



Markets and Reliability Committee (MRC) STANDING COMMITTEE PROPOSAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT

November 16, 2011

MRC Charge Track and Performance Assessment Track

Stakeholder Process Summary – MRC Charge Track

On May 24, 2011, PJM stakeholders [charged](#) items to be addressed through the stakeholder process via special MRC sessions. Charged issues are:

1. Modification to New Entry Price Adjustment (NEPA);
2. Identification of potential changes to make Fixed Resource Requirement (FRR) rules less restrictive to accommodate Load Serving Entity (LSE) issues;
3. Identification of potential changes to assure clearing of self supply while not manipulating clearing prices;
4. Exploration of opportunities for a less administratively burdensome Minimum Offer Price Rule (MOPR) exception process; and,
5. Identification of benefits and costs of changing from Real-time to Day-ahead LMP in determining the net energy revenue offset for MOPR's net asset class Cost of New Entry (CONE) determination.

NEPA modifications had an October 1, 2011, compliance filing date. With stakeholder support, PJM [filed](#) a brief informing the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) of productive progress borne through the stakeholder process. This filing respectfully requested that the Commission allot additional time for the stakeholder process to further refine NEPA proposals.

During the course of the stakeholder process, NEPA was parsed into three subordinate tracks. The first track, called Tariff Clarifications, maintains the current NEPA construct with clarifying language added to the PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT or Tariff). The second track, called Minor Tariff Change, were NEPA changes that would modify the original intent of NEPA and that could be implemented for the 2015/16 Base Residual Auction (BRA). This track could be either a transition to a separate market design or the end state itself. The third track, called Market Design Change, contemplated a new construct such as a long-term auction. Therefore, the long term, voluntary auction identified through the Performance Assessment track was subsumed by this discussion.

Over the course of twenty special MRC sessions from July through November, PJM's Consensus Based Issue Resolution process was used to conceive, develop, and ultimately refine package proposals relative to the group's May 24th MRC charge. The PJM facilitation team utilized various polling methods, break-out sessions and ad hoc discussions to refine such packages during the stakeholder process.

The October 7, 2011, [poll](#) was the first to evaluate the various MRC charge track proposals. This poll encompassed all five MRC charge track topics and all respective proposals brought forth by sponsoring stakeholders. The poll results



informed future discussions within the stakeholder body. The group was able to focus their work on singular packages for the MOPR, Self Supply and the FRR charges. The EAS topic was reduced to a singular recommendation to the MRC based on both the poll and the stakeholder discussion. However, due to varied support in this poll around NEPA packages, a second [poll](#) was discussed on November 2, 2011. The poll resulted in a clear direction for NEPA topics to clarify the existing Tariff language and to pursue a market design change in the future. Also, the stakeholders indicated a desire to not expand the intent of the existing NEPA language.

Through the process, the below items have been put forth for the MRC's consideration. The items in the 3/2 Member Support column are forwarded based on Section 7.4 of Manual 34 which outlines decision making for multiple alternatives.

MRC Charge Track			
Item	Forward for Vote	3-2 Member Support	Additional Documentation
NEPA	---	---	---
Tariff Clarifications	Language proposed	N/A	Tariff Redline
Minor Tariff Change	Nothing to vote	N/A	NEPA Matrix
Market Design Change	Nothing to vote	N/A	NEPA Matrix
FRR	Package 2	Status Quo	FRR Matrix
Self Supply	Package 2	Status Quo	Self Supply Matrix
MOPR Exception	Package 3	As Filed at FERC, Package 3b	MOPR Matrix
EAS Offset	Same method as VRR curve	Status Quo, CONE Modification	EAS Matrix

Package Proposals Summary – MRC Charge Track

New Entry Pricing Adjustment: Tariff Clarifications

PJM staff, in coordination with stakeholders, updated [Tariff language](#) to clarify the existing NEPA process. The intent of NEPA is not changed but more clarity to the existing process is provided. The referenced version is the latest iteration of proposed Tariff language that was reviewed with the stakeholders at the October 25 and November 2 MRC meetings.

New Entry Pricing Adjustment: Market Design Change

Stakeholders expressed a strong desire to consider substantive changes to the NEPA construct provided that the details were ultimately agreed. The [poll](#) discussed at the November 2, 2011, MRC illustrates the position. While no proposals are ready for vote, the stakeholders will pursue the topic further. The focus of discussion in this area has been on creating a long-term auction with products of varying tenor.



