

**FINAL**

Pursuant to notice duly given, a meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, February 3, 2022, at the Seaport Hotel, Boston, Massachusetts. 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 meeting, either in person or by telephone.

Mr. David Cavanaugh, Chair, presided, and Mr. David Doot, Secretary, recorded.

**APPROVAL OF JANUARY 6, 2022 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Cavanaugh referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the January 6, 2022 meeting, as circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes of that meeting were unanimously approved as circulated, with an abstention by Mr. Sam Mintz 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 approved as circulated, with oppositions by PowerOptions, the New Hampshire Office of the Consumer Advocate and the Maine Office of the Public Advocate, and with abstentions by Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited and Mr. Mintz noted. All but Mr. Mintz indicated that their opposition or abstention related to concerns with the proposed retirement reforms identified in Consent Agenda Item No. 3.

## ISO CEO REPORT

Mr. Gordon van Welie, ISO Chief Executive Officer (CEO), referred the Committee to both the summaries of the ISO Board and Board Committee meetings that had occurred since the January 6, 2022 Participants Committee meeting, as well as to his memo addressing the recent correspondence between the New England states (States) and the ISO regarding winter reliability, each of which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. There were no questions or comments on the summaries.

In response to comments and questions on the winter reliability issues, Mr. van Welie elaborated on the impact to New England resulting from New York's reducing nuclear power and shifting resource mix and other developments in that region. He identified the importance of addressing environmental concerns (underway in the Pathways process) and the consequences of controlled outages in response to extreme weather, which he identified as externalities not reflected in the current market design. He suggested that the retention of the Mystic units for two years and the Inventoried Energy Program (IEP) would be incrementally and moderately helpful in addressing the ISO's winter reliability concerns, but more conversation and work to help ensure reliability was required. A member suggested that in-depth discussion be continued within the NEPOOL process to identify a more enduring solution that sends suitable signals to the market. Another member credited actions already taken by the ISO, including the reflection of opportunity costs in the energy market, that support and contribute to enhanced reliability and proper functioning of the market. Mr. van Welie agreed that market signals do work, albeit within limits. He stressed the need to identify those limits and the carefully balanced actions that could be taken to protect the reliability of the region when outside of those limits. A member questioned a system that relies exclusively on market volatility to address seasonal energy supply concerns, and suggested that prices may be more predictable if the market includes forward

actions. The discussion concluded with assurance to the members that there would be further efforts at future NEPOOL meetings, with the Participants Committee summer meeting identified as one such meeting, to explore solutions that provide certainty, reliability and security during winter weather.

## **ISO COO REPORT**

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), began by referring the Committee to his February report, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Dr. Chadalavada noted that the data in the report was through January 26, 2022, unless otherwise noted. The report highlighted: (i) Energy Market value for January 2022 was \$1.4 billion, up \$693 million from the updated December 2021 value and \$926 million from January 2021; (ii) January 2022 average natural gas prices were 127% higher than December average prices; (iii) average Real-Time Hub Locational Marginal Prices (LMPs) for January (\$139/MWh) were 133% higher than December averages; (iv) average January 2022 natural gas prices and Real-Time Hub LMPs over the period were up 283% and 217%, respectively, from January 2021 average prices; (v) average Day-Ahead cleared physical energy during peak hours as percent of forecasted load was 98.7% during January (up from the 98.1% reported for December), with the minimum value for the month of 92.7% on January 7; and (vi) Daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) payments for January totaled \$3.7 million, which was down \$1.7 million from December 2021 and up \$0.2 million from January 2021. January NCPC payments, which were 0.3% of total Energy Market value, were comprised of \$3.6 million in first contingency payments (up \$0.6 million from December 2021) and \$29,000 in second contingency payments.

Dr. Chadalavada noted that sixteenth Forward Capacity Auction (FCA16) would begin on February 7 and would be conducted remotely.

Turning to January weather, he noted that the average temperature was colder than normal by approximately 2°F, resulting in higher than normal demand. The colder temperatures and high demand were coincident with natural gas prices remaining near \$20/MMBtu through most of the month with high LNG sendout and high utilization of oil to produce power.

He summarized power system conditions on January 11 and 12, 2022, during which there were a cascading set of events within several hours that turned an expected 1,300 MW surplus into a 1,200 MW deficit on January 11, and that resulted in a two-hour loss of power supply to Canaport on January 12. He confirmed in response to a question that the January 11 outages were mechanical- or equipment-related issues, and were not fuel-related.

Referring to the COO report, he also summarized the impacts of Winter Storm Kenan, a powerful blizzard that affected Southern & Eastern New England on January 29. He explained that New England was fortunate that the blizzard's winds shifted directionally from northeast to due north with the result of avoiding direct impacts in areas with more load, and minimizing transmission line and customer outages.

