

FINAL

Pursuant to notice duly given, a meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held via teleconference, beginning in executive session at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, September 3, 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**CONFIDENTIAL VOTE ON SLATE OF CANDIDATES FOR ISO BOARD**

Ms. Chafetz reminded the Committee that the identities of the candidates on the proposed slate must remain confidential until the ISO Board reports publicly on its final vote on the slate, and indicated that discussion of this matter would proceed entirely in executive session. Ms. Chafetz then introduced Mr. Phil Shapiro, Chairman of the Joint Nominating Committee (JNC), who joined this portion of the meeting to present and answer any questions regarding the slate and the process undertaken to identify that slate. Following general comments on the process, Mr. Shapiro identified the candidates, referring to the confidential package of materials that was circulated to the members and alternates of the Committee in advance of the meeting. Ms. Chafetz then introduced Chairman Matt Nelson, Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities and Commissioner Mike Giaimo, New Hampshire Public Utility Commission, who had each participated in the JNC efforts. Chairman Nelson and Commissioner Giaimo offered their thoughts on the nomination process and the proposed slate and then left the meeting.

The slate was then discussed among members and alternates, with initial comments offered by the NEPOOL members of the JNC. A number of members suggested potential enhancements to the nominating process. Based on the discussions, the NEPOOL members of

the JNC committed to explore the suggestions with the full JNC when the process for the next slate got underway in the late Fall.

Following further discussion, the following motion was duly made, seconded and approved by more than the 70% Vote required for NEPOOL endorsement, with the vote accomplished by secret written ballot per prior agreement of the Participants Committee:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee endorses the slate of candidates for the ISO Board that has been recommended by the Joint Nominating Committee and presented to the Participants Committee in executive session at this meeting.

GENERAL SESSION

Following a short recess, the NEPOOL Participants Committee reconvened by WebEx Event beginning at 11:00 a.m. A quorum determined in accordance with the Second Restated NEPOOL Agreement was reconfirmed. Those members, alternates and temporary alternates who participated in both the executive and general session portions of the meeting are identified in *bold italics* in the Attachment 1 attendance list.

APPROVAL OF AUGUST 6, 2020 MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the August 6, 2020 meeting, as circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes of the August 6, 2020 meeting were unanimously approved as circulated, with an abstention by Mr. Michael Kuser's alternate, Mr. Rich Heidorn, noted.

ISO COO REPORT

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), reviewed highlights from the September 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 further pushed back the planned

return of personnel to ISO facilities. As of the date of the meeting, roughly 125 employees had returned to work at ISO facilities on a voluntary basis. Given the status of the pandemic across the nation, the ISO planned to keep its facilities open for support staff on a voluntary basis through the end of 2020. The ISO planned to assess a more structured re-entry beginning in early 2021. Related to this plan, and as announced in a joint ISO and NEPOOL memo circulated to the Principal Committees the week before, NEPOOL meetings would continue to be virtual rather than in-person through the end of 2020. Monitoring of the situation with COVID-19 would continue and further updates on work and meeting plans for ISO and NEPOOL would be provided when and as appropriate.

Operations Report

Dr. Chadalavada then continued with his regular operations report. He noted that the data in the report was through August 26. He highlighted that: (i) Energy Market value for August was \$273 million, down \$54 million from an updated July 2020 value of \$326 million and down \$49 million from August 2019; (ii) August 2020 average natural gas prices were 5.8 percent lower than July average values; (iii) the average Real-Time Hub Locational Marginal Prices (LMP) for August (\$25.04/MWh) were 11 percent higher than July averages; (iv) average July 2020 natural gas prices and Real-Time Hub LMPs over the period were down 24 percent and up 6.2 percent, respectively, from August 2019; (v) the average Day-Ahead cleared physical energy during peak hours as percent of forecasted load was 101.1 percent during August (up from 100.7 percent during July), with the minimum value for the month (96.6 percent) on August 22; and (vi) the Daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) payments for July totaled \$2.9 million, which was up \$1.2 million from July 2020 and up \$1.3 million from August 2019. August NCPC, which was 1.1 percent of total Energy Market value, was comprised of (a) \$2 million in first contingency payments (up \$500,000 from July); (b) \$0.7 million in second

contingency payments (compared to no second contingency payments in July); (c) \$4,000 in voltage payments (down \$18,000 from July); and (d) \$195,000 in distribution payments (up \$47,000 from July).