Fixed Resource Requirement

Proposal – Package 2

Package 2 proposes that a LSE can partially elect FRR by Delivery Point(s) in a zone for the purposes of using a Planned Generation Capacity Resource (“PGCR”). This [proposal](#) was outlined at the November 2, 2011, MRC. Under the proposal, there are five conditions the LSE must satisfy.

1. The LSE’s size or position in the area where the partial FRR election is being made for the PGCR is such that either the LSE’s net short in the LDA after existing owned or long-term contracted resources prior to the PGCR is less than 1000 MW or the LSE’s Obligation Peak Load in the LDA is less than 1000 MW.
2. The LSE either owns the PGCR or has contracted for the output of PGCR for at least 10 years.
3. The LSE is the beneficial off-taker of the PGCR’s energy, ancillary services, and capacity.
4. The LSE’s customer(s) bear the PGCR investment gain or loss on revenues from PJM administered markets.
5. The LSE is a public power entity or a single customer LSE.

3/2 Forwarded Proposal – Status Quo

Presently, the FRR caps sales into the RPM at the lesser of 1,300 MW or 25% of the obligation. FRR’s election is five years in duration and FRR entities are not eligible to utilize RPM auctions to procure a portion of the FRR obligation. FRR election, for both the LSE and FRR entity, occurs two months prior to the upcoming BRA. With regard to an LSE’s obligation to serve load through an FRR capacity plan, only one LSE serves the entire load in an FRR service area.

Comparative Summary

Package 2 maintains certain elements from the present-day FRR process. Divergence occurs with regard to an FRR’s service area and the obligation to serve the entire load through an FRR capacity plan.

Today, only one LSE serves the entire load in an FRR service area through an FRR capacity plan. Package 2 proposes to allow the election of only certain zones rather than all zones as well as the partial election by volume, by zone for new or existing self supply.

Another area of divergence is the definition of an FRR service area. FRR service areas are currently defined as: (i) The service territory of an Investor Owned Utility (IOU), public power organization or electric cooperative; and, (ii). Separate geographic areas bounded by wholesale metering. The proposal put forth in package 2 would allow an LSE to partially elect FRR by delivery point(s) in a zone with planned resources.

Self Supply

Proposal – Package 2

Package 2 would enable planned resources to qualify for self supply. The proposal does not place limits or restrictions on the duration of self supply commitment for planned resources. The package is detailed in the [report](#) provided at the MRC on October 25, 2011. The information is listed under the MOPR Exception Process topic where a similar approach was being discussed for both topics.

Below are considerations in the proposal intended to allow assured clearing that is not intended to manipulate clearing prices:



1. Allow self supply, if economic, on a multi-year view to offer so it clears;
2. Exempt both upgrades at existing units (without limitation) and for unit additions at existing units (up to a threshold);
3. Extend renewable exemption to include other renewable projects such as landfill gas and biomass;
4. Allow LSEs to pull some load out of the BRA prior to the auction for new or existing self supply;
5. Add MOPR for certain MW amount tied to the size of the LDA. Targets below this MW level are not subject to MOPR screens and can be committed as self supply; and,
6. Keep MOPR out of the rest of the market.

3/2 Forwarded Proposal – Status Quo

There is not currently a self supply provision.

Comparative Summary

Today, planned resources are not eligible to participate in self supply. The proposal put forth in package 2 would allow planned resources to qualify as part of a self supply process.

Minimum Offer Price Rule Exception Process

Proposal – Package 3

[Package 3](#), presented on October 25, 2011, would adopt the MOPR Exception Process currently filed with FERC but would modify the allowed exceptions to include those as detailed in the Self Supply package 2 proposal above.

3/2 Forwarded Proposal – As Filed at FERC (5/12/11)

At least sixty (60) days prior to the start of the applicable auction, a request must be submitted by the seller seeking qualification under the MOPR exception process. The Independent Market Monitor (IMM) is to provide findings to both the seller and PJM within thirty (30) days of a request's receipt. In order to evaluate the exception, the seller must provide a list of eleven data points including information such as vendor quotes on plant equipment and environmental permits. A full list of required information can be found in the MOPR exception process [matrix](#) under the "Required information for exception" design component. Should a seller choose to appeal the IMM's decision, the seller has implicit rights to appeal to the FERC under Section 206 of the PJM OATT.

The standard for exception is whether a sell offer is consistent with the competitive, cost-based, fixed, nominal levelized, net cost of new entry were the resource to rely solely on revenues from PJM-administered markets.

