Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative
Stakeholder Group Meeting Process
September 13th 2004

Foley, Hoag LLP
Seaport World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard, 13th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts

Facilitator: Dr. Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates, Ltd.

RGGI Stakeholder Group Meeting #4: Meeting Summary

101 people attended this meeting that began at 9:30am and concluded at 4:30pm.

I. Materials Distributed and Presented

Prior to Meeting:

a. Agenda

At the Meeting:

b. Offsets Evaluation Process Presentation, *Chris Sherry, NJ DEP*
c. Energy Modeling Update Presentation, *Karl Michael, NYSERDA*
d. Compliance and Enforcement Presentation, *Joe Kruger, RFF*
e. RGGI Data Collection Presentation, *Chris Nelson, CT DEP*
f. Regional Greenhouse Gas Registry Presentation, *Joanne Morin, NH DES*
g. Draft Agenda for Allocation Workshop, *Judi Greenwald, Pew Center*

All the documents and presentations can be accessed on the RGGI project website:
http://www.rggi.org/stakeholder_schedule.htm

II. Welcome, Agenda Overview, Meeting Summary Review

Facilitator Jonathan Raab, of Raab Associates, Ltd. welcomed attendees to the meeting. All those present introduced themselves, and then Dr. Raab reviewed the agenda for the day.

III. Offsets

Chris Sherry, of NJ DEP presented the Staff Working Group's proposed approach to assessing potential offsets. Click on the following link to view the presentation:
http://www.rggi.org/docs/swg_offsets_approach_9_13_04.pdf

Questions from one or more RGGI Stakeholder Members, and Resource Panelists: (questions in italics, answers in regular font from Chris Sherry, unless otherwise noted)***:***

Will everything up to the key question slides will be included in the criteria?

Everything we're considering at the moment. We will lay out the process going forward later.

Can you lay out the timeline? Does this have to be done before April 2005?

Most likely we will provide guidelines in model rule, with specific criteria such as that found in technical protocols finalized during the period between completion of the model rule and the beginning of the cap-and-trade program.

Have you thought of a list of categories for offsets?

We are surveying the categories with significant low-cost resource potential, and then evaluating based on the criteria outlined in the presentation.

Will you do this internally, and then ask if there are a critical number of people who want this?

We are looking at the potential in the RGGI region and the U.S. as a whole, and then evaluating based on the criteria in the presentation.

What is the difference between categorical and non-categorical offsets?

A categorical offset could be land-use, renewable energy, etc., but certain sub-categories (e.g., within land-use category: forest preservation, reforestation, agricultural practices, etc.) may not qualify.

You've touched on quality of offsets, what are you thinking in terms of quantity? Is there a limit?

We are conducting an evaluation of the available supply, economics, and the flexibility provided in the context of carbon cap first, and will make a recommendation on a limit, if any, later.

What's the timeline in defining the potential quantity of offsets?

We are working with RFF, Pew, and WRI to gather national data and compile regional data to the extent possible. We may not be able to compile data on all potential offsets with significant available supply before the Model Rule is done, but we are making our best effort.

I'm struck by the assumption that offsets would be cheaper than allocations within the sector. That's less likely to be the case the higher the environmental integrity of offsets that's expected.

We want to create offsets of high environmental integrity but without onerous application and administrative costs to the extent possible. It's an open question what the model rule will include with respect to offsets.

Stakeholder Comment: It would be helpful if you could share data with Stakeholders that the SWG is getting from the Resource Panel.

Is the approach to qualitatively and quantitatively analyze and then develop the rule from what you like? Maybe you can do an iterative process and see what other criteria captures? Maybe there is something you can capture later on?

It's a question of what's available in the US, and in the RGGI region, based on objective and qualitative criteria. We need to do both. We're not applying screens in a linear fashion.

You said offsets had the potential to give both more and cheaper reductions than the cap alone. Some reductions will come from regulated sources, and offsets will bring deeper reductions, not just mitigate regulated emissions.

I said offsets had the *potential* to allow for greater reductions at a lower overall program cost, but we'd like to get a sense of the economics of what's out there.

Concerned it could take lots of time and still have some uncertainty.