Dr. Chadalavada highlighted operational challenges in August associated with Tropical Storm Isaias in the early part of the month (with Connecticut and Western Massachusetts particularly impacted), and on August 1, 9 and 10, when loads were 1,000 to 2,000 MW over forecasted levels. During those three days, the ISO was required to dispatch fast start resources to maintain Operating Reserves, which led to the higher first contingency commitment costs for the month. He said August 9 was particularly challenging from an operational perspective because of an unplanned transmission line outage in Northeast Massachusetts/Boston (NEMA), which required out-of-market commitments in NEMA and reduced generation in SEMA. The August 9 event was relatively short duration and all reliability standards were maintained. Also in NEMA, there were planned outages in early August on two transmission lines (3163 and 3164) but those outages were cut short due to higher loads and a different merit order for dispatch than expected. The ISO also was required to make supplemental commitments for local second contingency protection in NEMA.

In response to questions, Dr. Chadalavada explained why the originally scheduled transmission outages were permitted to proceed initially even though there had been a declaration of a Pool-wide Master/Local Satellite Procedure No. 2 Abnormal Conditions Alert (M/LCC-2 Declaration). He said that an M/LCC-2 Declaration does not require all outages to be recalled. The declaration in early August was because of the impact from Isaias in Connecticut and Western Massachusetts. NEMA had not been affected by those conditions so the ISO permitted the planned outages to proceed, only to be cancelled later based on evolving circumstances. Dr. Chadalavada acknowledged that the determinations on whether to proceed

with outages were inherently a balancing act, and that the ISO was studying the August events for lessons learned, and would continue to seek ways to minimize the need for out-of-market actions.

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 August 6, 2020 meeting, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He invited questions or comments on the summaries and there were none.

Mr. van Welie highlighted a virtual meeting that he and Ms. Anne George had with, and at the request of, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Secretary Dan Brouillette the week before the meeting. He reported that those discussions touched on all of the major issues currently under discussion in the NEPOOL processes. Mr. van Welie identified for Secretary Brouillette a number of the regional studies underway and encouraged the DOE labs to consider similar studies. He committed to keep the DOE Secretary updated on New England activities.

2021 ISO AND NESCOE BUDGETS

Mr. Robert Ludlow, ISO Vice President and Chief Financial & Compliance Officer, referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting related to the proposed 2021 ISO Operating and Capital Budgets and the process undertaken to date. Mr. Ludlow summarized the 2021 Operating Budget, which was up about two percent from the 2020 budget. He reported that key drivers of that increase included higher compensation and other inflationary costs, and planned spending on the Energy Security Improvements (ESI), renewable resources/emerging technologies impacts on market monitoring and System planning, the future grid initiative, increased software licensing and maintenance costs; and cyber security

and NERC Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) compliance. He said headcounts and professional fees were budgeted to remain level.

Mr. Ludlow reported that the ISO's 2021 Capital Budget would remain at \$28 million. As required, the ISO would review with the Budget & Finance Subcommittee and file with the FERC its quarterly filings on the Capital Budget and provide updates on specific projects as those projects move from conceptual design into chartered, active and completed projects.

Summarizing the process for budget review and approval, Mr. Ludlow said that the budgets had been reviewed with State officials and their comments on the budgets were due September 8. The ISO would respond to any comments and questions received from the States by September 23. The ISO Board would review the budgets and all feedback received at its September 16 meeting. The Participants Committee would be asked to support the final 2021 Budgets at its October 1 meeting and, with that input, the ISO Board planned to vote on the 2021 ISO Budgets thereafter. He expected that the annual Tariff filing, following Board action, would be made in mid-October, with a requested January 1, 2021 effective date.

Turning to the 2021 NESCOE Budget, Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to the NESCOE Budget materials posted in advance of the meeting. Ms. Heather Hunt, NESCOE Executive Director, reported that the 2021 Budget conformed to the 5-year *pro forma* budget approved by the Participants Committee in June 2017 and accepted by the FERC in August 2017. She encouraged anyone with questions or comments on the NESCOE Budget to contact her.