Dr. Chadalavada proceeded to respond to member questions. In response to a question on the timing of winter fuel surveys and forecasts, Dr. Chadalavada clarified that, absent a more pronounced fuel depletion, fuel surveys would continue to be issued twice weekly, and the 21-day forecast, weekly. He further confirmed that the Day-Ahead forecasts do not include anticipated customer outages, and that one explanation for the load forecast deviations during the blizzard was that many commercial customers decided the evening before the day of the blizzard to close. Also in response to questions asked of him before the meeting, he explained that, for planning purposes during extremely cold weather, the ISO estimates the amount of gas-fired-only generation (from the region's overall fleet of 10-11 GW of gas-fired-only generation) that is likely to be available and unavailable for commitment and dispatch on a given day based on

projected gas availability. The ISO reflects its estimate of the gas-fired-only generation that is likely to be unavailable in the anticipated cold weather outages line item of its capacity forecasts.

Reflecting on plans for a full-winter operations report following winter 2021-22, Dr. Chadalavada indicated in response to questions and requests that the ISO planned that report to include discussion of the impact of opportunity cost adders on the locational marginal prices. Further, the report would include information on LNG prices as compared to previous years. He explained that oil usage during winter 2021-22 explained some of the decoupling of electric prices from natural gas prices, which also would be discussed in the report, along with a more complete explanation of the very high energy market value. He noted that the ISO would try to be ready with that report in time for the March Participants Committee meeting, and if not, for the April meeting.

Discussing the status of transmission outages in the region, he noted that no outages had been approved or were anticipated in February. There were applications pending and under consideration for the March timeframe, including an outage on the Alps to Berkshire transmission line that may curtail imports and exports to and from New York, which he would address further in his March report.

### **MINIMUM OFFER PRICE RULE (MOPR) REFORM PROPOSAL**

Ms. Mariah Winkler, the Markets Committee (MC) Chair, provided a high-level summary of background information that led to the ISO's decision to develop a proposal to reform the MOPR. She also described the ISO's proposal to eliminate the current MOPR construct in advance of the seventeenth Forward Capacity Auction (FCA17) and a Participant-sponsored motion to amend that Proposal. Ms. Winkler explained that the motion to amend would establish a two-year transition period before eliminating the current MOPR, with that transition including a Renewable Technology Resource (RTR) exemption for up to 700 MW of

State-sponsored Policy Resources to qualify and participate in FCAs 17 and 18 with no application of any MOPR. She identified that amendment as the “Transition Proposal.” Ms. Winkler also reported on the votes of the MC, which recommended that the Participants Committee support the elimination of the current MOPR in advance of FCA17 (referred in materials circulated in advance of the meeting as the “MC-Recommended Proposal”) and the MC’s failed vote on the motion to amend the Proposal to include the Transition Proposal.

The following motion was then duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports revisions to the Tariff to implement reforms to the MOPR construct, as proposed by the ISO and recommended by the Markets Committee at its January 11, 2022 meeting, 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.

With the main motion before the Participants Committee, a motion was duly made and seconded to amend the main motion to include a revised Transition Proposal. Referring to materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting, the amendment’s proponents reviewed and explained the changes to the Transition Proposal since the MC’s consideration. Specifically, the proponents explained that the modified Transition Proposal that they had moved reflected the following changes: removal of the provision that provided for the netting out MW from resources that elected RTR treatment in FCA16; adoption of the revised definition of “Sponsored Policy Resource” contained in the MC-Recommended Proposal; deletion of outdated language in Tariff Section III.13; and adoption of a Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) /RENEW Northeast (RENEW)-recommended amendment to “rollover” un-cleared MW from FCA17 and increase the FCA18 MW RTR exemption cap. At the proponents’ request, a member representative explained the UCS/RENEW recommended change, referencing the UCS/RENEW materials that had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting.

Following questions and comments to clarify the motion to amend, the Chair turned to the ISO to explain its position on the motion to amend. Dr. Chadalavada referred to the ISO's January 26, 2022 memorandum that expressed the ISO's preference for the Transition Proposal as it had just been presented. He added that the ISO ultimately reached this determination based on its near term reliability concerns - particularly during the upcoming winter periods. He noted that the ISO was concerned that system reliability could be degraded by rapid and inefficient retirements by existing resources, which the ISO counted on to address extreme weather events. Dr. Chadalavada also explained that a transition would provide time to complete critical market reforms that would help mitigate those reliability concerns, citing specifically changes to the ancillary service markets and a more refined determination of the level of contribution each type of capacity resource makes to resource adequacy (which was generally referred to as effective load-carrying capability (ELCC) or Resource Capacity Accreditation). He said the ISO considered the Transition Proposal to be a reasonable compromise, worked on by stakeholders and the States, that would permit up to 700 MW of renewable resources to clear in FCAs 17 and 18. Dr. Chadalavada concluded by stating that the ISO supported the Transition Proposal as a preferred path forward that would allow the region to focus on other critically important changes during the transition rather than prolonged litigation that could result from a failure to compromise.