3/2 Forwarded Proposal – Package 3b

Package 3b is the same structure as the MOPR Exception Process package 3 [proposal](#) outlined immediately above. However, unlike the package 3 proposal, package 3b limits exceptions to:

1. Allow for upgrades, such as a process upgrade, at existing units without limitation;
2. Allow for unit additions at existing plant up to a pre-defined threshold;
3. Allow all renewable projects (e.g. landfill, biomass, etc);
4. Allow exception for certain MW amount tied to the size of the LDA; and,
5. Allow for unit replacement generation at existing site.



Additionally, this package utilizes proposed [additions](#) to Tariff language to the MOPR's standards for exception. These Tariff language updates, which would be added under Attachment DD 5.14(h), were reviewed at the November 2, 2011, MRC.

The proposed language would allow a capacity market seller, with respect to their relationship with an LSE, to submit a sell offer in an RPM auction for a Planned Generation Capacity Resource ("PGCR") that would have otherwise been subject to restrictions under 5.14(h). The PGCR can offer as self-supply and be self-scheduled as a price taker (i.e., at \$0). The resource would therefore be awarded or committed regardless of clearing price. To satisfy this provision, this proposal would require five conditions are met:

1. The LSE's size or position in the LDA where the PGCR is located is such that either the LSE's net short in the LDA after existing owned or long-term contracted resources prior to the PGCR is less than 1000 MW or the LSE's Obligation Peak Load in the LDA is less than 1000 MW;
2. The LSE either owns the PGCR or has contracted for the output of PGCR for at least 10 years;
3. The LSE is the beneficial off-taker of the PGCR's energy, ancillary services, and capacity;
4. The LSE's customer(s) bear the PGCR investment gain or loss on revenues from PJM administered markets; and,
5. The LSE is a Public Power Entity or a Single Customer LSE.

Comparative Summary

The MOPR exception process proposal put forward in package 3 maintains several elements from the proposal PJM filed with the FERC earlier this year. Divergence between the two proposals occurs with regard to the standards for exception.

In the PJM filing, the standard for exception is whether a sell offer is consistent with the competitive, cost-based, fixed, nominal levelized, net cost of new entry were the resource to rely solely on revenues from PJM-administered markets. Package 3, however, uses a broad set of exception criterion.

Package 3b limits the exception criterion outlined in package 3 and proposes updated Tariff language that would allow a capacity market seller to submit a sell offer for a PGCR if certain standards are met.

Energy and Ancillary Service Offset – MOPR Screen

Proposal – Use same method as VRR curve

The EAS offset methodology is utilized to estimate the revenues that the resource can expect to earn in the energy and ancillary service markets. The current methodology for estimating the EAS revenues utilizes Real-time locational marginal prices in the calculation. This assumes that the resource is not committed in the Day-ahead Energy Market and would only receive revenues from the Real-time Energy Market.

The recommendation is to revise the peak-hour dispatch method to better reflect actual dispatch operations and actual revenues earned. For example, the methodology would dispatch a resource first against Day-ahead locational marginal prices and then against Real-time locational marginal prices if Day-ahead prices do not support the commitment of the resource.



3/2 Forwarded Proposal – Status Quo

The current methodology for the calculation of the EAS offset for the MOPR screen utilized the Real-time locational marginal prices.

3/2 Forwarded Proposal – CONE Modification

The CONE modification package would include the same methodology for the calculation of the EAS offset as the VRR curve. However, this package addresses the levelization method for Gross CONE which was considered out-of-scope for the EAS discussion. The CONE modification package includes real levelization for Gross CONE.

Comparative Summary

The VRR methodology for the calculation of the EAS offset differs from the Status Quo by including Day-ahead Energy Market prices in addition to Real-time Energy Market prices in an effort to better reflect the actual dispatch operations and the actual revenues earned. The CONE modification package is the same as the VRR methodology but it recommends real levelization of Gross CONE which was considered out-of-scope for the EAS discussion.



Stakeholder Process Summary – Performance Assessment Track

The PJM OATT, in Attachment DD – Section 17.6, requires a performance assessment of the RPM be provided to the FERC within six months of the conclusion of the fourth delivery year. PJM contracted The Brattle Group to conduct the performance assessment. At the August 18, 2011, MRC, Brattle presented their findings with regard to the performance assessment. It was found that the RPM has achieved its design objectives. Recommendations to increase transparency and stability were also presented by Brattle to the stakeholder body.