CHANGES TO ISO-NE SELF-FUNDING TARIFF TRUE-UP MECHANISM

Ms. Michelle Gardner, Chair of the Budget and Finance Subcommittee (Subcommittee), referred the Committee to materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting related to a change to Section IV.A of the ISO New England Transmission, Markets and Services Tariff (the

Self-Funding Tariff). Summarizing those materials, she explained that the change was to permit the ISO to carry “special purpose funds” included in one year’s budget to a subsequent year in order to complete the project for which the funds were designated. She reported that the change was considered without objection by the Subcommittee at its August 10, 2020 meeting.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports revisions to the Section IV.A of the ISO New England Transmission, Markets and Services Tariff to carve special purpose funding out of the true-up mechanism, as proposed by the ISO and as circulated to this Committee with the August 27, 2020 supplemental notice, together with such non-substantive changes as may be approved by the Chair of the Budget and Finance Subcommittee.

In response to a question, Ms. Gardner confirmed that the proposed change would carve out of the Self-Funding Tariff’s true-up mechanism *any* special purpose funding that is allocated exclusively to one purpose and is maintained in a separate ledger account to be retained for use for that designated purpose in a future year. The change here would allow the ISO to apply special purpose funds established in 2020 to support Order 1000 competitive transmission solution costs in 2021. The expectation was that this sort of deferral of expense would be infrequent.

Without further discussion, the motion was then voted and approved unanimously, with an abstention on behalf of Mr. Kuser noted.

GROSS LOAD FORECAST RECONSTITUTION REVISIONS

Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to proposed changes to Tariff Section III.12.8 (Load Forecast Reconstitution Revisions) designed to address how passive demand response (PDR) (primarily energy efficiency measures) are to be treated in the load forecast, and specifically to ensure that PDRs are not double-counted in the Forward Capacity Market (FCM).

Ms. Emily Laine, Reliability Committee (RC) Chair, summarized the RC-recommended changes and provided background for that Committee's consideration of the Load Forecast Reconstitution Revisions. She reported that, at its July 21, 2020 meeting, the RC recommended Participants Committee support for the Revisions with a vote of 60.62 percent in favor. She reported that the ISO planned to file the Revisions so that the proposed methodology could be used for the 2021 load forecast (reflected in the 2021 CELT report), and in the development of the Installed Capacity Requirement for the sixteenth Forward Capacity Auction (FCA). She also reported that market-related concerns related to the clearing of PDRs had been discussed at the August 11 Markets Committee meeting.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the Load Forecast Reconstitution Revisions, as recommended by the Reliability Committee and the ISO, and as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee for its September 3, 2020 meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Reliability Committee.

Mr. Sebastian Lombardi, NEPOOL counsel, referred the Committee to concerns with the implementation of the Load Forecast Reconstitution Revisions without a companion Market Rule change that had been raised by the New England Power Generators Association (NEPGA) at the August 11 Markets Committee meeting. He explained that NEPOOL would not raise a procedural objection at the FERC should NEPGA or any other party express those same concerns before the FERC, provided that, in raising those concerns, they do not ask the FERC to order Market Rule changes that had not otherwise been previously vetted and voted in the Participant Processes.

In discussions, a Generation Sector representative summarized concerns with the proposed methodology and the view that the changes could result in double counting of energy

efficiency contributions to reliability. Others noted the reasons for their support of the proposed Revisions and expressed appreciation to the ISO for their efforts addressing the issues.

The motion was then voted and passed with a 68.22% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 3.34%; Transmission Sector – 16.70%; Supplier Sector – 9.28%; AR Sector – 5.50%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector – 16.70%; and End User Sector – 16.70%).

LITIGATION REPORT

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the September 1 Litigation Report that had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He then highlighted the following items:

(1) ***Mystic PP-10 Complaint Denied*** – The FERC on August 17, 2020 denied a Complaint by Mystic requesting that the ISO be prohibited from implementing changes to Planning Procedure No. 10 (Planning Procedure to Support the FCM) (PP-10), starting a 30-day clock for potential requests for rehearing.

(2) ***Mystic 8/9 Cost of Service (COS) Agreement*** – Rehearings were requested of the FERC’s July 17, 2020 orders in the Mystic 8/9 COS Agreement proceeding. Initial briefs in the Return on Equity (ROE) paper hearing were due September 28, 2020.

(3) ***Requests for Rehearing Denied by Operation of Law*** – Consistent with the DC Circuit’s ruling in *Allegheny Defense Project v. FERC* (Allegheny), which ruled that the FERC is not allowed to delay appellate review of its substantive orders through its former practice of issuing tolling orders, the FERC issued “Notices of Denial of Rehearings by Operation of Law” of its Inventoried Energy Program (Chapter 2B) Remand Order and its order terminating the Section 206 investigation into the ISO’s implementation of Order 1000 exemptions for Immediate Need Reliability Projects. That action started the clock for the filing of any appeal of those orders.

