

## **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, February 4, 2021. 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.

Mr. David Cavanaugh, Chair, presided and Mr. David Doot, Secretary, recorded. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that the meeting would be divided into two sessions, a morning session addressing general business and an afternoon session, beginning at 1:00 p.m., focused on the threshold jurisdictional and legal issues associated with the potential pathways and alternative market frameworks.

### **APPROVAL OF JANUARY 7, 2021 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Cavanaugh referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the January 7, 2021 meeting, as circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes of the January 7, 2021 meeting were unanimously approved as circulated, with an abstention by Mr. Michael Kuser's alternate noted.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Cavanaugh referred the Committee to the Consent Agenda that was circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the Consent Agenda was unanimously approved as circulated, with abstentions on behalf of the Conservation Law Foundation and Mr. Kuser recorded. Mr. Doot noted that the approval included support for revisions to Market Rule 1 to remove, as directed by the FERC's December 2, 2020 order issued in Docket No. EL20-54-000, the price-lock mechanism and zero-price offer rule from the

Forward Capacity Market (FCM), which had been filed a few days earlier by the ISO. He reported that NEPOOL would submit comments in support of the Market Rule revisions reflecting the Participants Committee's support for those changes.

## **JOINT NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

In support of the ongoing efforts to enhance transparency with respect to the Joint Nominating Committee (JNC) process, Mr. Cavanaugh referred to the summary of the January 15 JNC meeting circulated in advance of this meeting. He highlighted the focus of the JNC on replacing the diversity, skills and expertise of the four directors that would be transitioning off the Board over the subsequent two years, including experience with financial and wholesale electric markets and transmission planning. In addition to these areas, the search would seek candidates with energy industry and cybersecurity experience, and focuses on consumer interests and the transition to a clean energy environment. Further, the JNC considered and agreed to evaluate all candidates without regard to the projected ability of such candidates at the outset to serve for the full contemplated term limit (three three-year terms) without the need for an age limit waiver, which could be addressed later as necessary and appropriate. He reported that the next JNC meeting would be held March 5. He also indicated that, as requested at the January Participants Committee meeting, the March 4 Participants Committee meeting would include a presentation on the Board candidate search process, including a list of the candidate qualifications being sought and for when, by a representative from Russell Reynolds Associates, the search firm working with the JNC.

Mr. Cavanaugh then introduced incumbent ISO Board Member Mr. Michael Curran, who would be completing his first three-year term later in the year and was being recommended for a second three-year term. Mr. Curran referred members to the overview of his background circulated in advance of the meeting. He then highlighted his experiences, including his roles as

an ISO Board member, and summarized his vision for, and the ongoing challenges facing, the ISO Board and the region generally.

In response to questions from members, Mr. Curran noted the need to accommodate anticipated changes in technology and the importance of working collaboratively with ISO and industry colleagues through ongoing open communication, education and compromise. When asked about enhanced interaction with the Participants Committee, specifically beyond the stakeholder process, Mr. Curran referred to the current outreach process as beneficial and successful and encouraged continued effective use of those meetings. He noted that, should there be a need or opportunity for further interaction, that interaction should be on strategic issues at the time. He emphasized communication, education and compromise. In response to a question about ongoing Board transparency, Mr. Curran reflected on his past experience with open sessions in the Midcontinent Independent System Operator (MISO). He noted that the histories of the two regions working together were very different. New England's practice of twice-annual Sector meetings and individual meetings with each of the New England states were very positive features for New England in comparison to MISO. He noted that certain discussions of the MISO board were conducted in closed session. He explained that there were ongoing discussions of potential ways to enhance that transparency.

## **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 January 7, 2021 meeting, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. There were no questions or comments.

In response to a question at the prior meeting about the definition of "balancing resource" and a process for quantifying balancing resource requirements, Mr. van Welie suggested that

balancing resources might not be defined in terms of technology types. Rather, he thought the preferred focus would be on defining system requirements for additional or balancing energy. He noted that this was among the areas of focus in the pathways studies and was subject to further discussions and clarification.