The performance assessment [report](#) was posted on the PJM website under the August 18, 2011, MRC meeting materials. Stakeholders had the opportunity to respond to PJM with their feedback on the Brattle study at feedback session on August 30, 2011, and September 9, 2011. The feedback formed the basis for the stakeholders’ issue charge.

On September 15, 2011, PJM stakeholders [charged](#) four topics identified as short-term items for the stakeholder body to address for implementation in the 2015/16 BRA. Additional performance assessment issues identified by the stakeholders as either mid- or long-term items were out-of-scope at this time. Special MRC sessions in September, October and November addressed the short-term performance assessment topics that were charged:

1. CETL: Over the course of several special MRC working sessions in October, with stakeholder input, PJM staff **proposed** several Capacity Emergency Transfer Limit (CETL) enhancements, relative to RPM.
2. Load forecasting enhancement: Over the course of several special MRC working sessions in October, with stakeholder input, PJM staff **proposed** load forecasting enhancements, relative to RPM.
3. Voluntary, long-term auction: The implementation of a voluntarily, long-term auction has been incorporated into the NEPA market design proposals.
4. STRPT: The PJM Consensus Based Issue Resolution process was followed for addressing the short-term resource procurement target (STRPT) item. Over the course of various special MRC sessions in October, as part of this process, a robust solution **matrix** was developed which included several proposals. Stakeholders were polled twice to gauge support of various packages. The first **poll** occurred prior to the October 25, 2011, MRC meeting, while the second **poll** occurred prior to the November 2, 2011, meeting.

Performance Assessment Track		
Item	Forward for Vote	Additional Documentation
CETL	As proposed by PJM	Proposal (10/25/11 MRC)
Load Forecast	As proposed by PJM	Proposal (10/25/11 MRC)
Voluntary, Long-term Auction	Closed discussion. Rolled into NEPA	NEPA Matrix
STRPT	Status Quo, Package 1, Package 2	STRPT Matrix

Package Proposals Summary – Performance Assessment Track

Capacity Emergency Transfer Limit (CETL)

Proposal – PJM Recommendation

The stakeholder charge, relative to CETL, focused on four distinct areas. The first area seeks to provide CETL forecasts within the five and ten year Regional Transmission Expansion Plan (RTEP) outlook. As part of the RTEP five year out baseline analysis, PJM can calculate the CETL for LDAs similar to what is currently done for the RPM



planning parameters. Analysis would be done at the end of each RTEP cycle after baseline upgrades are added to the case. However, PJM does not believe that calculating CETL ten years out would provide meaningful information. This would require many assumptions about future generation that have large impacts on results.

The second CETL-related issue is for PJM to provide “uncertainty ranges” around CETL values. Determining “uncertainty ranges” around CETL is not practical given the number of factors influencing CETL. However, more extensive scenario analyses done as part of the RTEP is currently the subject of stakeholder discussions at the Regional Planning Process Task Force (RPPTF). These scenario analyses could provide additional information about limiting facilities for the given scenario.

The third CETL-related issue is with regard to PJM providing the CETL model to stakeholders. Cases used for development of the RTEP are currently [available](#), subject to Critical Energy Infrastructure Information (CEII) procedures, on the PJM website. A “mean dispatch” case for each LDA will be provided.

The fourth CETL-related charge item deals with identifying successive limiting elements. PJM will determine the limiting element for the LDA. However, those LDAs with a significant CETL margin (e.g., greater than 150%) will not be calculated. PJM will assume there is no change in the impedance of the network model to calculate the next limiting facility (i.e. essentially the first limiting element will be ignored).

Load Forecasting Enhancements

Proposal – PJM Recommendation

The stakeholder charge relative to load forecasting sought PJM to provide estimates of forecast uncertainty and to provide semi-annual load forecast updates. Presently, PJM does provide forecast uncertainty based on weather (e.g., 50/50 load and 90/10 load). In addition, more extensive scenario analyses done as part of the RTEP are, however, the subject of discussion at the RPPTF and may provide load forecast information based on alternate future scenarios. These analyses may provide load forecast information based on alternate future scenarios.

Relative to semi-annual load forecast updates, PJM can provide these updates based on the latest economic forecast data available. PJM can also provide updated zonal coincident peaks.