We've seen dynamic changes in offsets around world recently. We would like to ensure criteria and environmental integrity are set right, to ensure source reductions. This is a precedent for the country, not only for RGGI.

Franz Litz of NY DEC asked this Stakeholder if they were suggesting the SWG should just pick the offsets they like.

This Stakeholder suggested that the SWG not put constraints (such as within the region), if they meet the other offsets' criteria.

California is moving on to a sector-specific protocol. Putting a market price on carbon could create bridges to broaden the RGGI strategy to other sectors. We don't want to build best system today if it causes barriers to expand the system later.

We will consider specific criteria that can be applied to multiple offsets types (e.g. additionality criteria, baseline development standards, etc.) although most offsets types will likely also require additional sector-specific guidelines and/or technical protocols.

Franz Litz added that the SWG aims to develop standards and standardized approaches that do not require discretionary decisions on the part of agencies.

Is there any effort to coordinate with non US programs?

We will look at potential for linking with programs internationally as one of the criteria we'll evaluate.

Franz Litz suggested Stakeholders provide their rationale for why or why not to include a type of offset.

The idea of reducing discretion at the project level is attractive, as a standardized approach is necessary. Not just an environmental concern, but a market concern. We can't know what we want the tool to do. We need clear rules to send clear signals to market participants. The mission is to develop a cap which gives us the real reductions we're aiming for, so offsets shouldn't be figured out before the cap.

General criteria and case by case approach would not be feasible. Companies need some certainty as to what was an approvable additional offset. From both sides, a standardized approach is most viable. Idea that anything eligible could be attractive, the list of doable offsets with environmental integrity could grow over time.

Understandable to want standardized criteria, but shouldn't close door to other offsets which go beyond standard list if they make sense.

Are you outlining a process similar to the CDM, where project developers can propose offsets methodology to the CDM Executive Board?

CDM has been extraordinarily ambiguous, so we applaud SWG efforts to keep ambiguity out of process. Please keep door open to creativity and not close door to new types of projects.

Will it be a forward looking offset program, or retroactive? Or both? Think it would be good to include retrospective considerations.

Haven't made a recommendation; likely recommendation is a forward-looking program.

Franz Litz asked—how would you do offsets? Credit offsets projects based on full duration? Credit offsets projects in existence before start of RGGI based on full duration, or the time period remaining in project life of existing offsets, after RGGI program begins?

The Stakeholder from above responded, "probably both."

Maybe we should consider a regional group that would approve protocols going forward, so we can address creative ideas and maintain environmental integrity, without having to get approval from the regulators in each state every time.

We are looking at the potential for a regional organization to possibly provide technical assistance in administering an offsets program, but each state would still need to approve protocols in any case.

Questions and Comments from One or More Observers:

We are concerned that the less defined guidelines are, it will leave too much flexibility in each state and cause problems.

How will the potential supply of offsets influence allowance of offsets in model rule? Would there be a relationship between allocation of sources and supply of offsets?

Potential offsets and allocation of allowances are not directly connected.

Offsets in RGGI are an environmental benefit that would move forward in an expanded program. Replicating program internationally is more important than the cap level.

Do you have a sense of what the timeframe would be to finalize offset protocols?

Developing protocols is a time consuming process and would likely take place between development of the model rule and implementation of the cap-and-trade program.

If you start the offset program small and expand it later, it will be fuzzy when other offsets will be included. Should be clear when other offsets should be allowed. Should not pre-judge sources

of offsets at this point. If we are going to have tiered approach, need to come up with structured timeline.

There is not much US experience with verification for environmental integrity. We urge that verification be tiered to level of risk and nature of offset program, such as self-reporting, and minimize the unnecessary cost of having to run through agency reviews.

There need to be some sort of standards, but don't mandate that only one type of monitoring device can be used for certain types of offsets.

The need for an enforceable program may lead toward having contours around an offsets program, as there are limits to administrative resources to verify and enforce offsets.