## **ISO COO REPORT**

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), referred the Committee to his February report, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He noted that the data in the report was through January 27 unless otherwise noted. The report highlighted: (i) Energy Market value for January 2021 was \$354 million, down \$96 million from an updated December 2020 value of \$450 million and up \$57 million from January 2020 (he noted that, with the extremely cold last four days of January, total energy market value was likely to approach \$500 million, which he would identify more precisely in the March report); (ii) January 2021 average natural gas prices were 5.4 percent lower than December average prices; (iii) the average Real-Time Hub Locational Marginal Prices (LMPs) for January (\$37.16/MWh) were 11 percent lower than December averages; (iv) average January 2021 natural gas prices and Real-Time Hub LMPs over the period were up 41 percent and up 42 percent, respectively, from January 2020 average prices; (v) the average Day-Ahead cleared physical energy during peak hours as percent of forecasted load was 98.4 percent during January (down from 98.5 percent during December), with the minimum value for the month (92.6 percent) on January 18; and (vi) the Daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) payments for January (excluding the four cold days at the end of the month) totaled \$3.1 million, which was down \$0.5 million from December 2020 and up \$1.3 million from January 2020. January NCPC through the 27<sup>th</sup>, which was 0.9 percent of total Energy Market value, was comprised of (a) \$1.8 million in first contingency payments (down 0.1 million from December);

(b) \$1.2 million in second contingency payments (down \$403,000 from December); and (c) \$72,000 in distribution payments (up \$65,000 from December).

Turning to operational highlights from January, Dr. Chadalavada noted that the contingency costs were largely due to the outage of Line 391 (Scobie-Buxton), which had since returned to service. He reported that Line 385 (Deerfield-Buxton) would be out-of-service until the middle of following week and again later in the month for structure replacement, which was likely to result in similar second contingency costs. He estimated in response to a question that transfer limits between Maine and New Hampshire could be reduced by approximately 100-200 MWs, but the actual reductions would vary depending on flows from New Brunswick and the operations of generators in Maine. Dr. Chadalavada highlighted other expected major transmission line outages, including for Line 393/312 (Alps-Berkshire/Berkshire-Northfield) from February 17 through 19 and from March 1 through 20. He said that outage would be for the replacement of structures and the installation of phasor measurement units (PMUs), resulting in transfers between New York and New England, in both directions, being reduced to approximately 600-800 MW.

Mr. Chadalavada noted that FCA15 would begin on February 8. A mock auction was run on February 1, with 165 representatives from 100 companies participating. No major issues were identified during the remotely-conducted four rounds, with minor connectivity issues resolved in real-time. He then noted that the future grid reliability study phase one work had begun, with related meetings to take place in February. Last, he announced that the 2021 Regional System Plan (RSP21) public meeting was scheduled for October 6, 2021, with the venue and meeting format yet to be finalized.

In response to a question regarding prices during the last few days of January, Dr. Chadalavada explained that, (i) as noted earlier in his report, natural gas prices averaged \$11-

12/MMBtu, or roughly three times the average for the first two-thirds of the month; (ii) there was a few-day outage on a natural gas pipeline, which did not materially impact pipeline operations but did noticeably impact pricing and production on the energy side, and (iii) average loads were roughly 3,000 MW above the averages for the earlier part of the month. While each of these factors impacted pricing, the increases were most attributable to the higher gas prices. A member also noted that liquefied natural gas (LNG) prices in the international markets were very high so New England was more reliant on pipeline gas from Canada and domestic natural gas prices. Impacts were limited to pricing; there was no perceived risk to sufficiency of supply.