(4) **Order 841 Compliance Filings** - In light of the ISO's plan to submit in one filing the changes required in response to the FERC's second Order 841 compliance filing order, NEPOOL and the ISO had jointly requested a 35-day extension of time to submit the compliance filing. Expectations were that the extension would be granted, allowing for the revisions to be voted by the Participants Committee at its December meeting, with the compliance changes filed shortly thereafter.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Markets Committee (MC). Ms. Chafetz reported that the MC was scheduled to meet three days, September 8-10, with discussion largely focused on FCM parameters, but would also include, among other things, consideration of proposed changes to exempt Energy Efficiency from Pay-for-Performance settlement and to sunset the Forward Reserve Market on June 1, 2025.

Budget & Finance Subcommittee. Mr. Gerity noted that the next meeting of the Subcommittee was scheduled for October 5, at which the Subcommittee would revisit the proposed "Know Your Customer" (KYC) changes to the Financial Assurance Policy. He encouraged those interested in revisions to the KYC changes to reach out to the ISO in advance of that meeting with any questions or concerns and to plan to participate in that meeting.

Reliability Committee. Mr. Bob Stein, the RC Vice-Chair, reported that the RC was scheduled to meet on September 23 and highlighted that the Installed Capacity Requirements (ICR) and Related Values for FCA15 would be voted at that meeting.

Generation Information System (GIS) Agreement Working Group. Mr. Dave Cavanaugh, Working Group Chair, reported that work was underway to finalize terms of an extension of NEPOOL's arrangements with APX as the GIS administrator. Plans were to vote

on those arrangements at the October 1 Participants Committee meeting, and he encouraged anyone with any questions or concerns to contact him ahead of that vote.

Transmission Committee (TC). Mr. José Rotger, the TC Vice-Chair, reported that the TC was scheduled to meet September 15. He highlighted two items planned for that meeting -- a further discussion on Versant Power's proposal to waive Through or Out charges for transactions between the Northern Maine Independent System Administrator and ISO-NE Control Areas, and the FERC's directive in its second compliance filing order in the Order 841 (Electric Storage) proceeding that transmission charges for electric storage resources be waived under certain circumstances.

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

After a brief recess, the meeting resumed via WebEx. Ms. Chafetz introduced the discussion by reminding the Committee of the process, begun in June, to explore potential alternative pathways to New England's future grid. She noted that the Committee explored two possible pathways in August -- a forward clean energy market (FCEM) and carbon pricing. She indicated that, for the remainder of the meeting, there would be presentations and discussion on two additional potential pathways -- an energy-only market and alternative reliability assurance frameworks.

Energy-Only Market

Ms. Chafetz introduced Ms. Beth Garza, Senior Fellow with R Street Institute and former Director of the Electric Reliability Council of Texas (ERCOT) Independent Market Monitor, who provided an overview of ERCOT's Energy-Only Market. Ms. Garza referred the Committee to, and proceeded to review, a presentation that had been posted in advance of the meeting. After providing an overview of the ERCOT region, Ms. Garza identified that the ERCOT organized market relies solely on Energy (no market for installed capacity, load serving

entities have no requirement to own or procure installed capacity), decentralized capacity commitment (with daily and hourly reliability unit commitment filling any gaps and very low installed reserve margins), relatively large ancillary service requirements (procured only Day-Ahead, and not co-optimized in Real-Time), and its potential for very high wholesale electricity prices during times of high load (driven by natural gas prices and particularly by the availability of operating reserves with its adders and penalty mechanisms).

She described how ERCOT's decarbonization had been facilitated by the fact that Texas has areas that are especially well-suited for high performing wind and solar resources, while costs for those resources were falling. Further, as a single state, Texas was able to support financially across the state large transmission upgrades to move power from those resources to the load centers. Key issues going forward would be whether the market would continue to support the appropriate amount and cost of installed reserves. She also highlighted the potential for technology to enable decentralized reliability decisions. Importantly, ERCOT's Energy-Only market, with its hallmark periods of very high energy prices, continued to receive the support of Texas politicians and regulators.

Following her presentation, Ms. Garza responded to questions and comments. She clarified aspects of ERCOT's interconnection procedures and requirements, highlighting how those requirements, particularly those that socialized marginal transmission losses and the cost of transmission upgrades not otherwise taken on voluntarily by an interconnecting generator (generators only required to pay step-up transformer costs), had facilitated development in more remote areas of Texas. Once a generation resource was interconnected, it could participate, subject to customary communication and reliability requirements, as it wished.