Short-term Resource Procurement Target

Proposal – Status Quo

Presently, the STRPT has a 2.5% deferral of the total reliability requirement. This 2.5% deferral is also product-specific, meaning that both the minimum annual resource requirement and the extended summer resource requirement have a 2.5% deferral from the BRA.

Proposal – Package 1

Package 1 maintains the 2.5% deferral for the total reliability requirement; however, the proposal would eliminate the product-specific deferral measure. Given the acceptance of this proposal, future BRAs would procure the full requirement for both minimum annual resource requirement and the extended summer resource requirement.

Proposal – Package 2

Package 2 maintains the 2.5% deferral for the total reliability requirement. This proposal would also eliminate the deferral measure for minimum annual resource requirement; however, it would maintain the 2.5% deferral for extended summer resource requirements.



Comparative Summary

Status quo maintains the 2.5% deferral across the total reliability requirement, the minimum annual resource requirement and the extended summer resource requirement.

Package 1 would maintain the 2.5% deferral across the total reliability requirement, and eliminate any deferral for both the minimum annual resource requirement and the extended summer resource requirement.

Package 2 would maintain the 2.5% deferral across the total reliability requirement, and eliminate any deferral for the minimum annual resource requirement. It would, however, maintain the 2.5% deferral for the extended summer resource requirement.



Appendix I: Proposals Not Meeting the Threshold

Alternate proposals stakeholders have requested be put forward, without reaching the required threshold through the stakeholder process, are represented in this section.

New Entry Pricing Adjustment: Minor Tariff Change

The NEPA topic was segmented into three tracks - Tariff Clarifications, Minor Tariff Changes, and Major Market Design Changes. Stakeholders communicated in the [poll](#) discussed on November 2, 2011, a desire not to make changes to the existing tariff that would change the intent of the existing NEPA. Listed below is a package presented to make minor tariff changes that would change the original intent of NEPA as a transition to major market changes. This package is intended to be implemented for the 2015/16 BRA.

Proposal – Package 4

Similar to today, package 4 would keep the NEPA process included in the BRA for three years in advance of the delivery year. This proposal would also allow only NEPA resources to receive the higher clearing price make-whole payments. Resource eligibility would retain today's standards. Additionally, supply and demand must be co-located in the same LDA.

Unlike today, package 4 sets a five year period for the duration of new entry pricing. This proposal would adjust the trigger such that the only requirement is that the NEPA resource will clear. Planned units would be subject to the MOPR and would clear in year one BRA. Offers in years two through five would equal the first year offer price. This proposal would sunset within three years or when PJM implements a long-term auction, whichever is first.

Minimum Offer Price Rule Exception Process

The following package is a subset of Package 3 outlined in the MOPR Exception Process section of this report.

Proposal – Package 3c

Package 3c is the same structure as the MOPR Exception Process filed with FERC. However, Package 3c adds the following:

“Allow for an entity exception based on a predetermined very high percentage of the entity's obligation being fulfilled with its own generation or under contract. Contracts serve as a portion of the obligation fulfillment percentage only and would need to have been in place for x years prior to and x years beyond the delivery year in question.”



Appendix II: Supplemental Documents

Links to important documents accompanying this report are provided in the Stakeholder Process Summary above.

Appendix III: Stakeholder Participation

Below are individuals who registered for the consensus building meeting of the MRC held on October 26, 2011. This is a general representation of regular participants throughout the process.