## **LITIGATION REPORT**

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the February 2 Litigation Report that had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He then highlighted the following:

- (1) ***Litigation on FCM Parameters*** – Since the January 6 Report, comments and protests on the changes filed by the ISO to update the Cost of New Entry (CONE), Net CONE, and Payment Performance Rate values, beginning with FCA16, had been submitted and were pending before the FERC;
- (2) ***ARA ICR-Related Values and HQICCs*** - The FERC accepted on January 21 the Installed Capacity Requirement (ICR)-Related and Hydro Quebec Interconnection Capability Credits (HQICCs) values for the next round of Annual Reconfiguration Auctions (ARAs); and
- (3) ***FCA15 Qualification Informational Filing*** - The FERC had accepted on January 22 the ISO's informational filing, directing the ISO to modify the FCA Qualified Capacity values for a couple of New Generating Capacity Resources.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

**Markets Committee (MC).** Mr. William Fowler, the MC Vice-Chair, reported that the next MC meeting would be held February 9-10. A special meeting was also scheduled for February 24 to vote on potential changes to the Offer Review Trigger Prices (ORTPs) as a result of tax law changes implemented after NEPOOL's vote on them but before they were filed.

**Transmission Committee (TC).** Mr. José Rotger, the TC Vice-Chair, reported that the TC would next meet on February 23. The agenda would include further discussion of the Participating Transmission Owners' proposal to address reconstitution of behind-the-meter generation into the Regional Network Load calculation, and a review of certain tariff and planning aspects of ISO compliance with Order 2222 (distributed energy resource aggregations in ISO/RTO markets).

**Reliability Committee (RC).** Mr. Robert Stein, the RC Vice-Chair, reported that the RC was scheduled to meet on February 16.

**Joint MC/RC (Future Grid - Reliability Study).** Mr. Stein also reported that the next joint meeting of the MC and RC was scheduled for February 25, but was likely to be re-scheduled to February 26 in light of a conflict with the States' New England Energy Vision technical session on governance reform.

**Budget & Finance Subcommittee.** Mr. Thomas Kaslow, the Subcommittee Chair, announced that the next meeting of the Subcommittee was scheduled for February 11 and would include a review of the ISO's quarterly capital funding tariff filing and year-end results for NEPOOL's budget. He reported that changes to the Non-Commercial Capacity trading financial assurance provisions of the Financial Assurance Policy would next be discussed at the Subcommittee's March 25 meeting.

## **ADDITIONAL MATTERS**

Mr. Cavanaugh referred the Committee to a memo from a Participant representative, Mr. William P. Short III, circulated with the materials for the meeting, regarding a study of the issue of compensation for NEPOOL officers. He noted the request in the memo that Participants provide feedback to Mr. Short and encouraged those amenable to provide such feedback by May 1, 2021, as requested.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

Mr. Doot reminded the Committee of two upcoming meetings: a working session of the Participants Committee on February 18 to discuss the ISO's proposed analysis of certain potential pathways/market frameworks; and the March 4 meeting, which would likely include a vote on revisions to ORTP values/provisions supported by the Participants Committee at its December 4 meeting.

Ms. Heather Hunt, NESCOE Executive Director, noted that the New England Energy Vision technical sessions on wholesale market design and transmission planning had been held. Recordings and presentations for those sessions were posted on the New England Energy Vision website. A technical session on governance reform was scheduled for February 25, 9-2 p.m.; registration for that session was open. An incremental evening session on environmental justice-related matters would also be held, with details not yet finalized. Finally, in connection with the pathways study process, NESCOE sent a request to the ISO to provide a centralized summary of all the on-going studies that were underway and a website location for any future updates. In response to a question, Ms. Hunt committed to ensure that the contemplated report to the New England governors and any other output that might follow from the technical session process would be made available as part of the future pathways process underway.



## **PATHWAYS TO THE FUTURE GRID: LEGAL AND JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES**

After a brief recess, the meeting resumed via WebEx. Mr. Doot referred the Committee to, and proceeded to review, a background presentation that had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting on the threshold jurisdictional/legal issues associated with the potential pathways/alternative market frameworks. His presentation highlighted that the FERC's jurisdictional authority is set forth and limited by the Federal Power Act (FPA) to the transmission of energy in interstate commerce and the sale of energy at wholesale in interstate commerce. He explained that sections 205 and 206 of the FPA require the FERC to ensure that wholesale rates be filed with it and be just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential. FPA section 201(b) reserves to the states jurisdiction over retail electric power sales, distribution, generation siting and everything that does not otherwise fall within federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Doot then reviewed from his presentation several relevant court cases interpreting those provisions of the FPA. To help explain the concepts, he grouped factual circumstances into categories where current precedent have upheld FERC jurisdiction (thereby giving FERC a green light to act), those in which Courts have found FERC does not have jurisdiction (a red light) and those in which it is unclear whether FERC has jurisdiction (a yellow light).

