seconded to further amend the ISO's ESI proposal to remove the language that permits the ISO to add to the RER purchased Day-Ahead for every hour of the Operating Day an amount to account for potential load forecast error. Discussion on this motion to amend began with the

POE Sector. Representatives who spoke again expressed support for the amendment for the same reasons they supported the first amendment. Similarly, the End User members who spoke expressed their support for the amendment, with one summarizing analysis that suggested that allowing the ISO to include load forecast error in determining the RER to purchase could add anywhere from \$16 million to \$99 million in additional annual costs on consumers, even if RER were limited just to the winter period. Representatives from the other Sectors, to the extent they spoke, similarly referred back to their views expressed during the discussion of the first amendment.

Following discussion, the second NESCOE motion to amend was voted by roll call and passed with a 63.76% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 0%; Transmission Sector – 16.79%; Supplier Sector – 5.60%; AR Sector – 7.79%; POE Sector – 16.79%; and End User Sector – 16.79%). (See Vote 2 on Attachment 2).

NESCOE Amendment No. 3 (Strike Price \$10 Adder)

With a twice-amended main motion now before the Committee, a motion was duly made and seconded for a third motion to amend the ISO's ESI proposal. This amendment would add \$10/MWh in every hour to the strike price that the ISO proposed to use in that hour. Members who spoke in favor of this amendment argued that there was simply no support for the additional costs that an inappropriately low strike price would impose on consumers. There was some acknowledgement that the adder may reduce financial incentives to resources during certain hours, but they opined a higher strike price would achieve a more acceptable cost/benefit balance than the ISO's proposal. They also complained that the ISO failed to support its argument that a lower strike price was necessary. Members who spoke in opposition to the motion to amend reiterated the concern that the adder would effectively eliminate the availability of this option when needed.

The third NESCOE motion to amend was then voted and passed with a 61.27% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 0%; Transmission Sector – 16.79%; Supplier Sector – 4.48%; AR Sector – 6.42%; POE Sector – 16.79%; and End User Sector – 16.79%). (See Vote 3 on Attachment 2).

Thrice-Amended Main Motion

A motion to approve the thrice-amended main motion was then duly made and seconded. A number of members whose votes were going to be different on the amended motion than on the individual amendments described their positions. Some expressed concern that, while the amendments improved the ESI design, they would abstain when voting on the package because, in their view, the amended proposal, like the unamended ISO proposal, was still incomplete without a seasonal forward component and mitigation rules in place. More targeted revenues were needed to ensure available and flexible resources when needed. Others expressed support for the amendments as improving on a proposal but opposition to the amended proposal overall because, even with the amendments, the improved proposal was still unjust and unreasonable in their views, albeit less unreasonable than ISO's unamended ESI proposal.

Some who opposed the three amendments explained that they similarly would oppose the amended proposal, and would support the ISO's unamended ESI proposal even though they considered it only marginally sufficient to accomplish the necessary fuel security through LNG purchases. Others suggested that, particularly in the near term, but also as part of a transition to a system with a fundamentally-changed infrastructure, the region would be better-served, and operational reliability better achieved by, the increased reliability margin that the ISO's unamended proposal would provide, even if it proved to be somewhat more costly. Still others suggested that compensation for reliability services being provided was needed now and the

amended package would limit if not eliminate the opportunity to be compensated for those services.

The thrice-amended main motion was then voted and passed with a 61.70% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 0%; Transmission Sector – 16.79%; Supplier Sector – 3.54%; AR Sector – 7.79%; POE Sector – 16.79%; and End User Sector – 16.79%). (See Vote 4 on Attachment 2).

ISO Unamended ESI Proposal

In response to a question from the Chair, ISO representatives requested that the Committee consider and vote on its unamended ESI proposal. Turning first to NESCOE, which had sponsored the successful amendments, the NESCOE representative explained the opposition by the six New England states to the ISO's ESI Proposal. NESCOE characterized the proposal as a bad bargain for consumers. NESCOE opposed the ISO's proposed year-round call option approach, which NESCOE considered to exceed the scope of FERC's 2018 order requiring the filing of longer-term market changes to better address regional winter fuel security. NESCOE argued that the ISO's ESI proposal would produce unjust and reasonable rates. In its view, the ISO's proposal would be vulnerable to producing uncompetitive outcomes absent effective mitigation, would procure Day-Ahead options for more reserves than the system needs in Real-Time at excessive consumer costs, relies on a flawed impact analysis, and deviates from more conventional approaches used by other RTOs to procure ancillary services at far less cost and risk to consumers.