Addressing questions from members, Dr. Chadalavada stated that the ISO had no intention of preventing resources from retiring, but it rather wished to reduce the risk of inefficient retirements that would adversely impact reliability. He indicated that the ISO's judgement on these matters was informed by its operation of the system during stressed conditions, and that he had no separate, specific study to quantify the degree of risk to reliability from the immediate termination of the existing MOPR. He explained that the ISO supported the

700 MW RTR exemption as a reasonable compromise among stakeholders who objected to immediate MOPR elimination and state representatives and others who were pushing for more rapid elimination of MOPR. Dr. Chadalavada confirmed the ISO's understanding that the modifications to financial inputs for the Cost of New Entry (CONE) and Net CONE that were part of the MC-Recommended Proposal were removed from the Transition Proposal. Instead, the ISO would make a separate filing in advance of FCA19 to reflect necessary changes to those financial inputs, which he committed the ISO to explain in its filing letter to the FERC if the ISO submitted the Transition Proposal.

Following this explanation and clarification of the ISO's position on the motion to amend, that motion to amend was presented for debate, with many members and guests offering their views. Those in support of the motion to amend argued generally that the revised Transition Proposal was a reasonable approach in light of the ISO's system reliability concerns, as expressed in its January 26 memorandum. Others in support suggested that the Transition Proposal would mitigate against regulatory uncertainty resulting from ongoing litigation over an immediate elimination of the existing MOPR, as seen in other ISO/RTO regions. Some supporters suggested that more efficient retirements could minimize the use of out-of-market actions to address reliability needs. Supporters also expressed agreement with the ISO that the transition would provide time for the ISO to develop, with stakeholder input, necessary complementary market reforms to enhance energy security and more precisely define each resource's contribution to reliability (via the planned ELCC project). They thanked the ISO for listening to the input of stakeholders throughout the process and working diligently to consider and address concerns.

Those opposing the motion to amend the MC-Recommended Proposal expressed disappointment and frustration with the ISO's failure to present its views much earlier in the



stakeholder process. In those discussions, numerous opponents referenced with support the positions of UCS/RENEW, as summarized in its memorandum that was circulated and posted with the materials for the meeting. Reflecting their frustrations with how this matter had unfolded since the MC meeting, some opponents disagreed with the ISO's characterization of the positions of the States and the ISO's explanation for the evolution of its position on the matter. Some argued that the developments since the MC's consideration and vote compromised their confidence in the independence and transparency of the ISO, undermined the stakeholder process, and could undercut public confidence in the ISO.

Other members argued that any delay in the elimination of the current MOPR extended a market construct that they viewed as an unjust and unreasonable barrier to entry for new renewable resources. They expressed the view that certain FERC Commissioners had made very clear the need for prompt elimination of the MOPR and they cited recent statements by two of those Commissioners concerning the same. Citing those Commissioners, certain opponents of the transition argued that there was a substantial risk that a transition proposal would likely be rejected by the FERC and would inject considerably more uncertainty in future auctions. Some argued that the Transition Proposal with continuation of the Competitive Auctions with Sponsored Policy Resources for two more years continued to provide discriminatory treatment for renewable resources that are subject to payments to existing resources for the opportunity to earn capacity revenues in FCM.

Some opponents argued that the ISO's reliability concerns were opinions and conjecture that were lacking quantitative analysis in support. Those who shared to some extent the ISO's reliability concerns but opposed a transition to eliminate the current MOPR explained their position that a transition would not reduce risks to reliability. One member argued on that point that reliability might even be harmed by transition. Referencing the UCS/RENEW concern that

the elimination of the MOPR might be extended to and beyond FCA19, Dr. Chadalavada confirmed that the ISO was fully committed to elimination of the MOPR for FCA19 and would not support further delay of its elimination for FCA19 or beyond.

A NESCOE representative noted that NESCOE would not oppose the Transition Proposal. He explained that one of the six New England states, New Hampshire, opposed any elimination of MOPR, but the remaining States all supported elimination of the current MOPR, which would occur both with the MC-Recommended Proposal and the revised Transition Proposal. While noting that NESCOE members did not oppose the transition approach reflected in the motion to amend, if FERC were to approve the revised Transition Proposal with the elimination of the current MOPR for FCA19, the States would vehemently oppose any request to extend the current MOPR to FCA19 or beyond. The NESCOE representative also noted that NESCOE would expect the ISO to do the same.