Finally, he summarized in his presentation the precedent that helped to inform the FERC's evaluation of whether proposals presented to it are "just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential." He briefly explained the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine that presumes rates set in freely negotiated contracts to be just and reasonable unless those contracts harm the public interest. Addressing what is needed to demonstrate that a proposed rate is not unduly discriminatory, Mr. Doot summarized precedent that permits differences in rates, terms, and conditions so long as the differences are properly justified. Absent proper justification for such

differences, the FERC and courts will likely conclude that the rates are unduly discriminatory or preferential. He highlighted in the presentation several recent cases in which FERC addressed the issue of undue discrimination.

Mr. Cavanaugh then introduced Tony Clark, former FERC Commissioner, who moderated a panel discussion on legal and FERC-jurisdictional issues that may face future grid proposals. He introduced the following panelists (who were not speaking on behalf of any particular client or Entity):

- Phyllis Kimmel, an attorney in solo practice who had previously represented, among others, NESCOE and numerous state agencies and authorities on market and jurisdictional issues before the FERC and the US Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit;
- Ari Peskoe, Director of the Electricity Law Initiative at the Harvard Law School Environmental and Energy Law Program, who has written extensively about electricity regulation and was a presenter at the FERC's carbon pricing conference; and
- John Estes, the head of Skadden's Energy Regulation and Litigation Group, who had previously represented a group of generators in the protracted LICAP litigation, and as well as in FERC litigation involving numerous entities with conventional resources in New England.

The panel discussion focused on three main themes: (1) the issue of undue discrimination; (2) the interplay between state and federal jurisdiction; and (3) the protections that might be available under the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine.

Mr. Clark began by asking the panelists for their thoughts on the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine, and whether a state agreement about one of the future grid initiatives, such as a carbon price, might be afforded *Mobile-Sierra* protection (under which it would be more difficult to overturn a freely negotiated contract). While there was general agreement that *Mobile-Sierra* provides a freely negotiated agreement some protection from being overturned, that protection was not absolute and could be challenged if the agreement was not in the public interest. Further, the genesis of the doctrine was over bilateral contracts negotiated at arm's length, and it was not certain the extent to which *Mobile-Sierra* would be applied to a market design construct or other

type of future grid initiative. A panelist noted that courts have given the FERC leeway to apply *Mobile-Sierra* in other contexts, but is not clear how the FERC or courts would apply that doctrine to arrangements negotiated with the states. Given the likelihood that any FERC consideration of broad-based measures to reduce carbon will be considered by courts on appeal, the *Mobile-Sierra* precedent, should it be found to apply, could provide some protection against involuntary changes required by the FERC.

Mr. Clark then asked the panel for their insights on the middle ground between state jurisdiction and federal jurisdiction and what tools could be used to allow jurisdiction under both. The panelists agreed that forums like NEPOOL provide an excellent opportunity for middle ground collaboration between federal and state entities. The panelists also agreed that the FERC would have to be open to working with the states, and noted the latest composition of the Commission could facilitate that collaboration. The panelists discussed the idea of a “joint board” between the states and the FERC, citing the success of a similar structure in the telecommunications industry, although such a structure necessarily requires the cooperation of the FERC. The panelists also discussed the possibility of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among ISO and the states, concluding generally that a MOU could provide some limited protection against involuntary change required by the FERC, although that kind of protection would certainly not be absolute.

