FINAL

Pursuant to notice duly given, a meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, March 5, 2020, at the Colonnade 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.

Ms. Nancy Chafetz, Chair, presided and Mr. David Doot, Secretary, recorded. Ms. Chafetz referenced the ongoing concerns with the spread of the COVID-19 coronavirus and noted NEPOOL with ISO-NE was monitoring the situation closely. At that time, NEPOOL planned to proceed with its in-person Participants Committee meetings in April and its Summer Meeting in June, but would continue to monitor the situation closely, either cancelling meetings or holding them by teleconference if and as future circumstances warranted.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 6, 2020 MINUTES

Ms. Chafetz referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the February 6, 2020 teleconference meeting, as circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes of the February 6, 2020 meeting were unanimously approved as circulated.

CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Chafetz 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 unanimously approved without comment.

ISO COO REPORT

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), reviewed highlights from the March COO report, which was circulated in advance of the meeting and posted on the NEPOOL and ISO websites. He noted that, based on data through February 26, 2020 (except where otherwise noted): (i) Energy Market value was \$212 million, down \$86 million from January 2020 and down \$154 million from February 2019; (ii) average natural gas prices over the period were 21 percent lower than January average values; (iii) average Real-Time Hub LMPs (\$20.37/MWh) were 22 percent lower than January averages; (iv) average daily (peak hour) Day-Ahead cleared physical Energy, as a percent of forecasted load, was 100 percent in February, up from 99.6 percent in January; and (v) daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) for February totaled \$883,000, down \$791,000 from January 2020 and down \$1 million from February 2019. February 2020 NCPC, which was 0.4 percent of total Energy Market value, was comprised of (a) \$825,000 in first contingency payments, down \$791,000 from January.

Dr. Chadalavada noted that, like December, February's weather was mild. In fact, there were three instances in February where the minimum load occurred during mid-day rather than overnight, which was a trend that the ISO anticipated would continue with the growing deployment of behind-the-meter solar generation. Responding to a question he received before the meeting regarding negative LMPs during several mid-day hours, he explained that those prices resulted primarily from improved photovoltaic forecasting and large amounts of behind-the-meter generation during sunny days.

Addressing NCPC, Dr. Chadalavada noted that, in terms of absolute dollars, February NCPC was the second lowest in the last decade. The previous low of approximately \$600,000 occurred in February 2012. Looking ahead, he noted the possibility for increased out-of-merit commitment and NCPC in the Rhode Island load zone, from March 5 through May 2, 2020, as a result of a planned transmission outage. In response to a question, he identified Line 3520 (which runs from Bellingham to West Medway) as the affected line and explained that the

potential for additional commitments for second contingency protection increased as load levels approached or exceeded 15,000 MW.

Dr. Chadalavada then provided a high-level overview of the Boston 2028 RFP Phase One Proposals received by the deadline the night before. He reported that the ISO received 36 proposals from eight Qualified Transmission Project Sponsors. The in-service dates for the projects proposed ranged from 2023 to 2026 and costs ranged from \$49 million to \$745 million. Dr. Chadalavada indicated that, before additional information could be provided to Participants, additional review of the proposals would be needed, and the ISO would provide what information it reasonably could as soon as that review allowed. He confirmed that timeliness of project completion would be part of the ISO's evaluation, with projected in-service dates and costs higher priority factors in its proposal evaluations.

Dr. Chadalavada concluded his report by highlighting the consistently mild weather experienced during Winter 2019/20. The average temperature over that period was 4.3° F above normal, an average he confirmed did not otherwise mask extremes. There were no impacts resulting from limited natural gas availability and the power system operated well. In response to a question, he noted that there had been insufficient time to weather normalize the data for this presentation but committed to make available weather normalized data with the following month's report.