In Person Registration		
Last Name	First Name	Company Name
Barker	Jason	Constellation NewEnergy, Inc.
Batta	Mike	Virginia Electric & Power Company
Bloom	David	Baltimore Gas and Electric Company
Bowring	Joseph	Monitoring Analytics, LLC
Brodbeck	John	Shell Energy North America (US), LP
Campbell	Bruce	EnergyConnect Group, Inc.
Carretta	Kenneth	PSEG Energy Resources and Trade LLC
Citrolo	John	Calpine Energy Services, L.P.
Esposito	Pati	NRG Power Marketing, L.L.C.
Fitch	Neal	GenOn Energy Management, LLC
Flaherty	Dale	Duquesne Light Company
Francis	Franklin	Brookfield Energy Marketing LP
Fuess	Jay	PBF Power Marketing LLC
Galligan	Craig	FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.
Greening	Michele	PPL Energy Plus, LLC
Horstmann	John	Dayton Power & Light Company (The)
Horton	Dana	Appalachian Power Company
Hyzinski	Tom	PPL Energy Plus, LLC
Jablonski	James	Borough of South River, New Jersey
Jennings	Kenneth	Duke Energy Business Services LLC
Johnson	Carl	Long Island Lighting Company dba LIPA
Kelly	Greg	Tenaska Power Services Co.
O'Connell	Robert	J.P. Morgan Ventures Energy Corporation
Orzel	Chris	NextEra Energy Power Marketing, LLC
Phillips	Marji	Hess Corporation
Pratzon	David	Exelon Generation Co., LLC
Ramaekers	Robert	Tenaska Power Services Co.
Riding	MQ	NAEA Ocean Peaking Power, LLC
Rushing	Nathan	EMC Development Company, LLC
Schofield	Bill	Customized Energy Solutions, Ltd.*
Scoglietti	Barbara	Tangent Energy Solutions, Inc.
Scott	Ann	Tenaska Power Services Co.
Scott	Mark	Customized Energy Solutions, Ltd.*
Siegrist	Hal	GenOn Energy Management, LLC
Silverman	Abraham	NRG Power Marketing, L.L.C.
Stuchell	Jeff	FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.
Tatum	Ed	Old Dominion Electric Cooperative
Williams	Paul	ArcelorMittal USA LLC
Wilson	James	Wilson Energy Economics



Web Ex Registration		
Last Name	First Name	Company Name
Ainspan	Malcolm	Energy Curtailment Specialists, Inc.
Allen	Carrie	GenOn Energy Management, LLC
Applebaum	David	NextEra Energy Power Marketing, LLC
Bearden	Joel	Cargill Power Markets LLC
Benchek	Jim	Monongahela Power Company d/b/a Allegheny Power
Breidenbaugh	Aaron	EnerNOC, Inc.
Burlew	Sarah	PJM Interconnection
Burner	Bob	Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC
Chapman	Mike	Magnolia Energy L.P.
Clover	Bernita	Duquesne Light Company
Cox	Jason	Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc.
De Geeter	Ralph	PSC of Maryland
Dell Orto	Kenneth	CPV Maryland, LLC
Evrard	David	Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate
Flynn	Paul	PJM Interconnection
Freeman	Al	Michigan Public Service Commission
Gates	Ken	Primary Power LLC
Gilani	Rehan	ConEdison Energy, Inc.
Giles	Steven	Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc.
Gilrain	Mark	NRG Power Marketing, L.L.C.
Hanson	Mark	Illinois Commerce Commission
Heizer	Fred	Ohio Public Utilities Commission
Hoatson	Thomas	Riverside Generating, LLC
Howatt	Bob	Maryland Energy Administration
Huff	Gerald	FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.
Huntoon	Steve	NextEra Energy Power Marketing, LLC
Jeremko	Steven	New York State Electric & Gas Corporation
Krauthamer	Michael	Maryland PSC
Lindeman	Tony	FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.
Mariam	Yohannes	Office of the People's Counsel for the District of Columbia
Marmon	Gregory	Virginia Electric & Power Company
Marton	Dave	FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.
Maucher	Andrea	Division of the Public Advocate of the State of Delaware
Maye	Shelly-Ann	North America Power Partners LLC
Norton	Chris	American Municipal Power, Inc.
Nowicki	Linda	New Jersey Board of Public Utilities
Patrylo	Bob	H-P Energy Resources LLC
Patty	Sandra	MD DNR
Plutschak	Richard	Easton Utilities Commission
Quinlan	Pamela	Rockland Electric Company
Ramaekers	Bob	Tenaska Power Services Co.
Rismiller	Randy	Illinois Commerce Commission



Web Ex Registration		
Last Name	First Name	Company Name
Salaneck	Alexandra	Monitoring Analytics
Shanker	Roy	H.O. Energy Services (U.S.), Inc.
Simms	Chris	Downes Associates, Inc.
Smith	Brian	FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.
Stewart	Courtney	Delaware Public Service Commission
Stuss	Gordon	PSEG Energy Resources and Trade LLC
Swalwell	Brad	Tangent Energy Solutions, Inc.
Theodore	Sharon	EPSA
Thomas	Glen	GT Power Group, LLC
Toups	Stephanie	Tenaska Power Services Co.
White	Sheirmiar	Ohms Energy Company, LLC
Williams	Jeff	PJM Interconnection
Wolfe	Samuel	Viridity Energy, Inc.
Xenopoulos	Damon	Brickfield Burchette Ritts
Yu	Haibin	Calpine Energy Services, L.P.

Authors: Tim Burdis, Adrien Ford