Addressing the participation of demand-side resources, she explained that ERCOT's transmission cost allocation provided end user customer incentives to engage in aggressive

demand response. She observed that technology had progressed sufficiently to permit usage to be managed at a micro level, which in turn could provide opportunities for retail product development that could make demand-side actions easier and more cost-effective. She was not certain whether the price differentials over time would be sufficient to support substantial growth in those customers taking advantage of the opportunities. She explained her view that demand-side resources that depend primarily on fixed capacity payments for financial viability would not do as well in ERCOT's Energy-Only market.

On the topic of price caps and price signals, Ms. Garza summarized how price caps and the Value of Lost Load (VOLL) had evolved through the Texas regulatory process. She reported that a number of fast responding gas turbines had been added to the ERCOT system, effectively disciplining prices during times of very high load. As a result, ERCOT had a more nimble gas fleet, even as it experienced exponential growth in renewable resources. She highlighted the importance, particularly in an Energy-Only market, of incenting capacity resources to be available when and as needed, which would eventually require identifying revenue sources (e.g. ancillary services markets) to support continued capital investment. All else being equal, she favored direct assignment of costs to consumers, rather than indirectly, given higher risk premium costs associated with less direct approaches.

Ms. Garza, noting the advantages of an Energy-Only market, cautioned against relying exclusively on an Energy-Only market to decarbonize the grid. She opined that, if low carbon is the goal, then there would need to be disincentives for carbon-producing resources and that would have to be accomplished through actions other than just an Energy-Only market.

Alternative Reliability Assurance Frameworks

Ms. Chafetz then introduced Ms. Sharon Reishus, Founder of Reishus Consulting and former Chair of the Maine Public Utilities Commission, who moderated a panel discussion on

alternative reliability assurance frameworks with Steve Corneli, Principal and Owner of Strategies for Clean Energy Innovation, and Rob Gramlich, Founder and President of Grid Strategies LLC. They referred to presentation materials during the meeting, which were then posted with the meeting materials following the meeting.

To provide some context, referring to the presentation materials, Ms. Reishus began by summarizing the history of New England's resource adequacy approaches and state policies. She then turned to Mr. Corneli, who with reference to a series of slides described the basic dimensions of resource adequacy markets--what he termed "the what, the who and the how", of resource adequacy. He compared the various resource adequacy approaches used in PJM, MISO and ERCOT. He identified as important to the development of potential future frameworks the impact of RTO tariff provisions (e.g., the Minimum Offer Price Rules) on the costs for states to achieve their clean energy goals. If the tariff provisions unreasonably increase costs, he predicted that states would increasingly look to meet reliability assurance outside of federally-regulated markets; if the tariff provisions produce reasonable and justified costs, then the states would have more flexibility in working with wholesale capacity markets. He posed questions that would need to be addressed as the future resource mix changes resource adequacy's basic dimensions.

From there, Mr. Gramlich, also referring to his power point presentation, described key aspects of a number of reliability assurance models, including models driven by a fixed resource requirement (PJM option), a voluntary residual capacity market (early RTO capacity markets), load serving entity (LSE) responsibility working with a vertically integrated utility and RTO (MISO, SPP model), and LSE responsibility with competitive generation and retail markets (ERCOT, California, Australian models).

In response to questions and comments, Mr. Corneli stressed the importance of understanding and working towards a regional mix that would be most efficient, reliable and operate at least cost (whether through incentives, goals, procurement plans, or a mix thereof). He suggested that potential approaches to use the markets to decarbonize could include the creation of a carbon price signal to which market participants could react or, in addition, the creation of a form of centralized or coordinated system optimization. In either case, the market pathway chosen would need to ensure that other technologies could be developed and employed. The choice of approach to integrate decarbonization would require a careful balancing of economic and power system constraints, which was not likely to occur or be successful if customers were permitted to simply choose categories of resources that they preferred. Mr. Gramlich emphasized that both the system and the portfolio of resources would be critical to the integration of decarbonization, and decarbonization goals would not be achieved through one-off purchases of low or no carbon resources.

They discussed the related challenges presented by legal, jurisdictional and governance issues. Federal legislation, they explained, made clear the limited authority of the FERC over resource adequacy issues. Pragmatic solutions could be found in regional agreement, which was not foreclosed by federal legislation, and would, as a practical matter, better support a comprehensive focus on portfolio packages and how to address times of scarcity, which increasingly were not simply peak hours.