The panelists then discussed the topic of a Minimum Offer Price Rule (MOPR). There was generally the sense that, even if FERC may have a valid jurisdictional basis for the MOPR, it would not be surprising if the new Commission withdraws future support for the MOPR. One panelist noted that, while MOPRs may have served a purpose to protect against buyer-side market power, in practice they are interfering with state policies. Another panelist suggested that

FERC may be advancing its policy goals to the detriment of the state policies on renewables that are within the states' statutory authority.

The panelists explored at high level the question of whether one or more of the future grid proposals, such as a Forward Clean Energy Market (FCEM), might eliminate the need for a MOPR. That discussion was not definitive but instead highlighted the legal and policy goals of a MOPR and the possibility that certain of the proposals might obviate the need for a MOPR to advance those goals.

The panelists discussed the issues surrounding carbon pricing. The panelists had different views on this topic. One panelist opined that FERC's regulation of carbon pricing was plausible, feasible and defensible if it was demonstrably desirable to improve the efficiency and competitiveness of the wholesale market. The other panelists both opined that the courts, and not the FERC, will determine the FERC's authority to regulate carbon prices absent change in the FERC's statutory authority. One panelist expressed the view that the more expedient solution would be for the states to impose a price on carbon.

Turning to the issue of undue discrimination, the panelists agreed that any distinction among resources would need to be supported by valid reasons for treating the resources differently. The panelists suggested that a state law requiring utilities to buy from renewable resources could establish a valid, and not unduly discriminatory, distinction. However, there were examples of the FERC rejecting the notion that state policy was a valid distinction. Acknowledging precedent cutting both ways, the panelists agreed that the new Commission was likely situated to re-write this precedent and that this issue was ripe for FERC consideration.

Finally, the panelists were invited to offer parting words of advice for the region as it proceeds to consider future grid proposals. One panelist suggested a focus on legal jurisdiction, suggesting that FCEM, for example, might be designed to be outside FERC jurisdiction. Where

such jurisdiction rests with the FERC, the region would need to work together to demonstrate that the proposal meets the just and reasonable standard. Another panelist reiterated the view that a state-imposed carbon tax would be among the most straight-forward options. The third panelist emphasized the importance on following a process of informed, collaborative discussion among all affected parties and with the FERC before decisions are made.

In response to members' questions, panelists suggested that the best way to avoid a finding of undue discrimination would be to establish a well-developed record with evidence supporting differential treatment. The panelists characterized MOPR as a matter of FERC policy and predicted that the new Commission was likely to scale back its scope. They agreed that the FERC would likely be open to alternative market constructs that eliminate or reduce the need for a MOPR, so long as those constructs avoid price suppression and produce just and reasonable rates. On the issue of states' ability to contract independently, panelists concurred that the FPA did not restrict states from contracting with resources or entering into bilateral contracts, and explored the possibility of quasi-section 205 filing rights for states/state commissions. Noting certain analogous examples, panelists identified practical limitations to the establishment of more traditional filing rights, suggesting, and discussing the advantages and limitations of, other tools to enhance stakeholder, state and federal regulator collaboration.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