Dr. Chadalavada responded to comments from stakeholders on the process, expressing the ISO's view that the stakeholder process worked as intended. He referenced the ISO's May 2021 memorandum, when the ISO announced its intention to work to eliminate the MOPR in advance of FCA17, in which the ISO had flagged various concerns with that elimination that needed to be considered, including the potential of inefficient retirements from existing resources. He referred to the ISO's early enlistment of the External Market Monitor (EMM) to help address those concerns. Throughout the process, Dr. Chadalavada said, the ISO carefully listened to stakeholder feedback and modified its proposal based on that feedback. It also fully considered the EMM's recommendations. He reminded members that, at no point, had the ISO ever expressed any opposition to the Transition Proposal. Instead, the ISO kept an open mind and continued to listen to and fully and carefully consider stakeholder feedback through the entire process, while further considering the expected impact from the EMM's

recommendations, which the ISO supported. With all of that information, the ISO concluded, in its independent judgment, that the Transition Proposal was preferable to an immediate elimination of the current MOPR, for all of the reasons noted in the January 26 memorandum. Dr. Chadalavada acknowledged that it may have helped if the ISO had reached this definitive conclusion earlier, but the speed with which the process to develop the MOPR elimination proposal proceeded limited that possibility. He disagreed with the suggestion that the stakeholder process failed or that it lacked transparency, arguing instead that the outcome should more properly be viewed as a success of the process.

Before voting the amendment, the Transition Proposal proponents argued that the amendment reflected a compromise approach borne out of collaboration, that they viewed the litigation risk differently than those opposing the Transition Proposal, and that the Transition Proposal would mitigate the need for out-of-market actions because it was a measured approach to decarbonizing the region.

Following that discussion, the motion to amend was then voted and passed with a 61.49% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 8.32 %; Transmission Sector – 16.64%; Supplier Sector – 14.72%; AR Sector – 5.33%; POE Sector – 8.85%; End User Sector – 7.63%; and Provisional Members – 0%). (*See* Vote 1 on Attachment 2).

With the once-amended main motion then before the Committee, a motion was duly made and seconded to further amend the MOPR reform proposal to modify the Interconnection Procedures in Schedules 22 and 23 of the Open Access Transmission Tariff. Specifically, the amendment, which was proposed by RENEW (and sponsored by UCS) and circulated and posted in advance of the meeting, would permit any resource that cleared only a portion of its capacity because it was prorated due to the RTR exemption cap from having the portion of its capacity that did not clear from losing its queue position prior to FCA19. The proponent of this change

explained her view that the existing time-out provisions in Schedule 22 and 23 could produce an unfair result if not modified. In response to clarifying questions, the proponent confirmed that the second motion to amend was not seeking changes to Schedule 25 because that schedule was not implicated in what the amendment was trying to address. She also explained that the proposed amendment would help to mitigate elevated risks placed on renewable resources by not eliminating the current MOPR for FCAs 17 and 18.

Members then offered comments on the motion to amend. Members who supported that motion expressed appreciation to UCS/RENEW for bringing the amendment forward because it addressed a long-standing issue in which resources pay all network upgrade costs to support capacity delivery but get timed out of the queue merely because the resource does not clear all of its capacity within the time-out period due to application of the MOPR. Members who spoke against the motion to amend expressed support for what the amendment was seeking to address but argued that the proposed change raised broader and more complex issues that needed to be explored more fully rather than being addressed narrowly, as proposed. The ISO advised the Committee that it did not support the motion to amend because, in its view, the proposed change was not related to MOPR reform. The proponents expressed their disagreement with the ISO's position.

A suggestion was made to consider deferring the vote on this topic until the Transmission Committee had a chance to consider the proposal more fully. That suggestion was not supported, and the vote on the motion to amend was called. By a show of hands in the room, it was determined that the motion to amend would not pass. No roll-call vote was requested.

The Committee then voted the once-amended main motion (i.e., the Transition Proposal). That motion passed with a 69.56% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 10.19%; Transmission

Sector – 16.67%; Supplier Sector – 16%; AR Sector – 8.11%; POE Sector – 8.87%; End User Sector – 9.72%; and Provisional Members – 0%). (See Vote 2 on Attachment 2).

## **LITIGATION REPORT**

Mr. Patrick Gerity referred the Committee to the February 1 Litigation Report that had been circulated and posted the day before the meeting. He highlighted the following:

- (i) The February 2 submission of the region's Order 2222 compliance filing, which was filed after completion of the February 1 Report;
- (ii) The FERC's Jan 21 order accepting the FCA16 qualification information filing;
- (iii) The status at that time of the quickly evolving litigation over the ISO's termination of the Capacity Supply Obligation of Killingly Energy Center, which included a pending request before the Circuit Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit (DC Circuit) for a stay of FERC's approval of that termination;
- (iv) The request to FERC by ConnectGen South Wrentham for a waiver of Schedule 22, § 4.4 (Queue Position Modifications) to allow it to qualify for and bid into FCA17 with its existing queue position;
- (v) The DC Circuit's decision denying the appeal by Cogentrix and Vistra of the FERC's order regarding treatment of expenditures to comply with CIP-IROL requirements; and
- (vi) Activity in the FERC proceeding investigating Schedule 25 and Section I.3.10 of the ISO's Tariff.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

*Markets Committee.* Mr. William Fowler, the MC Vice-Chair, reported that the MC would hold a one-day meeting virtually on February 8.

