

General Principles:

- 1) The need for a forum for regional commissioners to meet (that is not cumbersome for CONEG. I see CONEG as convener, no policy staff etc) I know David doesn't want to lose this forum for Enviro Commissioners and Lawrence suggested a potential need for Economic Development folks to meet.
- 2) The benefit of an annual joint meeting of all committees, since much of the work overlaps.
- 3) A structure for NEC ECP that is parallel, or at least compatible, with the CONEG structure, or we won't streamline the process or leverage the regional work.

GINA:

Forums for commissioners/secretaries might benefit from an overarching regional plan and agreed to set of priorities on topics that merit it. Alternatively if the forum is to not to move a regional agenda forward per se and is instead is so the agency heads can network - get to know each other, share experiences in the various jurisdictions, troubleshoot problems etc. then the planning, analyses, and coordination are simpler endeavors. Your call as to what's needed. Identifying regional plans and priorities takes work and resources that the jurisdictions and CONEG may not be able to deliver.

FYI CONEG's Transportation Policy Committee (which functions as regional transportation policy forum on select transportation issues such as passenger rail) includes several northeast states depending on the topic, not just New England and NY. This may be challenging to line this group up with NEGC/ECP interests. Although the proposal appears to drop transportation from NEGC/ECP efforts all together. This may be OK given other cross border transportation initiatives, although climate change and energy issues related to transportation in the NEGC/ECP region will be lost – see climate change comment below.

I assume you realize that in the proposed reorganization - climate change generally and the effort to bring transportation into climate change energy discussions are no longer identified as a multi-jurisdictional, multi agency, cross border topic as is the intent of the current NEGC/ECP framework. (It's debatable if this has been done well to date.) Not sure if there will be push back from the environmental community, Quebec, and other entities with an interest in this. The NEGC/ECP efforts and GHG emissions targets were seen as historic and when the first plan was developed.

ANNE:

A discussion draft of an option for a reorganized CONEG structure.

- This draft allows for “two iterations” of the Northeast Committee on Environment (same membership but two hats with differing scope of activities, reporting structure and staffing from CONEG). It assumes that the COE operates independently from CONEG for many of its management/operations activities on specific regulatory programs and with regional groups like NESCAUM). It assumes that the COE can also operate as a policy advisory committee to CONEG – and as such would focus on regional policy issues and would report to the CONEG governors through the Advisory Committee (i.e., its policy work/recommendations would be reviewed by the Advisory Committee – on a region-wide basis, not just reviewed by the individual governors' staff) – i.e., it would follow the CONEG internal review procedures that require any document,

action associated with CONEG to be reviewed by the Advisory Committee and accepted by the governors.

ED:

Here's some general comments, but honestly I didn't find Anne's charts or email particularly helpful. With respect to commissioners meeting - NECPUC and NESCOE members aren't entirely the same ones participating in NEG. ME, NH, RI, and MA have different folks that aren't involved in NECPUC or NESCOE. The said, most of the NEG stuff is so high level, and the work is done by other entities, that I'm not sure meetings of all the commissioners is necessary. Calls and emails should be sufficient. That's just for energy committee. It may be useful for energy folks to meet in the context of the environment committee.

Overall working on NICE, it doesn't seem that the NEG is all that useful with respect to energy. With respect to NESCOE, it's important to keep in mind that they are limited by their charter and funding to issues associated with ISO.

With respect to CONEG vs NEC ECP structure, it's such a small community that we can figure out how to work under two slightly different structures.

Hope that's somewhat helpful. I have worked on NICE but haven't done anything with CONEG as a stand alone group.