IV. Modeling

Karl Michael of NYSERDA said the modeling process is progressing with stakeholder input. He went on to give a presentation updating Stakeholders on the major assumptions and the structure of the modeling process. Click on the following link to view the presentation: http://www.rggi.org/docs/rggi_modeling_9_13_04.pdf

Questions from one or more Stakeholders, Resource Panelists: (questions in italics, answers in regular font from Karl Michael, unless otherwise noted)***:***

I'm surprised to see transmission constraints resolved.

We have not distributed this to Stakeholders yet, but we've worked with the ISO's and we think it's close.

Please explain what you took into account in the pollution control retrofit?

Major choices were EPA or EIA data; we went with a mix of EIA and EPA data. Model needs to make adjustments to meet cap. If emissions are too high, the model will install pollution control technology or engage in fuel switching.

Have you also considered coal price forecasts?

Not discussed yet, therefore not on list. We're trying to come up with way of looking at coal prices which are more transparent than ICF's standard assumptions. Will be something on this shortly.

On peak demand forecast in PJM only included NJ and the Delmarva Peninsula. If you are only dealing with the portions of PJM that are within the RGGI region, how do you deal with fact that PJM is one economic entity? E.g., can decrease emissions in NJ by increasing emissions from plants in PA through economic dispatch.

We are using PJM load forecasts for the entire PJM ISO.

On list of assumptions nearly completed, rename "demand" to "electricity".

How is clean combined heat and power being handled?

CHP will be considered as part of an end-use energy efficiency package.

Can you talk about cost of capital assumed in the model?

See chart on page 7 of presentation.

It is important to address the cost of increased pollution control. Nuclear re-licensing and updating assumptions will likely impact this.

How many sensitivity runs do you predict you will do?

There is not always a clear distinction between a sensitivity and a policy case. Expect a total of 15 scenarios, some of which are sensitivities, others will be more complex, time consuming and expensive.

Will the model constrain gas services infrastructure?

This hasn't been resolved in the model. Model does not build gas pipelines as it builds new generating units. We need to ensure model makes reasonable assumptions. There is a feedback loop that increases gas prices, reflecting constrained supply.

Assuming supply availability, we need to worry about reliability issues related to over-reliance on gas.

We depend on Stakeholders and Resource Panelist feedback to help ensure make sure we accurately represent everything in the model.

How is the model handling leakage, especially with NJ being so closely wired to PA?

We will evaluate scenarios with and without a carbon policy, and assess any leakage that happens. If substantial, we will look more closely at evaluating policy mechanisms to address leakage.

When would they be evaluated?

After the reference case, carbon policies will not be too complex to set up in the model. We will run the reference case scenario soon.

Where in this analysis do you look at allocation of costs and benefits –who's paying and who's benefiting? Where are the consumer burdens and economic benefits? Is there a stage where follow-up modeling will be available to measure those impacts?

Energy modeling doesn't address what impact a carbon policy will have on people of different income brackets. But, another subgroup →macroeconomic modeling, will try to address that issue.

If an entity wanted to pay for additional sensitivity run, will ICF run it and include it in report?

Franz Litz replied that would have to be discussed with agency heads, but it's important that states maintain control. He added that there has already been a budget increase to model the effect of renewables, and include MD and PA.

There could be a problem if Stakeholders with more substantial financial resources funded certain runs to address their own specific interests.

When can we discuss financial assumptions?

Comments on financial assumptions can be addressed on a Stakeholder Modeling Subgroup call, or call me (Karl Michael). I'm open to feedback anytime.

I have a concern that we keep putting off macroeconomic modeling and just look at electric sector modeling. Want to evaluate who is getting windfalls and who is paying as we go along, as it may inform how we structure the rule.

Sonia Hamel of MA OCD said that the REMI modeling relies in part on output from the IPM model, but that the distributional analysis requested would probably be done as a post-REMI modeling analysis with spreadsheet or other means.

Have you talked to ICF and determined what are the priority sensitivity runs (i.e., likely to have largest impact)? Karl Michael said the priority sensitivity runs have not been finalized yet, but that ICF claims fuel prices and demand forecasts tend to have greatest impact. Chris Nelson of CT DEP added that only two sensitivity runs were done in CT: with and without nuclear relicensing and nuclear up-rating; the impact of these assumptions were more significant than fuel prices and demand forecast variances.

How does model handle new transmission lines?