DISCUSSION OF NEW ENGLAND'S TRANSITION TO THE FUTURE GRID

Referring to materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting, Ms. Chafetz introduced plans under development for future discussions on issues related to New England's transition to a future grid. She explained that, in response to multiple requests for the region to dedicate time and resources to access and explore market and reliability issues in light of evolving state energy and environmental policies, the Sector Vice-Chairs, working closely with

New England States Committee on Electricity (NESCOE) and ISO representatives, had proposed to inform future discussions with a study and assessment of the future state of New England's power system. At highest level, the proposal consisted of asking the ISO to conduct a study on what the system might look like at a set time in the future where States have met their public policy goals. As part of the proposed study process, a gap analysis would be conducted to identify reliability or market deficits, if any, and then to explore potential market approaches to address any identified future gaps. The study process and parameters would be reviewed first in a stakeholder process in which stakeholders would have meaningful opportunities to help develop the various inputs, assumptions and scenarios. Stakeholders would have input into all decision-making as to the modeling. The process would begin in the next month or two at a joint meeting of the Markets and Reliability Committees. Ms. Chafetz also informed the Committee of a contemplated parallel, but separate, discussion. Specifically, at the Participants Committee Summer Meeting, there would be an educational session and discussion on potential market design approaches to consider in light of expected future changes to New England's grid. Ms. Chafetz then requested feedback from Participants on these proposed plans for future discussions.

Ms. Heather Hunt, NESCOE's Executive Director, expressed appreciation and support for the planned study and the opportunity over the summer to begin education and discussion on various potential market options that might help New England States to achieve their carbon reduction goals. She explained the intent of NESCOE's July 2019 request was to initiate proactive and actionable discussion on the future grid and potential market changes to achieve States' goals other than through the reactionary changes that have been directed by the FERC and driven the region's efforts in past years.

Many differing views were shared in discussion. There was broad support for the study proposal that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Numerous members expressed appreciation that action was now being taken in response to the earlier requests on this matter. Many urged that the effort be undertaken expeditiously and with a manageable and transparent timeline reflecting expediency. While many supported the proposed study process, some voiced concern that the region was not moving fast enough on these issues and that debates over study scope and desired scenarios may delay progress. They expressed desire not to wait for study results before exploring potential market design options. Others disagreed, asserting that future action should be based on facts informed by data, and that any future market changes should be tailored to address specific gaps that the study uncovers. A number of members urged that participation in future discussions be broadened to include representatives of environmental interests and potentially others who may not be NEPOOL members. The Committee was encouraged to review prior studies before the scope of the planned study is finalized.

Some members sought assurance that an element of the study would be analysis of whether projected market revenues would be sufficient and certain enough to support the investment and development of new renewable resources sought by the States, without the need for long-term contracts. Two potential market design concepts that were identified for possible future study were carbon pricing and a previously-discussed forward clean energy market. As to the potential of carbon pricing, some expressed concern with the complexity of addressing the increased costs and others questioned whether such an outcome would achieve the desired goal of having predictable market revenues to support the financing of desired new renewable resources.

A number of members urged that the process be communicated and structured to facilitate attendance by officials from each of the six states. They urged further that the process for discussing and defining scope be very transparent with full input by interested parties.

Some members, in response for input on the Summer Meeting agenda, encouraged that the Committee receive reports from various other regional markets working to address similar issues. Others recommended that the discussion include representatives of the financial community who could address what would be needed from the markets to ensure the financeability of desired resources. Some urged that discussion educate the Committee and regulators on the suite of potential market options that might be available to address gaps once they were identified. There was a strong desire for the format to be structured to encourage meaningful and informed participation by state representatives/officials.

At the request of Ms. Chafetz, Ms. Hunt summarized NESCOE's support to begin moving on the request for a study process, which she explained reflected consensus among NEPOOL's elected leaders and NESCOE on a process to begin meaningful discussion now. She said NESCOE was pleased that education on potential market adjustments would begin over the summer. Ms. Hunt went on to underscore NESCOE's intent to include broad transparency and communication on this topic with States and others outside of the NEPOOL membership.

Ms. Chafetz thanked the Committee for its input.

ISO CEO REPORT

Mr. Gordon van Welie, ISO Chief Executive Officer (CEO), referred the Committee to the summaries of the ISO Board and Board Committee meetings that had occurred since the February 6, 2020 Participants Committee meeting, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. There were no questions or comments on the summaries.

Mr. van Welie then reported that the following day he would participate in a media session on the state of the grid. Many of the themes addressed in the ISO's 2020 *Regional Electricity Outlook*, a copy of which had been circulated and posted with the meeting materials, would be addressed.