***Transmission Committee (TC).*** Mr. José Rotger, the TC Vice-Chair, reported that the next TC meeting was scheduled virtually for February 17 and would include a review of FERC Order 881 (Managing Transmission Line Ratings).

***Reliability Committee.*** Mr. Robert Stein, the RC Vice-Chair, reported that the next regularly-scheduled RC meeting was scheduled for February 15, with the venue (in-person or virtual) still under evaluation. The meeting's agenda would include a presentation by the ISO on an operational study being jointly conducted by the ISO and the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) on the impacts of extreme weather using New England as a model.

***Budget & Finance (B&F) Subcommittee.*** Mr. Cavanaugh reported that the next B&F Subcommittee meeting was scheduled for February 10.

***Membership Subcommittee.*** Ms. Sarah Bresolin, Subcommittee Chair, noted that the next virtual meeting was scheduled, by Zoom, for February 14 at 1:00 p.m.

***Joint Nominating Committee (JNC).*** Mr. Cavanaugh reported that the JNC had met on January 7. He reminded the Committee that two members, Mr. Barney Rush and Ms. Vickie VanZandt, would conclude their service at the end of the 2022 Board year, with one of those vacancies requiring a candidate to be identified (the other already filled in the last JNC process). He added that Board Chairman, Ms. Cheryl LaFleur, was concluding her first term and eligible for re-election. He noted that, toward the end of February, JNC members would provide feedback on proposed specifications for a new candidate to be placed on a recommended slate and the JNC would begin its process for reviewing resumes. Updates on JNC activities would continue to be provided at future NPC meetings.

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

Mr. Doot reported that the next Participants Committee Meeting was scheduled to take place on March 3 at the Seaport Hotel, although a decision may be made to hold the meeting virtually if warranted by the amount of business to discuss. Mr. Cavanaugh reminded stakeholders of the Future Grid Pathways meeting on March 1 to review a draft Pathways Study Report.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 3:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

David Doot, Secretary

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN FEBRUARY 3, 2022 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Able Grid Infrastructure Holdings, LLC	Generation		Sam Lines (tel)	Abby Krich (tel)
Acadia Center	End User	Melissa Birchard (tel)		
Advanced Energy Economy (AEE)	Associate Non-Voting	Caitlin Marquis (tel)	Jeff Dennis (tel)	
Agilitas Companies	AR-DG			Sarah Bresolin (tel)
American PowerNet Management	Supplier			Jason Frost
Ampersand Energy Partners	Supplier			Julia Frayer
Anbaric Development Partners LLC	Provisional Member		Theodore Paradise (tel)	
Appian Way Energy Partners	Supplier			Andy Weinstein
AR Large Renewable Gen. (RG) Group Member	AR-RG	Alex Worsley (tel)		
AR Small Distrib. Generation (DG) Group Member	AR-DG			Michael Macrae
AR Small Load Response (LR) Group Member	AR-LR	Brad Swalwell (tel)	Kathy Abernathy (tel)	
AR Small Renew. Generation (RG) Group Member	AR-RG	Erik Abend (tel)		
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Associated Industries of Massachusetts (AIM)	End User			Mary Smith (tel)
AVANGRID: CMP/UI	Transmission	Alan Trotta (tel)	Jason Rauch (tel)	
Bath Iron Works Corporation	End User			Bill Short (tel)
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 (tel)		
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			Bill Short (tel)
Calpine Energy Services, LP	Supplier	Brett Kruse		Bill Fowler; John Flumerfelt
Castleton Commodities Merchant Trading	Supplier			Bob Stein (tel)
Central Rivers Power	AR-RG			Bill Fowler
Centrica Business Solutions Optimize, LLC	AR-LR		Aaron Breidenbaugh (tel)	Nancy Chafetz (tel)
Chester Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
CleaResult Consulting, Inc.	AR-DG	Tamera Oldfield (tel)		
Clearway Power Marketing LLC	Supplier			Pete Fuller (tel)
Competitive Energy Services, LLC	Supplier		Eben Perkins (tel)	
Concord Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Coop.	Publicly Owned Entity	Brian Forshaw (tel)		
Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel	End User		Dave Thompson (tel)	
Conservation Law Foundation (CLF)	End User	Phelps Turner (tel)		
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	Supplier	Grant Flagler (tel)		
Constellation Energy Generation	Supplier	Steve Kirk	Bill Fowler	
Covanta Energy Marketing, LLC	AR-RG			Bill Fowler
CPV Towantic, LLC	Generation	Joel Gordon		
Cross-Sound Cable Company (CSC)	Supplier		José Rotger	
Danvers Electric Division	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
DC Energy, LLC	Supplier			Brett Kruse
Deepwater Wind Block Island, LLC	Generation	Eric Wilkerson		
Dominion Energy Generation Marketing	Generation		Weezie Nuara	
DTE Energy Trading, Inc.	Supplier			José Rotger