The model, as used for the purposes of RGGI, is static with regard to transmission, as it only includes transmission expansion currently proposed by the ISOs. We need to look for yellow flags and make adjustments and run sensitivity to account for any transmission expansion beyond current plans. If build too much generation and not enough transmission, costs go up.

Congratulations on the work you've done so far. However, we're concerned about the schedule. Hopefully there will be sufficient time to analyze and digest model runs.

On potential sensitivity runs, may be interesting to look at potential allocations, and also look at supply availability of offsets.

Is there a way of evaluating cost of avoided transmission from energy efficiency? It seems like a big number to ignore.

Not specifically. IPM not a transmission model. There are ways of addressing those things, but not with this model. Perhaps the Energy Efficiency Working Group can estimate this.

Question and Comments from one or more Observers: (questions in italics, answers in regular font from Karl Michael, unless otherwise noted)***:***

Companies consider the book life of new nuclear plants to be 40 years, not 30, as you have assumed. Companies will only do so many upgrades in a given year due to capital constraints, so you may want to spread out upgrades by company. Also, NEI will be happy to provide RGGI with data to do a re-licensing run. Understanding how re-licensing affects economics of cap and trade program is important, and we advise doing sensitivity assuming no re-licensing.

What's expectation timing wise on the initial run of the basic carbon cap?

Likely in October.

What is role of Stakeholder group relative to the Staff Working Group? Who is going to decide stringency of cap that will be modeled?

Franz Litz replied that the important assumptions are being kicked up to the agency heads. The SWG wrote a memo to agency heads, so they were briefed. We are unlikely to do modeling runs on caps without first consulting with the agency heads.

For additional energy efficiency, make sure to include not only demand, but also on supply side impacts.

If new natural gas transmission is built, it will have a large effect on the system.

Fuel prices and role of new coal are key assumptions. Stakeholders have expressed concern how assumptions will interplay with each other.

What level of detail will you be releasing from the model results?

We will share the results for the entire region, and they will also be broken out by each state. Some states are subdivided in zones and data will be available at that level too. Detail will be available to the Stakeholder Modeling Working Group, and likely will be publicly available as well.

Is the effect of closed cycle cooling upgrades on heat rate as would result from presently planned upgrades (Brayton point, etc.,) or future 316(b) Phase II compliance included in the model?

We'll look into that.

V. Compliance and Enforcement

After lunch Joe Kruger from RFF gave a presentation on compliance and enforcement. Click on the following link to view the presentation:
http://www.rggi.org/docs/compliance_enf_9_13_04.pdf

Questions and Comments from one or more Stakeholders, Resource Panelists: (questions in italics, answers in regular font from Joe Kruger, unless otherwise noted)***:***

Why are we looking at NOx and SOx in terms of penalties, when they are not germane to what we're looking at?

Certain elements may be relevant.

Are there ways RGGI could piggyback on existing monitoring systems from NOx or SOx?

For the large percentage of RGGI units covered under Title IV, CO_2 data is already reported to EPA. Software might be adapted to collect this information.

Would the emissions measurement protocols for NOx opt-ins be a model for an opt-in program in RGGI?

The difficult issue with opt-ins is not so much the measurement of emissions. Rather it is uncertainty about the baseline, i.e., "Were those emission reductions at the opt in units going to happen anyway?"

Do you have an opinion on title IV units –CEM data and EIA data?

It is difficult to make a thorough comparison of the two data sources. CEM data goes thru a QA process, and the monitoring procedures are public and transparent. My understanding is that EIA also has a QA process but does not have a uniform reporting protocol for its data. For example, there could be variation in how companies measure the fuel that is used at power plants.

If we wanted some portion of model rule to incorporate some relief valve related to price, do you have a suggestion on how to do so? Is an auction the only way?

There are various folks in the market who collect and disseminate price information, and an annual auction could also work. There just needs to be an agreement on what the price index should be. .

Is it possible to manipulate price?

Possible, but if the process was transparent, different participants in the market would likely balance each other out and keep each other honest. There may be some argument as to what the process should be.

I'm struck by the high compliance rate for NOx and SOx programs, and low number of enforcement penalties imposed.