Referring to the prior discussion of New England's transition to a future grid, Mr. van Welie expressed his satisfaction with the support for the commencement of a study, which he similarly supported. He expected that the study effort would be both exciting and challenging and shared his initial thoughts on the study process. He emphasized his view of the importance to the region of crafting a sophisticated study process that would be repeatable and evergreen, able to be updated and re-run as circumstances and assumptions shift, and informative from both a wholesale power system market design and transmission investment perspective. The study process would need to account for increasing difficulties associated with connecting additional renewable resources, and with the power system's role in the decarbonization of the economy as a whole, particularly the implications of translating those goals into electricity demand and supply. Various scenarios addressing each would need to be developed and updated over time. He predicted that the process would inform and support discussions around the implications of a decarbonized economy on both market design and transmission investment.

A number of members supported his view that the process developed should be evergreen, with lessons learned and changed circumstances able to be reflected and accounted for in subsequent modeling and iterations. The challenge would be to produce something useful in the short run that would also allow for expansion of what needs to be studied and produce a stream of deliverables.

Mr. van Welie then described an ongoing dialogue with some of New England's U.S. senators on the region's market design, which he reported had more particularly been focused

recently on carbon pricing. He described a recent meeting with U.S. Senator Sheldon Whitehouse from Rhode Island, at which those issues were discussed. Mr. van Welie reported that, during that meeting, he had committed to raise with the Participants Committee a possible study of carbon pricing. To that end, he emphasized to the Committee his views on the importance of carbon pricing, the benefits it might have in relieving tensions between wholesale market design and state policy objectives, and the role and timing that such a study might play in the broader discussions that were beginning. He asked for reactions on the possibility of conducting that study as part of, or even separately from, the study process under consideration in the transition to future grid discussions.

Members generally welcomed and supported the proposition that carbon pricing should be studied, though there were a number of concerns raised with, as well as a variety of perspectives as to, how that study could be timed and incorporated. Concerns with carbon pricing centered on its impacts on markets, system operations, cost allocation, and resource financeability, as well as the efficacy and impacts of limiting carbon pricing to the electric power sector. Some articulated perceived benefits of proceeding promptly with such a study, but to do so on a separate track from the study process agreed to by NEPOOL, ISO and NESCOE. Others supported incorporating the study of carbon pricing within the scope of the larger study being initiated, subject to a full vetting, critique and consideration of its role in future paths, without prejudice to current or future positions. Members encouraged the ISO to produce quantitative analyses that address the merits and impacts of carbon pricing in order to support a sorting through of concerns and to help inform discussion on possible end states. Members also urged that future discussions address impacts on existing Tariff obligations, among them the establishment of the Cost of New Entry and Offer Review Trigger Prices.

ADVANCED ENERGY ECONOMY (AEE) MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

Ms. Sarah Bresolin, Chair of the Membership Subcommittee, referred the Committee to materials circulated in advance of the meeting on this topic. She reminded the Committee that AEE had requested to become a NEPOOL member but did not meet the eligibility criteria of any of the six Sectors. The Participants Committee in December had indicated support for AEE membership and encouraged the Subcommittee to explore admission on the same basis as Fuels Industry Participants. Pursuant to that encouragement, the Subcommittee had discussed and recommended that the Participants Committee support AEE's membership on that basis. She reported that some of the Subcommittee members acknowledged that AEE met the definition of Fuels Industry Participant but suggested that the moniker for such Participants ideally should be broadened. She explained that such a change would require amendments to the NEPOOL arrangements, and the Subcommittee decided against seeking further amendments at this time.

The following motion was then duly made, seconded and unanimously approved without further discussion or abstention:

RESOLVED, that, in accordance with Section 1.28A of the Second Restated NEPOOL Agreement, the Participants Committee determines Advanced Energy Economy (AEE) to be a Fuels Industry Participant.

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee approves the membership Application of AEE subject to the following conditions: (i) that AEE sign and return the Standard Membership Conditions, Waivers and Reminders acceptance letter; (ii) that the ISO and NEPOOL counsel find the AEE Application complete; and (iii) that AEE execute an Indemnification Agreement should its requested membership effective date be less than 60 days from date of the membership filing that requests FERC acceptance of the addition of AEE to the list of NEPOOL Participants.