A Generation Sector representative, notwithstanding his support for the ISO's proposed ESI design as innovative improvements to the region's overall market design, explained that the Participant could not support the ISO's unamended ESI proposal. In this Participant's view, the ISO's ESI proposal, as ultimately crafted, did not satisfy the compliance obligation imposed by the FERC to address fuel security.

Mr. Chadalavada on behalf of the ISO expressed understanding of and respect for the legitimate and well-articulated concerns with ESI. He noted that the ISO was focused on the longer term and was trying to implement markets that would work under almost all foreseeable circumstances and not just during the winter months. He said the ISO was mindful of consumer costs and believed its proposal achieved the right balance between costs and benefits. He recognized there was legitimate disagreement on this point and that the FERC would make the call. He expressed his appreciation for the stakeholder involvement, efforts and feedback. He committed the ISO to consistently evaluate its markets and propose adjustments if and as deemed desirable or necessary.

There being no further discussion, the unamended main motion was voted and failed to pass with a 39.59% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 14.39%; Transmission Sector – 0%; Supplier Sector – 12.59%; AR Sector – 12.61%; POE Sector – 0%; and End User Sector – 0%). (See Vote 5 on Attachment 2).

EARLIER SUNSET OF THE INVENTORIED ENERGY PROGRAM

The Committee then considered the ISO proposal to accelerate the sunset of the Inventoried Energy Program provisions so that they would not be effective for the commitment period covered by FCA15 if the FERC accepted ESI. Referring to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting and without discussion, the following motion was moved, seconded, voted, and passed overwhelmingly with opposition noted by Exelon and abstentions by Dynegy, NextEra, NRDC, and Mr. Kuser:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the Tariff revisions for the early sunset of the Inventoried Energy Program, which is conditional upon the FERC's acceptance of the ESI design for the fifteenth Capacity Commitment Period, as recommended by the Markets Committee at its March 24, 2020 meeting, and as circulated to this Committee in advance of this meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Markets Committee.

LITIGATION REPORT

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the March 31 Litigation Report that had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He summarized for the Committee actions that were being taken by the FERC in light of the COVID 19 pandemic, noting that certain filing deadlines had been extended and other requirements relaxed. He encouraged members to check with FERC counsel for specifics. Related, he noted the ISO's filing early that day to have the FERC waive notarization requirements for financial assurance policy submissions that Market Participants were required to make with the ISO by the end of April.* He then highlighted the following items:

- The deadline the next day for comments on the FCA14 results filing;
- Developments regarding FCA15, including a limited waiver of the Delist Bid deadline, the rejection of the filing to remove the fuel security retention provisions for FCA15, and the continued but extended appellate proceedings concerning the Inventoried Energy Program;
- The FERC's conditional acceptance of the region's filing in response to Order 845 on interconnection provisions, which required the region to make and file changes in further compliance on or before July 17, and which he said were to be reviewed with the Transmission Committee over the next several months;
- The FERC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NOPR) on transmission incentives that also was planned to be reviewed with the Transmission Committee to consider whether NEPOOL should submit any comments; and finally

* Secretary's Note: This filing was made moot later that day when the FERC issued an order granting, among other things, a blanket waiver of notarization requirements imposed by all ISO/ RTO tariffs.

- The FERC's order the prior day confirming on remand that payments made under the 2013/14 winter program were just and reasonable.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Before proceeding to committee reports, Ms. Chafetz provided an update on the plans for discussions on the future grid. Although the impacts of COVID-19 were delaying the planned kick-off for the process to define the study discussed at the March Participants Committee meeting, Ms. Chafetz noted that NESCOE would be offering its thoughts on the study at a joint meeting of the Markets Committee (MC) and Reliability Committee (RC) scheduled for April 7. A more fulsome kickoff was being planned for May, and plans for discussions on the second day of the June Summer Meeting were being developed.

Markets Committee. Mr. Bill Fowler, the MC Vice-Chair, reported that the MC was scheduled to meet the morning of April 7, with plans for a vote on changes to the Generation Information System (GIS) operating rules, discussion on changes to Manual M-11 and the Information Policy, and a presentation on the IMM's Fall 2019 quarterly report. The joint MC/RC meeting would convene later that day after a break for lunch.

Budget & Finance Subcommittee (B&F). Ms. Michelle Gardner, B&F Chair, reported that B&F was scheduled to meet on April 21, 2020, and would consider clean-up changes to the Billing Policy and continue discussion of potential "know your customer" enhancements to the Financial Assurance Policy for new and existing Participants.

