

MSC Remarks to MPEC

Tuesday, May 19, 2026

Good morning, Markets+ Participant Executive Committee Members,

For those that don't know me, I am Idaho Commissioner John Hammond, Vice Chair of the Markets+ State Committee. I'm here to share what the MSC has been working on these last few months and make a request on behalf of the committee.

Capacity Building

Towards the end of last year, the MSC and its staff identified a need for additional education and created a capacity building plan to bolster member knowledge of Markets+ ahead of go-live in October 2027. So far, the MSC has held two educational sessions on the history of Markets+ and the tariff development process. In the upcoming sessions, we'll be focusing on governance, price formation fundamentals, and market monitoring. I want to give a big thank you to SPP for all their support in getting these sessions underway, and we look forward to the continued collaboration.

Markets+ Governance

The MSC has also been revisiting a governance issue that was first raised last year. There has been a concern within the MSC that there could be a potential imbalance in representation where one sector could dominate the decision-making and governance of Markets+. Over the years, the MSC has discussed both the substantive merits of the concern itself (could one sector actually dominate Markets+ decisions?) as well as potential pathways to prevent and alleviate such concerns if they ever developed.

The MSC believes the best starting point is to determine the extent of the potential problem and work with members to further address the issue. Accordingly, the MSC approved a motion last year:

Recommending the MPEC direct the Markets+ Interim Governance Task Force (MIGTF) to evaluate the MIP member election process and consider enhancements to the process for review and consideration by the MPEC.

In alignment with the ongoing MIGTF work, the MSC revisited this concern at our in-person meeting last week and reaffirmed member interest in advancing the resolution. The discussion also identified several potential pathways the MPEC and MIGTF could consider if action is warranted. These include:

- Clarifying how and by whom the slate of MIP candidates is approved;

- Establishing criteria and qualifications for MIP candidates; and/or
- Defining guardrails for when and why the MPEC may reject a slate.

At the same time, the MSC recognizes that outlining specific solutions at this stage may be premature relative to the MIGTF's work. The immediate priority is to evaluate whether the current voting structure could result in unintended or undesirable governance outcomes. The MSC would only consider potential remedies after that evaluation is complete and has indicated an openness to a range of approaches, including tariff changes or alternatives that do not require reopening the tariff.

Commission Hammond briefly noted his role on the ROWE Nominating Committee here, along with the broader context that these concerns are not unique to Markets+. States consistently seek governance structures that are balanced, ensure a meaningful role for states, and support transparent, accountable decision-making.

In bringing this forward, the MSC's goal is to be constructive and solution-oriented. We are committed to working collaboratively with the MPEC, the MIGTF, SPP, and the broader Markets+ stakeholder community to ensure the governance framework evolves in a way that is durable, balanced, and broadly supported. We view this as a shared effort and stand ready to partner in evaluating the issue and, if needed, developing practical, workable solutions.

Thank you for your time.