**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN FEBRUARY 3, 2022 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Durgin and Crowell Lumber Co., Inc.	End User			Bill Short (tel)
Dynegy Marketing and Trade, LLC	Supplier	Andy Weinstein		Bill Fowler
EDF Trading North America, LLC	Supplier			Brett Kruse
Elektrisola, Inc.	End User			Bill Short (tel)
Emera Energy Services	Supplier			Bill Fowler
Enel X North America, Inc.	AR-LR	Michael Macrae (tel)		
ENGIE Energy Marketing NA, Inc.	AR-RG	Sarah Bresolin (tel)		
Environmental Defense Fund (EDF)	End User	Jolette Westbrook (tel)		
Eversource Energy	Transmission	James Daly (tel)	Dave Burnham	
Excelerate Energy LP	Associate Non-Voting	Gary Ritter		
FirstLight Power Management, LLC	Generation	Tom Kaslow		
Galt Power, Inc.	Supplier	José Rotger	Jeff Iafrazi (tel)	
Garland Manufacturing Company	End User			Bill Short (tel)
Generation Group Member	Generation	Dennis Duffy (tel)	Abby Krich (tel)	
Georgetown Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Granite Shore Power Companies	Generation			Bob Stein (tel)
Great River Hydro	AR-RG			Bill Fowler
Groton Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Groveland Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc. (HQUS)	Supplier	Louis Guilbault (tel)	Bob Stein (tel)	
Hammond Lumber Company	End User			Bill Short (tel)
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User			Jason Frost
High Liner Foods (USA) Incorporated	End User		William P. Short III (tel)	
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Holden Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Holyoke Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	End User	Hannah Oakes (tel)	Todd Grisctel (tel)	
Interconnect Storage LLC		Colleen Nash (tel)		
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Jericho Power LLC (Jericho)	AR-RG	Ben Griffiths	Nancy Chafetz (tel)	
Jupiter Power	Provisional Member			Ron Carrier (tel)
KCE CT 1, LLC	Provisional Member			Abby Krich (tel)
Littleton (MA) Electric Light and Water Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Craig Kieny (tel)	
Long Island Power Authority (LIPA)	Supplier	Bill Kilgoar (tel)		
Maine Power LLC	Supplier	Jeff Jones (tel)		
Maine Public Advocate's Office	End User			Jason Frost
Maine Skiing, Inc.	End User	Hannah Oakes (tel)	Todd Grisctel (tel)	
Mansfield Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Maple Energy LLC	AR-LR			Doug Hurley (tel)
Marble River, LLC	Supplier	Seth Kaplan		Abby Krich (tel)
Marblehead Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Marco DM Holdings	Generation			Andy Weinstein
Mass. Attorney General's Office (MA AG)	End User	Tina Belew (tel)		
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

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN FEBRUARY 3, 2022 MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Merrimac Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Middleborough Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Mintz, Samuel	End User	Sam Mintz		
Moore Company	End User			Bill Short (tel)
National Grid	Transmission	Tim Brennan (tel)	Tim Martin	
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)	End User	Bruce Ho (tel)		
Nautilus Power, LLC	Generation	Dan Pierpont	Bill Fowler	
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned Entity	Steve Kaminski (tel)		Brian Forshaw (tel); Dave Cavanaugh; Brian Thomson
New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate	End User	Donald Kreis (tel)		Jason Frost
New England Power Generators Assoc. (NEPGA)	Associate Non-Voting	Bruce Anderson	Dan Dolan	
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	
Novatus Energy (Blue Sky West et. al)	AR-RG			Aby Krich (tel)
NRG Power Marketing LLC	Supplier		Pete Fuller (tel)	
Nylon Corporation of America	End User			Bill Short (tel)
Pascoag Utility District	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Paxton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Peabody Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
PowerOptions, Inc.	End User	Heather Takle (tel)		Jason Frost (tel)
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Reading Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Russell Municipal Light Dept.	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Saint Anselm	End User			Bill Short (tel)
Shell Energy North America (US), L.P.	Supplier	Jeff Dannels		
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	
Stonepeak Kestrel Energy Marketing, LLC	Supplier			Andy Weinstein
Stowe Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Sunrun Inc.	AR-DG			Peter Fuller (tel)
Talen Energy Marketing, LLC	Supplier			Brett Kruse
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity	Devon Tremont	Dave Cavanaugh	
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	
Tenaska Power Services Co.	Supplier			Andy Weinstein
The Energy Consortium	End User	Bob Espindola (tel)	Mary Smith (tel)	
Union of Concerned Scientists	End User		Francis Pullaro (tel)	
Vermont Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned Entity	Craig Kiemy (tel)		
Vermont Electric Power Company (VELCO)	Transmission	Frank Ettori	Karin Stamy (tel)	
Vermont Energy Investment Corp (VEIC)	AR-LR		Doug Hurley (tel)	
Vermont Public Power Supply Authority	Publicly Owned Entity			Brian Forshaw (tel)
Versant Power	Transmission		Dave Norman (tel)	Tim Martin
Village of Hyde Park (VT) Electric Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Dave Cavanaugh	
Vitol Inc.	Supplier			Brett Kruse
Voltus, Inc.	AR-LR	Nicole Irwin-Vet (tel)		
Wakefield Municipal Gas & Light Department	Publicly Owned Entity		Brian Thomson	