Reliability Committee. Mr. Robert Stein, the RC Vice-Chair, reported that, following the joint April 7 meeting with the MC, the next regularly-scheduled RC meeting would be April 22, 2020, at which the RC would discuss fuel security assumptions and the need to retain resources for fuel security in FCA15.

Transmission Committee (TC). Mr. José Rotger, the TC Vice-Chair, reported that the TC was scheduled to meet on April 28, 2020. The two key items planned for discussion were the ISO's plans in response to the FERC order conditionally accepting the Order 845 (interconnection reforms) compliance filing and whether NEPOOL should file comments on the FERC's transmission rate incentives NOPR.

Joint Nominating Committee (JNC). Mr. Doug Hurley reported that the JNC met telephonically on March 19, 2020 and had narrowed to approximately eight the list of candidates to be interviewed by the Committee. The Committee hoped to conduct those interviews in person, if possible, and Mr. Hurley committed to report at a future meeting on the status of those interviews.

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Doot, Secretary

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN APRIL 2, 2020 TELECONFERENCE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Acadia Center	End User		Deborah Donovan	Jerry Elmer
American Petroleum Institute	Fuels Industry Part.	Zoe Cadore		
AR Small Load Response (LR) Group Member	AR-LR	Doug Hurley	Brad Swalwell	
AR Small Renewable Generation (RG) Group Member	AR-RG	Erik Abend		
American PowerNet Management	Supplier			Mary Smith, Michael Macrae
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Associated Industries of Massachusetts (AIM)	End User			R. Borghesani
AVANGRID: CMP/UI	Transmission		Alan Trotta	
Bath Iron Works Corporation	End User			William P. Short III
Belmont Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Block Island Utility District	Publicly Owned Entity	Dave Cavanaugh		
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		
C.N. Brown Electricity, LLC	Supplier			William P. Short III
Calpine Energy Services, LP	Supplier	Brett Kruse		
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	
CLEARresult Consulting, Inc.	AR-DG	Tamera Oldfield		
Competitive Energy Services, LLC	Supplier		Glenn Poole	
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	Jerry Elmer		
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	Supplier	Norman Mah		
CPV Towantic, LLC	Generation	Dan Pierpont		
Cross-Sound Cable Company (CSC)	Supplier		José Rotger	
Danvers Electric Division	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
DC Energy, LLC	Supplier	Bruce Bleiweis		
Direct Energy Business, LLC	Supplier	Nancy Chafetz		
Dominion Energy Generation Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Mike Purdie		
Durgin and Crowell Lumber Co., Inc.	End User			William P. Short III
Dynergy Marketing and Trade, LLC	Supplier	Andy Weinstein		Bill Fowler
EDF Trading North America, LLC	Supplier	Chris Armitage		
Elektrisola, Inc.	End User			William P. Short III
Emera (ENMAX) Maine	Transmission	Lisa Martin	David Norman	
Emera Energy Services	Supplier		Bill Fowler	
Enel X North America, Inc.	AR-LR		Herb Healy	
ENGIE Energy Marketing NA, Inc.	AR-RG	Sarah Bresolin		Pete Fuller
Environmental Defense Fund	End User	N. Jonathan Peress		
Eversource Energy	Transmission	James Daly		Dave Burnham, Vandan Divatia
Excelerate Energy LP	Fuels Industry Part.			Gary Ritter
Exelon Generation Company	Supplier	Steve Kirk	Bill Fowler	
FirstLight Power Management, LLC	Generation	Tom Kaslow		Nancy Chafetz
Galt Power, Inc.	Supplier	José Rotger		
Garland Manufacturing Company	End User			Michael Macrae