Both Messrs. Corneli and Gramlich addressed the cost-shifting issues that could arise in multi-state regions with different state resource mixes. Mr. Corneli suggested that possible approaches could include development of ultra-refined Unforced Capacity values to recognize reliability contributions (getting to the heart of the capacity obligation) or an asset-mix approach. Mr. Gramlich suggested that there would need to be (i) someone responsible for procurement for

load and (ii) financial/penalty enforcement through Real-Time, scarcity-based, VOLL-based pricing.

Addressing resource specific questions, Messrs. Corneli and Gramlich, joined by Ms. Garza, explained the favorable circumstances that had led to development of wind and solar resources, as well as the reasons why certain natural gas-fired combustion turbines were also favored. With respect to storage resources, they acknowledged the ability of those resources to fill in reliability gaps, but left unresolved questions about the feasibility of long-duration storage and whether or how discharge of storage resources should be centralized or could be decentralized. They noted the computational challenges of optimizing storage resources, and the importance and value of emerging technology to make that practicably feasible. They noted the benefits of scale in jurisdictional markets and that any reduction in scale could adversely impact outcomes and approaches, and needed to be very carefully evaluated.

Next Steps

Ms. Chafetz stated that discussion comparing the advantages and disadvantages and trade-offs among the various pathways would begin at the October 1 Participants Committee meeting. She announced that NEPOOL had retained Dr. Frank Felder, who had presented at the Summer Meeting on the advantages and disadvantages of various markets around the globe, to help frame the upcoming discussions on tradeoffs. She encouraged anyone who wished to provide input to Mr. Felder in advance of the October 1 discussion to submit that input in writing to Mr. Lombardi, who would see that the information was sent to Mr. Felder and posted on the NEPOOL website for all to see. Any initial questions from Mr. Felder on the identified pathways would similarly be posted.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Doot, Secretary