These can be explained by high excess emissions penalties, a liquid market to buy allowances, and no economic rational to not comply.

Do you have a number for covered facilities and those eligible for offsets in the EU Program?

There are 12,000 installations (may include several units each) in the EU. Most projected EU offsets are in developing countries.

Why is CO_2 reported with CEMs?

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 required electric power units to report CO_2, but not necessarily to use CEMs. Many companies have chosen to use CEMs because they need either a CO_2 or an O_2 monitor to calculate NOx emissions rates to meet their Title IV NOx

requirements. Overall CEMs are used at approximately 40% of units and cover around 88% of the CO_2 emissions from Title IV units.

Any performance advances in tracking CO_2 with CEMs in the near future?

I haven't heard of any, but I'm not the right person to ask.

Is borrowing factored in, if so how?

Borrowing has not been used in either the U.S. NOx or U.S. SO2 programs. Under the Kyoto agreement, if Parties have excess emissions at the end of the first five-year commitment period, there is a deduction made from their assigned amount units (analogous to allowances) in the second commitment period at a rate of 1.3 assigned amount units for every excess ton of emissions.

Discussion Question: How should compliance be demonstrated and what enforcement mechanisms should apply?

(Questions or comments from one or more Stakeholders, Resource Panelists, and Observers in italics): CEM data used in NOx and SOx is a great way to go as long as installations have CEMs. However, process is extremely limiting once you go beyond point source. With CEM, it will be difficult to expand beyond utilities.

Price should be order of magnitude higher than market price for the allowance.

We (a generator) never plan not to comply for ethical and business reasons.

Another Stakeholder suggested that it helps well meaning companies to have high penalties, so not to give non compliers an economic advantage.

Consider a floating compliance cost. All units owned by that company within that state. Start with unit, move to company, then contain compliance within each state may make it administratively easier to operate.

How do you peg to the market price? Peg on a certain day, or take an annual average?

Ben Feldman of Natsource suggested an index price similar to the Megawatt daily index price is one option. Most people fairly comfortable with this, but the Megawatt daily index price has come under some concern in recent years with wholesale electricity markets.

Has there been a provision to try out new technologies? Perhaps a mechanism which allows some leniency for the deployment of new technology? Another Stakeholder replied that you can always buy an allowance, so they didn't understand how it would increase the risk of investing in a new technology.

As you expand RGGI to other sectors, it impacts supply coming in from offset markets. Cost of CEMs is significant for small units to opt in to the 3P system. Technically, shouldn't be difficult to measure this on the back end. Carbon is related to the fuel coming in. Have to be careful on how far you go with verification.

Calpine has 22 units in RGGI, and no CEM systems installed. Part of me would like verification at CEMs level, but would have to retrofit all our units. Also, I don't see how incurring penalty over a certain amount of time would be an economic advantage. RGGI should also include a section for honest mistakes, for example, a problem from a CEM software vendor.

Penalty provision should be lowered if allowances not available for cumulative circumstances (e.g., hot summer, nuke down, etc.,).

Consider how penalties are designed as there may be more honest mistakes as the program is expanded.

One suggestion to deal with honest mistakes is to have the period of time between true up period and compliance period as long as possible (i.e., few months). EPA Clean Markets Group has been great to work with, and they can help companies comply.

VI. RGGI Data Collection Efforts

Chris Nelson of CT DEP gave a presentation on RGGI data collection efforts. Click on the following link to view the presentation: http://www.rggi.org/docs/data_collection_9_13_04.pdf

Questions or comments from one or more Stakeholders, Resource Panelists, and Observers *in italics,* answers in regular font from Chris Nelson, unless otherwise noted)*:*

Does EIA 767 include coal and oil, or just gas?

EIA-767 files include all steam-electric units with a generator nameplate rating of 10 or more megawatts, regardless of fuel type.

Do you have data for an output-based allocation?

Almost, we hope to have that soon to look at output based allocation scenarios.

NY ISO published annual data since 1997. Data is now published yearly and available in the spring.

I'd suggest changing part 75 CEMS to monitoring systems. Methodology good enough for NOx should be good enough for CO_2.