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN APRIL 2, 2020 TELECONFERENCE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Generation Group Member	Generation			Ron Coutu
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.	Supplier	Louis Guibault	Bob Stein	
Hammond Lumber Company	End User			Michael Macrae
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User	Mary Smith	Michael Macrae	
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	
IDT Energy, LLC	Supplier		Glen Biren	
Industrial Energy Consumer Group (IECG)	End User			Alan Topalian
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Jericho Power LLC (Jericho)	AR-RG	Mark Spencer		
King Forest Industries, Inc.	End User			William P. Short III
Littleton (MA) Electric Light and Water Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity	Craig Kieny		
Long Island Power Authority (LIPA)	Supplier		Bill Killgoar	
Maine Power LLC	Supplier	Jeff Jones		
Maine Public Advocate's Office	End User	Drew Landry		
Maine Skiing, Inc.	End User			Alan Topalian
Mansfield Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Maple Energy LLC	AR-LR			Doug Hurley
Marble River, LLC	Supplier		John Brodbeck	
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			Jose Rotger
Merrimac Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Michael Kuser	End User	Michael Kuser		
Middleborough Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Moore Company	End User			William P. Short III
National Grid	Transmission	Tim Brennan	Tim Martin	
Natural Resources Defense Council	End User	Bruce Ho		Jerry Elmer
Nautilus Power, LLC	Generation		Bill Fowler	
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned Entity	Steve Kaminski		B. Forshaw; D. Cavanaugh; B. Thomson
New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate	End User	Pradhip Chattopadhyaya		Jason Frost
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		Pete Fuller	
Nylon Corporation of America	End User			William P. Short III
Pascoag Utility District	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN APRIL 2, 2020 TELECONFERENCE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Paxton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Peabody Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
PNE Energy Supply	Supplier			William P. Short III
PowerOptions, Inc.	End User	Heather Takle		
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC	Supplier	Joel Gordon		
Reading Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Repsol Energy North America Company	Fuels Industry Part.		Nancy Chafetz	
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Russell Municipal Light Dept.	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Saint Anselm College	End User			William P. Short III
Shipyards Brewing LLC	End User			William P. Short III
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	
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
Verde Group, LLC	Provisional Member		Mike Bedley	
Vermont Electric Coop.	Publicly Owned	Craig Kiemy		
Vermont Electric Power Co. (VELCO)	Transmission	Frank Etori		
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	
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	
Z-TECH, LLC	End User			William P. Short III

**APRIL 2, 2020 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING
ROLL CALL VOTES**

TOTAL

Sector	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5
GENERATION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.39
TRANSMISSION	16.79	16.79	16.79	16.79	0.00
SUPPLIER	5.60	5.60	4.48	3.54	12.59
ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES	7.79	7.79	6.42	7.79	12.61
PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY	16.79	16.79	16.79	16.79	0.00
END USER	16.79	16.79	16.79	16.79	0.00
% IN FAVOR	63.76	63.76	61.27	61.70	39.59

GENERATION SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5
CPV Towantic, LLC	O	O	O	O	F
Dominion Energy Generation Mktg.	O	O	O	O	F
FirstLight Power Resources Mgmt.	O	O	O	O	F
Generation Group Member	O	O	O	O	F
Nautilus Power, LLC	O	O	O	O	F
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	O	O	O	O	F
NRG Power Marketing, LLC	O	O	O	O	O
IN FAVOR (F)	0	0	0	0	6
OPPOSED (O)	7	7	7	7	1
TOTAL VOTES	7	7	7	7	7
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	0	0	0	0

TRANSMISSION SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5
Avangrid (CMP/UI)	F	F	F	A	O
Emera Maine	F	A	A	A	A
Eversource Energy	F	F	F	F	A
National Grid	F	F	A	F	A
Vermont Electric Power Co.	F	F	F	F	A
IN FAVOR (F)	5	4	3	3	0
OPPOSED	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL VOTES	5	4	3	3	1
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	1	2	2	4

ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5
Renewable Generation Sub-Sector					
Central Rivers Power	O	O	O	O	F
ENGIE Energy Marketing NA	O	O	O	O	F
Great River Hydro	O	O	O	O	F
Jericho Power	O	O	O	O	F
Wheelabrator/Macquarie	O	O	O	O	F
Small RG Group Member	A	A	A	A	A
Distributed Gen. Sub-Sector					
CLEARresult Consulting, Inc.	A	A	A	A	A
Sunrun Inc.	F	F	F	F	F

SUPPLIER SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5
American PowerNet Management	F	F	F	F	O
BP Energy Company	A	A	A	O	F
Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc.	O	O	O	O	F
C.N. Brown Electricity, LLC	F	F	F	F	O
Calpine Energy Services, LP	O	O	O	O	F
Castleton Comm. Merchant Trading	O	O	O	O	F
Competitive Energy Services, LLC	F	F	O	O	F
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	A	A	A	O	A
Cross-Sound Cable Company	A	A	A	A	A
DC Energy, LLC	A	A	A	A	A
Direct Energy Business, LLC	O	O	O	O	F
Dynegy Marketing and Trade, LLC	O	O	O	O	F
Emera Energy Companies	O	O	O	O	F
Exelon Generation Company	O	O	O	O	A
Galt Power, Inc.	A	A	A	O	F
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	O	O	O	O	F
IDT Energy, LLC	A	A	A	A	A
LIPA	A	A	A	A	A
Maine Power, LLC	F	F	F	F	O
Marble River, LLC	O	O	O	O	--
Mercuria Energy America, Inc	A	A	A	O	F
PNE Energy Supply LLC	F	F	F	F	O
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade	O	O	O	O	F
IN FAVOR (F)	5	5	4	4	12
OPPOSED	10	10	11	15	4
TOTAL VOTES	15	15	15	19	16
ABSTENTIONS (A)	8	8	8	4	6

ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES SECTOR (cont.)