LITIGATION REPORT

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the March 3 Litigation Report circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. He highlighted the following three developments:

- FERC action on numerous FCA14-related matters -- The FERC had denied waivers requested by individual Participants of the qualification rules and rejected challenges to the offer floor prices and mitigation imposed by the Internal Market Monitor on energy storage resources. The FERC encouraged further stakeholder discussion about establishing specific mitigation provisions for energy storage resources. The results of FCA14 were pending before the FERC, with comments on the results filing due on or before April 3, 2020.
- notice that the ISO's Inventoried Energy Program (the Chapter 2B Proposal) took effect by operation of law remained pending before the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals (DC Circuit). In response to member questions on whether the ISO or NEPOOL intended to defend the FERC filing before the DC Circuit (given the absence of a FERC decision), the ISO indicated that it had not intended to advocate in the appeal proceeding unless requested to do so by the FERC. Mr. Doot indicated that NEPOOL, which had not supported the filing initially, and had not taken a position on the filing before the FERC, had intervened in the DC Circuit proceeding to monitor the appeal, but did not intend to advocate for any particular outcome.
- the status of the PJM proceeding in which the FERC had expanded the application of PJM's Minimum Offer Price Rule (MOPR) to certain existing resources, that remained pending before the FERC on rehearing. He noted four NYISO-related orders issued since the last meeting that came to a somewhat different outcome for the New York markets, with the FERC indicating the different circumstances in NYISO versus PJM warranted the different outcomes.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Markets Committee (MC). Ms. Mariah Winkler, the MC Chair, reported that the MC was scheduled to meet twice in March, on March 10–11, and again on March 24, 2020. The key item to be addressed was the Energy Security Improvements proposal and amendments thereto, which would then be presented to the Participants Committee for consideration at its April 2, 2020 meeting.

Budget & Finance Subcommittee (B&F). Ms. Michelle Gardner, B&F Chair, reported that B&F was scheduled to meet on March 26, 2020. Projected topics included a review of the year-to-date progress on the NEPOOL budget, a preview of minor B&F-related Information Policy changes that would be considered subsequently by the Markets Committee, and potential "know your customer" enhancements for new and existing Participants.

Reliability Committee (RC). Mr. Robert Stein, the RC Vice-Chair, reported that the next RC meeting would be March, 17, 2020, at which the RC would receive an ISO-led presentation on FCA14 results.

NEPOOL Generation Information System (GIS) Agreement Working Group. Mr.

Dave Cavanaugh reported that the GIS Agreement Working Group had been meeting to discuss plans following the December 31, 2020 expiration of the amended and restated GIS Administration Agreement between NEPOOL and APX. He explained the Working Group was exploring options to the potential modification and extension of the term of that Agreement. The next teleconference meeting was planned for the next day and he encouraged any interested members to participate in that and future meetings.

Transmission Committee (TC). There was no TC report this month.

Joint Nominating Committee (JNC). Mr. Doug Hurley reminded the Committee that the JNC needed to identify one nominee to fill the seat of Chris Wilson, who was completing his

third full term (and 9th year) on the Board. The JNC was scheduled to meet later in March to select from the list of candidates for that open Board seat those to be interviewed in person in early May.

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,	
David Doot, Secretary	

PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PARTICIPATING IN MARCH 5, 2020 MEETING