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
PARTICIPATING IN FEBRUARY 3, 2022 MEETING**

<b>PARTICIPANT NAME</b>	<b>SECTOR/ GROUP</b>	<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	<b>ALTERNATE NAME</b>	<b>PROXY</b>
Walden Renewables Development LLC	Generation			Abby Krich (tel)
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	Jim Ginnetti (tel)
Z-TECH LLC	End User			Bill Short (tel)

**FEBRUARY 3, 2022 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING  
VOTES TAKEN ON MOPR PROPOSAL**

**TOTAL**

Sector	Vote 1	Vote 2
GENERATION	8.32	10.19
TRANSMISSION	16.64	16.67
SUPPLIER	14.72	16.00
ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES	5.33	8.11
PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY	8.85	8.87
END USER	7.63	9.72
PROVISIONAL MEMBERS	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<b>% IN FAVOR</b>	<b>61.49</b>	<b>69.56</b>

**GENERATION SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Able Grid Infrastructure Holdings	O	A
CPV Towantic, LLC	F	F
Deepwater Wind Block Island	O	O
Dominion Energy Generation Mktg	F	F
FirstLight Power Management, LLC	O	O
Generation Group Member	Split	Split
<i>Energy Management Inc.</i>	O	O
<i>Millennium Power Partners,</i>	F	F
<i>Record Hill Wind LLC</i>	O	O
<i>Waterside Power, LLC</i>	F	F
GSP Companies	F	F
Marco DM Holdings, LLC	F	F
Nautilus Power, LLC	F	F
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	O	O
Walden Renewables Development	O	A
IN FAVOR (F)	5.5	5.5
OPPOSED (O)	5.5	3.5
TOTAL VOTES	11.0	9.0
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0.0	2.0

**TRANSMISSION SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Avangrid (CMP/UI)	F	F
Eversource Energy	A	F
National Grid	F	F
VELCO	F	F
Versant Power	F	F
IN FAVOR (F)	4	5
OPPOSED (O)	0	0
TOTAL VOTES	4	5
ABSTENTIONS (A)	1	0

**ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
<b>Renewable Generation Sub-Sector</b>		
Central Rivers Power	F	F
Covanta Energy Marketing, LLC	F	F
ENGIE Energy Marketing NA, Inc.	O	O
Great River Hydro, LLC	F	F
Jericho Power LLC	F	F
Novatus Energy	O	A
Wheelabrator/Macquarie	F	F
Large RG Group Member	O	A
Small RG Group Member	O	A
<b>Distributed Gen. Sub-Sector</b>		
Agilias Companies	O	O
Borrego Solar Systems Inc.	O	A
CLEAResult Consulting, Inc.	A	A
Sunrun Inc.	O	O
Small DG Group Member	O	O
<b>Load Response Sub-Sector</b>		
Centrica Bus. Solutions Optimize	F	F
Enel X North America, Inc.	O	A
Maple Energy	O	O
Vermont Energy Investment Corp.	O	O
Voltus, Inc.	O	O
Small LR Group Member	Split	Split
<i>Ameresco CT LLC</i>	O	O
<i>Tangent Energy Solutions, Inc.</i>	A	F
IN FAVOR (F)	6.0	6.5
OPPOSED (O)	12.5	7.5
TOTAL VOTES	18.5	14.0
ABSTENTIONS (A)	1.5	6.0