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5
Load Response Sub-Sector					
Enel X North America, Inc.	F	F	O	F	A
Maple Energy	F	F	F	F	O
Vermont Energy Investment Corp.	F	F	F	F	O
Small LR Group Member	F	F	A	A	Split
Energy Federation Inc.					O
Tangent Energy Solutions, Inc.					F
IN FAVOR (F)	5	5	3	4	6.5
OPPOSED	5	5	6	5	2.5
TOTAL VOTES	10	10	9	9	9
ABSTENTIONS (A)	2	2	3	3	3

**APRIL 2, 2020 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING
ROLL CALL VOTES**

END USER SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5
Acadia Center	F	F	A	A	O
Associated Industries of Mass.	F	F	F	F	O
Bath Iron Works Corporation	F	F	F	F	O
Conn. Office of Consumer Counsel	F	F	F	F	O
Conservation Law Foundation	F	F	A	A	O
Durgin and Crowell Lumber Co.	F	F	F	F	O
Elektrisola, Inc.	F	F	F	F	O
Environmental Defense Fund	F	F	A	F	A
Garland Manufacturing Co.	F	F	F	F	O
Hammond Lumber Company	F	F	F	F	O
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	F	F	F	F	O
High Liner Foods (USA) Inc.	F	F	F	F	O
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	F	F	F	F	O
King Forest Industries, Inc.	F	F	F	F	O
Michael Kusar	A	A	A	A	A
Maine Public Advocate Office	F	F	F	F	O
Maine Skiing, Inc.	F	F	F	F	O
Mass. Attorney General's Office	F	F	F	F	O
Moore Company	F	F	F	F	O
Natural Resources Defense Council	F	F	A	A	O
NH Office of Consumer Advocate	F	F	F	F	O
Nylon Corporation of America	F	F	F	F	O
PowerOptions, Inc.	F	F	F	F	O
St. Anselm College	F	F	F	F	O
The Energy Consortium	F	F	F	F	O
Z-TECH, LLC	F	F	F	F	O
IN FAVOR (F)	25	25	21	22	0
OPPOSED	0	0	0	0	24
TOTAL VOTES	25	25	21	22	24
ABSTENTIONS (A)	1	1	5	4	2

PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR (cont.)

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F	F	F	O
Holden Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Holyoke Gas & Electric Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F	F	A	O
Ipswich Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Littleton (MA) Electric Light Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
Mansfield Municipal Electric Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Marblehead Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Mass. Bay Transportation Authority	F	F	F	F	O
Mass. Mun. Wholesale Electric Co.	F	F	F	A	O
Merrimac Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
Middleborough Gas and Elec. Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
Middleton Municipal Electric Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	F	F	F	F	O
North Attleborough Electric Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
Norwood Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
Pascoag Utility District	F	F	F	F	O
Paxton Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	F	F	F	A	O
Princeton Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Reading Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F	F	F	O
Russell Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Shrewsbury's Elec. & Cable Ops.	F	F	F	A	O
South Hadley Electric Light Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Stowe (VT) Electric Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F	F	F	O
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F	F	A	O
Vermont Electric Cooperative	F	F	F	F	O
Village of Hyde Park (VT) Elec. Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
VT Public Power Supply Authority	F	F	F	F	O
Wakefield Mun. Gas and Light Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Wallingford, Town of	F	F	F	F	O
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	F	F	F	F	O
West Boylston Mun. Lighting Plant	F	F	F	A	O
Westfield Gas & Electric Light Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
IN FAVOR (F)	51	51	51	30	0
OPPOSED	0	0	0	0	51
TOTAL VOTES	51	51	51	30	51
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	0	0	21	0

PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	F	F	F	A	O
Belmont Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
Block Island Utility District	F	F	F	F	O
Boylston Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Braintree Electric Light Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
Chester Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F	F	A	O
Concord Municipal Light Plant	F	F	F	F	O
Conn. Mun. Electric Energy Coop.	F	F	F	F	O
Danvers Electric Division	F	F	F	F	O
Georgetown Municipal Light Dept.	F	F	F	F	O
Groton Electric Light Dept.	F	F	F	A	O
Groveland Electric Light Dept.	F	F	F	F	O