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Acadia Center	End User		Deborah Donovan	
American Petroleum Institute	Fuels Industry Part.	Zoe Cadore		
AR Small Load Response (LR) Group Member	AR-LR		Brad Swalwell (tel)	
AR Small Renewable Generation (RG) Group Member	AR-RG	Erik Abend (tel)		
American PowerNet Management	Supplier			Mary Smith, Mike Macrae
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
AVANGRID: CMP/UI	Transmission		Alan Trotta (tel)	
Belmont Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Block Island Utility District	Publicly Owned	Dave Cavanaugh		
Boylston Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
BP Energy Company	Supplier			José Rotger
Braintree Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned			Dave Cavanaugh
Brookfield Renewable Trading and Marketing	Supplier	Aleksandar Mitreski		
Calpine Energy Services, LP	Supplier	Brett Kruse		
Central Rivers Power	AR-RG		Dan Allegretti	
Chester Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
ClearResult Consulting, Inc.	AR-DG	Tamera Oldfield (tel)		
Concord Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Coop.	Publicly Owned	Brian Forshaw		
Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel	End User		Dave Thompson (tel)	
Conservation Law Foundation (CLF)	End User	Jerry Elmer		
CPV Towantic, LLC	Generation	Dan Pierpont (tel)		
Cross-Sound Cable Company (CSC)	Supplier	Dan Trospont (to)	José Rotger	
Danvers Electric Division	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Direct Energy Business, LLC	Supplier	Nancy Chafetz	Dave Cavanagn	
Dominion Energy Generation Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Mike Purdie (tel)		
Enel X North America, Inc.	AR-LR	Greg Geller	Herb Healy (tel)	
ENGIE Energy Marketing NA, Inc.	AR-RG	Sarah Bresolin	(***)	
Eversource Energy	Transmission	James Daly	Cal Bowie	
Excelerate Energy LP	Fuels Industry Part.	builds Bury	Cui Bowie	Gary Ritter
Exelon Generation Company	Supplier	Steve Kirk		
FirstLight Power Management, LLC	Generation	Tom Kaslow		
Galt Power, Inc.	Supplier	José Rotger		
Generation Group Member	Generation	Dennis Duffy	Abby Krich	Bob Stein
Georgetown Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned	Dennis Burry	Dave Cavanaugh	200 Stem
Groton Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
Groveland Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	Supplier		Bob Stein	
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User	Mary Smith	Mike Macrae	Doug Hurley
High Liner Foods (USA) Incorporated	End User	y	William P. Short III	
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Holden Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
Holyoke Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
Industrial Energy Consumer Group (IECG)	End User			Alan Topalian
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	1 opunui
Jericho Power LLC (Jericho)	AR-RG	Mark Spencer		
Littleton (MA) Electric Light and Water Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Entreton (1911) Electric Elgit and Water Department	1 donery Owned	L	Dave Cavanaugn	1

PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PARTICIPATING IN MARCH 5, 2020 MEETING

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department	Publicly Owned	Craig Kieny		Dave Cavanaugh
Long Island Power Authority (LIPA)	Supplier		Bill Killgoar	
Maine Power LLC	Supplier	Jeff Jones (tel)		
Maine Public Advocate's Office	End User	Drew Landry		
Maine Skiing, Inc.	End User			Alan Topalian
Mansfield Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
Maple Energy LLC	AR-LR		Luke Fishback (tel)	Doug Hurley
Marble River, LLC	Supplier		John Brodbeck	
Marblehead Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
Mass. Attorney General's Office (MA AG)	End User	Christina Belew	Benjamin Griffiths	
Mass. Bay Transportation Authority	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Company	Publicly Owned	Brian Thomson		
Merrimac Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Middleborough Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
National Grid	Transmission	Tim Brennan	Tim Martin	
Natural Resources Defense Council	End User	Bruce Ho		
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned	Steve Kaminski (tel)		B. Forshaw; D. Cavanaugh; B. Thomson
New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate	End User			Jason Frost
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	Generation	Michelle Gardner		
North Attleborough Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Norwood Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
NRG Power Marketing LLC	Generation		Pete Fuller	
Pascoag Utility District	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Paxton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
Peabody Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
PowerOptions, Inc.	End User	Heather Takle		
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC	Supplier	Joel Gordon		
Reading Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Repsol Energy North America Company	Fuels Industry Part.		Nancy Chafetz	
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Russell Municipal Light Dept.	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Operations	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
South Hadley Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
Stowe Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Sunrun Inc.	AR-DG	Chris Rauscher (tel)		Pete Fuller
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
The Energy Consortium	End User		Mary Smith	Doug Hurley; Mike Macrae
Verde Group, LLC	Provisional Member		Mike Bedley (tel)	
Vermont Electric Coop.	Publicly Owned	Craig Kieny		Dave Cavanaugh
Vermont Electric Power Company	Transmission	Frank Ettori		
Vermont Energy Investment Corp (VEIC)	AR-LR		Doug Hurley	
Village of Hyde Park (VT) Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Wakefield Municipal Gas & Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
Wallingford DPU Electric Division	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	

PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PARTICIPATING IN MARCH 5, 2020 MEETING

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR/ GROUP	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Wellesley Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Brian Thomson	
Westfield Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Dave Cavanaugh	
Wheelabrator North Andover Inc.	AR-RG			Jim Ginnetti (tel)