What about using the methodology from the environmental disclosure requirements from a number of states, whatever data sets they are using to disclose CO_2 emissions to ratepayers? This issue has been there for how long?

People at EPA are looking at this.

Smaller units, which start and stop more frequently, will have different emissions based on usage.

Jonathan Raab then took a poll of people interested in having a single conference call to review this data set and discuss the questions posed in Chris's presentation. About 10 people in room said they were interested in call. Chris Nelson and Jonathan Raab said they would set up a conference call.

VII. Regional Greenhouse Gas Registry (RGGR)

Joanne Morin of NH DES then gave a presentation updating the group on the framework for the registry and its' interface with RGGI. Click on the following link to see the presentation: http://www.rggi.org/docs/rggr_presentation_9_13_04.pdf

Questions or comments from one or more Stakeholders, Resource Panelists, and Observers *in italics,* answers in regular font from Joanne Morin, unless otherwise noted)*:*

Why do voluntary reduction programs come under the mandatory reporting section on slide 4?

These government programs are required to report, but not required to reduce volume of emissions.

How will this avoid double counting or double reporting?

That's why scope 2 is separated.

Would you require including part 75 reporting requirements of WRI protocol?

Realistically yes, but we'll try to limit this.

A Resource Panelist added RGGI will likely be at unit or plant level, versus corporate level as with the WRI protocol.

We want to follow the WRI protocol, to keep it consistent if one company divests, etc.,

Why would control be different for RGGI than other pollution control programs? It should be the same as the NOx program.

What if there's a different owner and operator? State thinks about point source, but financial accounting is not necessarily the same. We don't want double counting. We may need to speak offline on this further.

RGGI should care about a specific source, how much it emits, and if it has permits. You should be indifferent to corporate structure. I understand why you do it for a voluntary program for corporate goals, but it's not necessary for a mandatory, RGGI program.

We want to make sure that reporting system does not lead to double counting or facilities being left out.

When will there be a need for stakeholder involvement for RGGR?

Over the next few months we'll be looking at software and development costs. We also need to look at quantification protocols, and need input from specific folks. Likely at the beginning of the year we will need input on protocols and design elements.

We'd encourage a public outreach process for RGGR.

We are not redoing the WRI process. Please give us specific feedback on protocols and implementation. What areas would you want to get involved with and have specific input into?

VIII. Wrap up / Announcements / Next Steps

Allocation Workshop

Judi Greenwald of the Pew Center on Global Climate Change then reviewed a draft agenda for an Allocation Workshop. She said it would likely be in Boston or New York, either on October 13th or 14th, but leaning toward Boston on Oct. 13th. Click here to view the draft agenda: http://rggi.org/docs/invitee_agenda_10_14_04.pdf

The following feedback on the Allocation Workshop was provided by one or more Stakeholders, Resource Panelists, and Observers:

- *Oct. 14th is the next date in an ongoing FERC negotiation.*
- *Technical allocation issues should be covered: allocation mechanisms which deal with imports from out of region, and deal with LSE's important.*
- *I'd like to push back against allocation being the next thing discussed. We need to talk about the cap. We fear there will be an overly hurried decision about the nature of a cap.*

Franz Litz responded to the last point saying that modeling results are a key ingredient to cap determination. Modeling more than anything will help the SWG understand reductions that will play out. In the meantime, let's cover as many other bases as we can now.

One Stakeholder suggested that we should be having a conceptual discussion of nature, size of cap, etc.,

Additional feedback on topics, speakers, dates, etc., for the Allocation Workshop should be emailed to Judi Greenwald at: GreenwaldJ@pewclimate.org

NEEP Conference on Energy Efficiency and Policy

Dale Bryk of NRDC announced that there will be a NEEP conference on Public Policy and Building Energy Codes at the Double Tree Hotel in Waltham, MA on November 17 and 18. She said that one part of the conference will consider how RGGI will impact energy efficiency policy and vice versa. For more information contact Jane Stolzman via email at jstolzman@neep.org.

Suzanne Watson of NESCAUM added that there will be a modeling summit on November 18th in conjunction with the NEEP conference. The title is: *"Building from First Principles of Good*

Energy Modeling: Why Policy makers Should Care", and the goal is to bring to modelers and policy makers together to make good policy. For more information and to register, email Suzanne Watson, Energy Team Leader at: swatson@nescaum.org, or call: 617-367-8540x280.