David Doot, Secretary

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN FEBRUARY 4, 2021 TELECONFERENCE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Acadia Center	End User	Deborah Donovan		
Advanced Energy Economy	Fuels Industry Participant	Caitlin Marquis	Jeff Dennis	
American Petroleum Institute	Fuels Industry Participant	Paul Powers		
American PowerNet Management	Supplier			Joyceline Chow
AR Large Renewable Generation (RG) Group Member	AR-RG	Alex Worsley		
AR Small Load Response (LR) Group Member	AR-LR	Brad Swalwell		Doug Hurley
AR Small RG Group Member	AR-RG	Erik Abend		
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Associated Industries of Massachusetts (AIM)	End User		Bob Ruddock	Roger Borghesani; Joyceline Chow
AVANGRID: CMP/UI	Transmission		Alan Trotta	
Avangrid Renewables	Transmission	Kevin Kilgallen		
Belmont Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Block Island Utility District	Publicly Owned Entity	Dave Cavanaugh		
Borrego Solar Systems Inc.	AR-DG	Liz Delaney		
Boylston Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
BP Energy Company	Supplier			José Rotger
Braintree Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity			Dave Cavanaugh
Brookfield Renewable Trading and Marketing	Supplier	Aleks Mitreski		
Calpine Energy Services, LP	Supplier	Brett Kruse		Bill Fowler
Castleton Commodities Merchant Trading	Supplier			Bob Stein
Central Rivers Power	AR-RG		Dan Allegretti	
Chester Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
CLEARresult Consulting, Inc.	AR-DG	Tamera Oldfield		
Concord Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Coop.	Publicly Owned Entity	Brian Forshaw		
Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel	End User		Dave Thompson	
Conservation Law Foundation (CLF)	End User	Phelps Turner		
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	Supplier	Norman Mah		
CPV Towantic, LLC	Generation	Joel Gordon		
Cross-Sound Cable Company (CSC)	Supplier		José Rotger	
Danvers Electric Division	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Dominion Energy Generation Marketing, Inc.	Generation		Weezie Nuara	
DTE Energy Trading, Inc.	Supplier			José Rotger
Dynergy Marketing and Trade, LLC	Supplier	Andy Weinstein		Bill Fowler
Emera Energy Services	Supplier			Bill Fowler
Enel X North America, Inc.	AR-LR	Michael Macrae		
ENGIE Energy Marketing NA, Inc.	AR-RG	Sarah Bresolin		
Environmental Defense Fund	End User	Jollette Westbrook		
Eversource Energy	Transmission	James Daly	Dave Burnham	
Excelerate Energy LP	Fuels Industry Participant	Gary Ritter		
Exelon Generation Company	Supplier	Steve Kirk	Bill Fowler	
FirstLight Power Management, LLC	Generation	Tom Kaslow		
Galt Power, Inc.	Supplier	José Rotger		
Generation Group Member	Generation	Dennis Duffy	Abby Krich	Alex Worsley
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	

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN FEBRUARY 4, 2021 TELECONFERENCE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Groveland Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc. (HQUS)	Supplier	Louis Guilbault	Bob Stein	
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User	Joyceline Chow		
High Liner Foods (USA) Incorporated	End User		William P. Short III	
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity	John Coyle	Dave Cavanaugh	
Holden Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Holyoke Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	End User	Alan Topalian		
Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.	Supplier		Scott Hendricks	
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Jericho Power LLC (Jericho)	AR-RG	Mark Spencer	Nancy Chafetz	Herb Healy; Marji Philips
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	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	Rebecca Tepper
Mass. Bay Transportation Authority	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Company	Publicly Owned Entity	Brian Thomson		
Mercuria Energy America, LLC	Supplier			José Rotger
Merrimac Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Michael Kuser	End User		Jason York	
Middleborough Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
National Grid	Transmission		Tim Martin	
Natural Resources Defense Council	End User	Bruce Ho		
Nautilus Power, LLC	Generation		Bill Fowler	
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned Entity	Steve Kaminski		Brian. Forshaw; Dave Cavanaugh; Brian Thomson
New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate (NHOCA)	End User		Erin Camp	
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	Generation	Michelle Gardner		
North Attleborough Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Norwood Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
NRG Power Marketing LLC	Generation		Pete Fuller	
Pascoag Utility District	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Paxton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Peabody Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
PowerOptions, Inc.	End User			Erin Camp
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC	Supplier		Eric Stallings	
Reading Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Rodan Energy Solutions (USA) Inc.	Provisional Member	Aaron Breidenbaugh		
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN FEBRUARY 4, 2021 TELECONFERENCE MEETING**

<b>PARTICIPANT NAME</b>	<b>SECTOR/ GROUP</b>	<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	<b>ALTERNATE NAME</b>	<b>PROXY</b>
Russell Municipal Light Dept.	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
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	Joyceline Chow
Vermont Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned Entity	Craig Kieny		
Vermont Electric Power Co. (VELCO)	Transmission	Frank Ettori		
Vermont Energy Investment Corp (VEIC)	AR-LR		Doug Hurley	
Vermont Public Power Supply Authority	Publicly Owned Entity			Brian Forshaw
Village of Hyde Park (VT) Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
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	