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN SEPTEMBER 3, 2020 TELECONFERENCE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Acadia Center	End User	<i>Deborah Donovan</i>		
Actual Energy	Supplier		<i>John Driscoll</i>	
Advanced Energy Economy	Fuels Industry Participant	<i>Caitlin Marquis</i>		
American Petroleum Institute	Fuels Industry Participant	Zoe Cadore		
American PowerNet Management	Supplier			Mary Smith
AR Small Distributed Generation (DG) Group Member	AR-DG			Andy Karetsky
AR Small Load Response (LR) Group Member	AR-LR	<i>Doug Hurley</i>	<i>Brad Swalwell</i>	
AR Small Renewable Generation (RG) Group Member	AR-RG	<i>Erik Abend</i>		
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Associated Industries of Massachusetts (AIM)	End User			Roger Borghesani
AVANGRID: CMP/UI	Transmission		<i>Alan Trotta</i>	
Belmont Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Block Island Utility District	Publicly Owned Entity	<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>		
Borrego Solar Systems Inc.	AR-DG	<i>Liz Delaney</i>		
Boylston Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
BP Energy Company	Supplier			<i>José Rotger</i>
Braintree Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity			<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>
Brookfield Renewable Trading and Marketing	Supplier	Aleks Mitreski		
Calpine Energy Services, LP	Supplier	<i>Brett Kruse</i>		
Castleton Commodities Merchant Trading	Supplier			<i>Bob Stein</i>
Central Rivers Power	AR-RG		<i>Dan Allegretti</i>	
Chester Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
CLEARResult Consulting, Inc.	AR-DG	<i>Tamera Oldfield</i>		
Concord Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Coop.	Publicly Owned Entity	<i>Brian Forshaw</i>		
Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel	End User		<i>Dave Thompson</i>	
Conservation Law Foundation (CLF)	End User	<i>Phelps Turner</i>		
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	Supplier	<i>Norman Mah</i>		
Cross-Sound Cable Company (CSC)	Supplier		<i>José Rotger</i>	
Danvers Electric Division	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
DC Energy	Supplier	<i>Bruce Bleiweis</i>		
Direct Energy Business, LLC	Supplier	<i>Nancy Chafetz</i>		
Dominion Energy Generation Marketing, Inc.	Generation	<i>Mike Purdie</i>	<i>Weezie Nuara</i>	
DTE Energy Trading, Inc.	Supplier			<i>José Rotger</i>
Dynergy Marketing and Trade, LLC	Supplier	<i>Andy Weinstein</i>		
Elektrisola, Inc.	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Enel X North America, Inc.	AR-LR	Greg Geller	Herb Healy	
ENGIE Energy Marketing NA, Inc.	AR-RG	<i>Sarah Bresolin</i>		
Environmental Defense Fund	End User	<i>Jollette Westbrook</i>		
Eversource Energy	Transmission	<i>James Daly</i>	<i>Dave Burnham</i>	Vandan Divatia
Exelon Generation Company	Supplier	<i>Steve Kirk</i>		
FirstLight Power Management, LLC	Generation	<i>Tom Kaslow</i>		
Galt Power, Inc.	Supplier	<i>José Rotger</i>		
Generation Group Member	Generation	Dennis Duffy	<i>Abby Krich</i>	<i>Bob Stein</i>
Georgetown Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Great River Hydro	AR-RG			<i>Dan Allegretti</i>
Groton Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN SEPTEMBER 3, 2020 TELECONFERENCE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Groveland Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc. (HQUS)	Supplier	<i>Louis Guibault</i>	<i>Bob Stein</i>	
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User	Mary Smith		
High Liner Foods (USA) Incorporated	End User		<i>William P. Short III</i>	
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Holden Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Holyoke Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	End User	<i>Kevin Penders</i>		
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Jericho Power LLC (Jericho)	AR-RG	<i>Mark Spencer</i>		
Littleton (MA) Electric Light and Water Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Craig Kieny	
Long Island Power Authority (LIPA)	Supplier		<i>Bill Killgoar</i>	
Maine Power	Supplier	<i>Jeff Jones</i>		
Maine Public Advocate's Office	End User	<i>Drew Landry</i>		
Maine Skiing, Inc.	End User	<i>Kevin Penders</i>		
Mansfield Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Maple Energy LLC	AR-LR		Luke Fishback	<i>Doug Hurley</i>
Marble River, LLC	Supplier		John Brodbeck	
Marblehead Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Mass. Attorney General's Office (MA AG)	End User	<i>Tina Belew</i>	<i>Ben Griffiths</i>	R. Tepper
Mass. Bay Transportation Authority	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Company	Publicly Owned Entity	<i>Brian Thomson</i>		
Mercuria Energy America, LLC	Supplier			<i>José Rotger</i>
Merrimac Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Michael Kuser	End User		<i>Rich Heidorn</i>	
Middleborough Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
National Grid	Transmission	<i>Tim Brennan</i>	<i>Tim Martin</i>	
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)	End User	<i>Bruce Ho</i>		
Nautilus Power, LLC	Generation			<i>Dan Allegretti</i>
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned Entity	Steve Kaminski		<i>Brian. Forshaw; Dave Cavanaugh; Brian Thomson</i>
New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate (NHOCA)	End User		<i>Erin Camp</i>	<i>Jason Frost</i>
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	Generation	Michelle Gardner		
North Attleborough Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Norwood Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Novatus Energy	AR-RG	<i>Stacey Fitts</i>		
NRG Power Marketing LLC	Generation		<i>Pete Fuller</i>	
Pascoag Utility District	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Paxton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Peabody Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
PowerOptions, Inc.	End User	<i>Heather Takle</i>		<i>Jason Frost</i>
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Priogen Power LLC	Supplier	<i>Michel Soucy</i>		
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC	Supplier	<i>Joel Gordon</i>		
Reading Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN SEPTEMBER 3, 2020 TELECONFERENCE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Russell Municipal Light Dept.	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Operations	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
South Hadley Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
St. Anselm College	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Stowe Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Sunrun Inc.	AR-DG	Chris Rauscher		<i>Pete Fuller</i>
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
The Energy Consortium	End User	Roger Borghesani		
Vermont Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned Entity		Craig Kieny	
Vermont Electric Power Co. (VELCO)	Transmission	<i>Frank Etori</i>		
Vermont Energy Investment Corp (VEIC)	AR-LR		<i>Doug Hurley</i>	
Vermont Public Power Supply Authority	Publicly Owned Entity			<i>Brian Forshaw</i>
Versant Power	Transmission	<i>Lisa Martin</i>	<i>Dave Norman</i>	
Village of Hyde Park (VT) Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Wakefield Municipal Gas & Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Wallingford DPU Electric Division	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Brian Thomson</i>	
Westfield Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		<i>Dave Cavanaugh</i>	
Wheelabrator North Andover Inc.	AR-RG			Jim Ginnetti
ZTECH, LLC	End User		Gus Fromuth	