It was then announced that the next Stakeholder meeting will be on November 12th, in New York City.

VII. Next Steps / To Do's

- Post all presentations on the RGGI website *(Raab Associates, Ltd., NJ DEP)*
- Write and circulate meeting summary *(Raab Associates, Ltd.)*
- Set up Stakeholder conference call to review RGGI data collected and discuss inconsistencies *(Raab Associates, Ltd., CT DEP)*
- Send notice with date and location of Allocation Workshop *(Judi Greenwald, Pew Center)*

RGGI Stakeholder Meeting #4
September 13, 2004

Attendance List

Affiliation	Name	4/2/04	5/20/04	6/24/04	9/13/04
Staff Working Group					
CT DEP	Chris James	X		X	
CT DEP	Chris Nelson		X		X
DE DNREC	Philip Cherry	X		X	X
ECP	Bill Breckenridge				
MA DEP	Bill Lamkin	X			X
MA DEP	Nancy Seidman			X	
MA DOER	Dwayne Breger	X	X	X	X
MA OCD	Sonia Hamel	X	X	X	X
MD-DOE	Gene Higa	X	X	X	X
MD-Energy Administration	Michael Li				
ME DEP	Kevin Macdonald	X		X	
ME DEP	James Brooks				
ME PUC	Dennis Bergeron				
NB	Darwin Curtis				
NH DES	Joanne Morin	X	X		X
NH DES	Bob Scott	X			
NH DES	Andy Bodnarik				
NH DES	Joe Fontaine			X	X
NH PUC	Maureen Sirois				
NJ BPU	Michael Winka	X			
NJ DEP	Christopher Sherry	X	X	X	X
NJ DEP	Joe Carpenter	X			
NJ DEP	Jeanne Herb				
NJ DEP	Sam Wolfe	X			
NY DEC	Franz Litz	X	X	X	X
NY DEC	Michael Sheehan	X	X		X
NY DEC	Thomas McGuire	X	X	X	X
NY DEC	Lois New	X	X	X	X
NY DEC	Mark Lowery	X	X		X
NY DEC	Jason Denham			X	
NY PSC	John D'Aloia	X	X	X	X
NY PSC	Tina Palmero				
NYSERDA	Karl Michael	X	X	X	X
PA DEP	Joe Sherrick	X	X	X	
RI DEM	Steve Majkut		X		
VT DEC	Dick Valentinetti	X			X
VT PSB	David Farnsworth				X

Affiliation	Name	4/2/04	5/20/04	6/24/04	9/13/04
Stakeholder Group					
ACEEE	Bill Prindle	X	X	X	X
AES	Mark Buzel	X	X	X	X
AES	Chris Wentlent	X			
CLF	Seth Kaplan	X	X		X
Constellation	John Quinn	X	X	X	X
Dominion	Dan Weekley	X	X	X	X
Dominion	Lenny Dupuis	X	X	X	X
EDF	Jessica Holliday	X	X		X
Entergy	Brent Dorsey	X	X		X
Entergy	Jeff Williams			X	
Environment Northeast	Dan Sossland				
Environment Northeast	Derek Murrow	X	X	X	X
IEP of NJ	Steve Gabel			X	X
IEP of NJ	Mally Becker		X		
International Paper	Doug Stilwell				
International Paper	Karen B Risse (Alternate)	X	X	X	X
Keyspan	Bob Teetz	X	X	X	X
Keyspan	Cathy Waxman (Alternate)	X	X	X	X
Maine Public Advocate	Steve Ward	X	X	X	X
NEGT	Tom Powers	X	X		
NEGT	Susan Flash			X	
NEGT	Paula Hamil				X
NGRID	Joe Kwasnik	X	X	X	X
Northeast GHG Coalition	Michael J Bradley	X	X		X
Northeast GHG Coalition	Brian Jones (Alternate)	X	X	X	X
NRDC	Dale Bryk	X	X	X	X
NRDC	Emily Billo (Alternate)	X	X		
Northeast Utilities	Jon Russell	X	X	X	X
NY Coalition	John G.Holsapple	X	X	X	X
NY Coalition	Sandra Meier (Alternate)	X	X	X	
PA Consumer Advocate	Sonny Popowsky	X		X	X
Office of PA Consumer Advocate	Griffiths, Dan (Alternate)		X		
Pace Law Center	Larry De Witt	X	X	X	X
PIRG	Rob Sargent	X	X	X	X
PSEG	Ron Drewnowski	X	X	X	X
PSEG	Christine Neely (Alternate)		X		X
PSEG	James Hough			X	
The New England Council	Deirdre Savage	X	X	X	X
UCS	Deb Donovan	X	X		X
UCS	Michelle Manion (Alternate)	X	X	X	X
United Technologies Corporation	Christopher Powell	X	X		X