**FEBRUARY 3, 2022 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING  
VOTES TAKEN ON MOPR PROPOSAL**

**SUPPLIER SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
American PowerNet Management	O	F
Ampersand Energy Partners LLC	A	A
Appian Way Energy Partners East	F	F
BP Energy Company	F	F
Brookfield Renew. Trading & Mktg	A	A
C.N. Brown Electricity, LLC	F	F
Calpine Energy Services, LP	F	F
Castleton Comm. Merchant Trading	F	F
Clearway Power Marketing LLC	F	F
Competitive Energy Services, LLC	O	O
Consolidated Edison Energy Inc.	A	A
Constellation Energy Generation	F	F
Cross-Sound Cable Company	F	F
DC Energy, LLC	F	F
DTE Energy Trading, Inc.	F	F
Dynegy Marketing and Trade, LLC	F	F
Emera Energy Services Companies	F	F
Emera Energy Companies	F	F
Galt Power, Inc.	F	F
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	F	F
LIPA	A	A
Maine Power, LLC	F	F
Marble River, LLC	O	A
Mercuria Energy America, Inc.	F	F
NRG Power Marketing, LLC	F	F
Shell Energy North America (US)	F	F
Stonepeak Kestrel Energy Mktg	F	F
Talen Energy Marketing, LLC	F	F
Tenaska Power Services Co.	F	F
Vitol Inc.	F	F
IN FAVOR (F)	23	24
OPPOSED (O)	3	1
TOTAL VOTES	26	25
ABSTENTIONS (A)	4	5

**END USER SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Acadia Center	O	O
Associated Industries of Mass.	O	F
Bath Iron Works Corporation	F	F
Conn. Office of Consumer Counsel	A	F
Conservation Law Foundation	O	O
Durgin and Crowell Lumber Co.	F	F
Elektrisola, Inc.	F	F
Environmental Defense Fund	O	O
Garland Manufacturing Co.	F	F
Hammond Lumber Company	F	F
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	O	F
High Liner Foods (USA) Inc.	F	F
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	O	O
Maine Public Advocate Office	O	O
Maine Skiing, Inc.	O	O
Mass. Attorney General's Office	O	O
Mintz, Samuel	A	A
Moore Company	F	F
Natural Resources Defense Council	O	O
New Hampshire OCA	F	A
Nylon Corporation of America	F	F
PowerOptions, Inc.	O	O
St. Anselm College	F	F
The Energy Consortium	O	F
Union of Concerned Scientists	O	O
Z-TECH, LLC	F	F
IN FAVOR (F)	11	14
OPPOSED (O)	13	10
TOTAL VOTES	24	24
ABSTENTIONS (A)	2	2

**FEBRUARY 3, 2022 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING  
VOTES TAKEN ON MOPR PROPOSAL**

**PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	O	O
Belmont Municipal Light Dept.	O	O
Block Island Utility District	F	F
Boylston Municipal Light Dept.	O	O
Braintree Electric Light Dept.	F	F
Chester Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	O	O
Concord Municipal Light Plant	F	F
Conn. Mun. Electric Energy Coop.	A	A
Danvers Electric Division	F	F
Georgetown Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Groton Electric Light Dept.	O	O
Groveland Electric Light Dept.	F	F
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Holden Municipal Light Dept.	O	O
Holyoke Gas & Electric Dept.	O	O
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	O	O
Ipswich Municipal Light Dept.	O	O
Littleton (MA) Electric Light Dept.	F	F
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Dept.	A	A
Mansfield Municipal Electric Dept.	O	O
Marblehead Municipal Light Dept.	O	O
Mass. Bay Transportation Authority	F	F
Mass. Mun. Wholesale Electric Co.	O	O
Merrimac Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Middleborough Gas and Elec. Dept.	F	F
Middleton Municipal Electric Dept.	F	F
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	A	A
North Attleborough	F	F
Norwood Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Pascoag Utility District	F	F
Paxton Municipal Light Dept.	O	O
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	O	O
Princeton Municipal Light Dept.	O	O
Reading Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F

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

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Russell Municipal Light Dept.	O	O
Shrewsbury's Elec. & Cable Ops.	O	O
South Hadley Electric Light Dept.	O	O
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Dept.	O	O
Stowe (VT) Electric Dept.	F	F
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	O	O
Village of Hyde Park (VT) Elec. Dept.	F	F
VT Electric Cooperative	F	F
VT Public Power Supply Authority	A	A
Wakefield Mun. Gas and Light Dept.	O	O
Wallingford, Town of	F	F
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	F	F
West Boylston Mun. Lighting Plant	O	O
Westfield Gas & Electric Light Dept.	F	F
IN FAVOR (F)	25	25
OPPOSED (O)	22	22
TOTAL VOTES	47	47
ABSTENTIONS (A)	4	4

**PROVISIONAL MEMBERS**

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2
Anbaric Development Partners, LLC	O	O
Interconnect Energy Storage LLC	O	A
Jupiter Power LLC	O	O
KCE CT 1 & 2	O	A
IN FAVOR (F)	0	0
OPPOSED (O)	4	2
TOTAL VOTES	4	2
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	2