**VOTE TAKEN AT
SEPTEMBER 3, 2020 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

TOTAL

Sector	Vote 1
GENERATION	3.34
TRANSMISSION	16.70
SUPPLIER	9.28
ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES	5.50
PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY	16.70
END USER	16.70
% IN FAVOR	68.22

GENERATION SECTOR

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

TRANSMISSION SECTOR

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

SUPPLIER SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1
BP Energy Company	F
Calpine Energy Services, LP	A
Castleton Comm. Merchant Trading	O
Cross-Sound Cable Company	F
DC Energy, LLC	A
Direct Energy Business, LLC	A
DTE Energy Trading, Inc.	F
Dynegy Marketing and Trade, LLC	O
Exelon Generation Company	A
Galt Power, Inc.	F
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	O
LIPA	A
Mercuria Energy America, Inc	F
Priogen Power LLC	A
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade	O
IN FAVOR (F)	5
OPPOSED	4
TOTAL VOTES	9
ABSTENTIONS (A)	6

ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1
Renewable Generation Sub-Sector	
Central Rivers Power	O
ENGIE Energy Marketing NA	A
Great River Hydro	O
Jericho Power	O
Novatus Energy	A
Wheelabrator/Macquarie	A
Small RG Group Member	A
Distributed Gen. Sub-Sector	
Borrego Solar Systems Inc.	A
Sunrun Inc.	A
Load Response Sub-Sector	
Enel X North America, Inc.	F
Maple Energy	F
Vermont Energy Investment Corp.	F
Small LR Group Member	F
Energy Federation Inc.	
Tangent Energy Solutions, Inc.	
IN FAVOR (F)	4
OPPOSED	3
TOTAL VOTES	7
ABSTENTIONS (A)	6

**VOTE TAKEN AT
SEPTEMBER 3, 2020 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

END USER SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1
Conn. Office of Consumer Counsel	F
Conservation Law Foundation	A
High Liner Foods (USA) Inc.	F
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	F
Michael Kuser	A
Maine Public Advocate Office	F
Maine Skiing, Inc.	F
Mass. Attorney General's Office	F
Natural Resources Defense Council	F
NH Office of Consumer Advocate	F
PowerOptions, Inc.	F
IN FAVOR (F)	9
OPPOSED	0
TOTAL VOTES	9
ABSTENTIONS (A)	2

PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR

Participant Name	Vote 1
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	F
Belmont Municipal Light Dept.	F
Block Island Utility District	F
Boylston Municipal Light Dept.	F
Braintree Electric Light Dept.	F
Chester Municipal Light Dept.	F
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	F
Concord Municipal Light Plant	F
Conn. Mun. Electric Energy Coop.	F
Danvers Electric Division	F
Georgetown Municipal Light Dept.	F
Groton Electric Light Dept.	F
Groveland Electric Light Dept.	F
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	F
Holden Municipal Light Dept.	F
Holyoke Gas & Electric Dept.	F
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	F

PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR (cont.)

Participant Name	Vote 1
Ipswich Municipal Light Dept.	F
Littleton (MA) Electric Light Dept.	F
Mansfield Municipal Electric Dept.	F
Marblehead Municipal Light Dept.	F
Mass. Bay Transportation Authority	F
Mass. Mun. Wholesale Electric Co.	F
Merrimac Municipal Light Dept.	F
Middleborough Gas and Elec. Dept.	F
Middleton Municipal Electric Dept.	F
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	F
North Attleborough Electric Dept.	F
Norwood Municipal Light Dept.	F
Pascoag Utility District	F
Paxton Municipal Light Dept.	F
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	F
Princeton Municipal Light Dept.	F
Reading Municipal Light Dept.	F
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	F
Russell Municipal Light Dept.	F
Shrewsbury's Elec. & Cable Ops.	F
South Hadley Electric Light Dept.	F
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Dept.	F
Stowe (VT) Electric Dept.	F
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	F
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	F
Village of Hyde Park (VT) Elec. Dept.	F
VT Public Power Supply Authority	F
Wakefield Mun. Gas and Light Dept.	F
Wallingford, Town of	F
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	F
West Boylston Mun. Lighting Plant	F
Westfield Gas & Electric Light Dept.	F
IN FAVOR (F)	49
OPPOSED	0
TOTAL VOTES	49
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0