Affiliation	Name	4/2/04	5/20/04	6/24/04	9/13/04
Resource Panel					
ISO-NE	Mark Babula	**X**			
ISO-NE	Jim Platts	**X**		**X**	**X**
NatSource	Richard Rosenzweig	**X**			
NatSource	Neil Cohn	**X**			
NatSource	Ben Feldman			**X**	**X**
NESCAUM	Ken Colburn				**X**
NESCAUM	Suzanne Watson	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**
NYISO	Dave Lawrence	**X**			**X**
NYISO	Mollie Lampi				
NYISO	Aaron Breidenbaugh		**X**		**X**
Pew Center	Sally Ericsson	**X**	**X**		
Pew Center	Judi Greenwald	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**
PJM	Susan Covino				
PJM	Kenneth A. Schuyler, PE		**X**		
PJM	Joe Kerecman	**X**	**X**		
RAP	Richard Cowart	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**
RFF	Joe Kruger	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**
WRI	Jonathan Pershing	**X**	**X**	**X**	
WRI	Andrew Aulissi	**X**		**X**	
Facilitators					
Raab Associates, Ltd.	Jonathan Raab	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**
Raab Associates, Ltd.	Peter Wortsman	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**
Raab Associates, Ltd.	Susan Rivo		**X**		**X**

Observers at September 13th Meeting		
Affiliation	**Name**	**9/13/04**
American Refuel Company	Derek Grasso	**X**
Boston Carbon Corporation	Charlie Parker	**X**
BP America	James Keating	**X**
Calpine	Don Neal	**X**
Center for Energy & Economic Development (CEED)	Eugene M. Trisko	**X**
Center for Energy & Economic Development (CEED)	John Paul	**X**
Clean Water Action	Jed Thorp	**X**
Con Edison	Dan Cunningham	**X**
Connecticut Petroleum Council	Steve Guveyan	**X**
Cozen O'Connor	Peter Fontaine	**X**
Edison Electric Institute	Eric Holdsworth	**X**
Environment Northeast	Heather Kaplan	**X**
Environmental Advocates of New York	Christine Vanderlan	**X**
Environmental Resources Trust	Marco Buttazzoni	**X**
EPA	Norm Willard	**X**
First Environment	Jay Wintergreen	**X**
Green Fuel Technologies Corp.	Julianne Zimmerman	**X**
Independent Power Producers of New York (IPPNY)	Radmila Miletich	**X**
MA Climate Action Network	Marc Breslow	**X**
MA Legislature	Jim Marzilli	**X**
MA-EOEA	David Cash	**X**
NEI	Mary Quillian	**X**
NESCAUM	Kelly Levin	**X**
NiSource	Arthur Smith	**X**
NRG	Rodney Bownds	**X**
Pew Charitable Trust	Lea Aeschliman	**X**
Southern Company	Gary Hart	**X**
Stone and Webster Management Consultants Inc.	Frank Osten	**X**
Synapse Energy	Geoff Keith	**X**
Technology and Market Solutions	David South	**X**
The Energy Foundation	Marcus Schneider	**X**
The Nature Conservancy	Sarah Woodhouse Murdock	**X**
The Oak Foundation	Nathaniel O'Connell	**X**
Trinity Consultants	Katherine N. Blue	**X**
Tufts University	Jeff Smith	**X**
UJAE	Bill Cunningham	**X**