**FINAL**

Pursuant to notice duly given, a meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, September 5, 2024, at the Westin Portland Harborview Hotel, Portland, Maine. 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. Sarah Bresolin, Chair, presided, and Mr. Sebastian Lombardi, Secretary, recorded.

## APPROVAL OF AUGUST 1, 2024 MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Bresolin referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the August 1, 2024 meeting, as circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes of that meeting were unanimously approved as circulated, with an abstention by Mr. Jon Lamson noted.

## CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Bresolin then referred the Committee to the Consent Agenda that was circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Before asking for a motion, Ms. Bresolin asked Mr. Al McBride, ISO-NE Vice President, System Planning, to address the status and implementation of the revisions to Planning Procedure No. 5-6 (PP 5-6) (Orders 2023/2023-A-Related Revisions), the third of the three Consent Agenda Items. Mr. McBride explained that, because the FERC had not yet issued an order on the region's Order 2023 compliance filing, the ISO would put on hold its transition to the proposed new rules and continue its processing of existing interconnection requests under currently-effective Tariff provisions. While the ISO continued to seek support for the PP 5-6 changes, Mr. McBride said that the changes would not be made effective until the FERC issued an order on the Order 2023 compliance filing and the ISO had an opportunity to confirm that the PP 5-6 Revisions are consistent with that order. Any further revisions required by the FERC's order would be discussed and reviewed with the Reliability Committee (RC). Mr. McBride stated that a memo providing more formal notice of, and further guidance and details related to, the suspension of ongoing Order 2023 compliance proposal implementation activities would be circulated to Participants and posted later that day.

A motion to approve the Consent Agenda was then duly made, seconded and unanimously approved as circulated, with an abstention by Mr. Lamson noted.

In response to questions, Mr. McBride assured members that the ISO memo to be released later in the day would provide further guidance and clarity on the impact to the October 11, 2024 deadline under the compliance proposal for interconnection customers to submit an executed Transitional Cluster Study Agreement. Members thanked the ISO for their efforts to incorporate stakeholder feedback into the PP 5-6 Revisions, as well as for their guidance on the path forward in the absence of a FERC order and looked forward to future efforts to advance the coordination and efficiency of the interconnection queue process.

**ISO CEO REPORT**

In the absence of Mr. Gordon van Welie, ISO Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Ms. Maria Gulluni, ISO General Counsel, invited any questions on the September CEO Report, which had been circulated and posted with the materials for the meeting. There were no questions or comments on the CEO Report.

**ISO COO REPORT**

***Operations Report***

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), began by referring the Committee to his September operations report, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Dr. Chadalavada noted that the data in the report was through August 27, 2024, unless otherwise noted. The September report highlighted: (i) that the Peak Hour for August, with 23,758 MW of Revenue Quality Metered (RQM) Data (including settlement-only generation), occurred on August 1, 2024 during the hour ending at 6:00 pm; (ii) August averages for Day-Ahead Hub LMP ($36.11/MWh), Real-Time Hub LMP ($39.06/MWh), and natural gas prices ($1.63/MMBtu); (iii) Energy Market value for August 2024 was $403 million, up from $310 million in August 2023 and down from the updated July 2024 Energy Market value of $674 million; (iv) Ancillary Markets value ($14.3 million) was down from August 2023 ($21.5 million); (v) average Day-Ahead cleared physical energy during the peak hours as percent of forecasted load was 102.5% during August (up from 101.4% reported for July 2024); (vi) Daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) payments for August totaled $3 million, comprised of (a) $2.5 million in first contingency payments, including $439,000 in Dispatch Lost Opportunity Costs, $356,000 in Rapid Response Pricing Opportunity Costs, $327,000 paid to resources at external locations, (b) $66,000 in second contingency payments (protection for South Boston/SEMA due to transmission work), and (c) $412,000 in Distribution payments; and (vii) Forward Capacity Market (FCM) value was $120 million.

Dr. Chadalavada highlighted the heightened impacts that inaccurate weather forecasts could have on days when load levels are high (in the 22,000 - 24,500 MW range), noting by way of example four days in August (August 4, 16, 18, and 28) when there was a substantial deviation from the forecast load during periods of high demand. He explained that fleet performance and load forecasting accuracy each play a significant role in system operation, as would be further demonstrated during his review of the events on August 1.

Turning to transmission outages, Dr. Chadalavada noted three: the first, an outage at Sandy Pond Phase II, which would run from September 23, 2024 to October 14, 2024 and would limit transfer capacity across the Phase II interface to zero in both directions; the second, involving numerous outages on the New York to New England interface starting mid-September and running through the end of October (including ongoing maintenance and construction-driven outages on Lines 352 and 329 (Long Mountain - Frost Bridge and Frost Bridge – Southington) (September 30 to October 21) and on Line 398 (Long Mountain – Cricket Valley) (September 16 to September 29), which would limit transfer capacity in both directions; and third, the continuation of a large generator outage in New Brunswick, which had been further extended to November 15, 2024, and would continue to impact flows in both directions, as discussed at previous Participants Committee meetings.  He encouraged members if interested to visit the ISO's portal to understand the specific limitations during these periods of time.

In response to questions and a request, Dr. Chadalavada provided an update on efforts to implement the Day-Ahead Ancillary Services Initiative (DASI) on March 1, 2025, which he said were going well and were on schedule.  He reported that the ISO had received the final software from General Electric and was in the process of its comprehensive testing process and adjustments.  He highlighted that a DASI testing environment (sandbox) would come online in October to facilitate Participants' training and preparation to use the DASI interface.  Dr. Chadalavada committed the ISO to circulate information with project updates and highlighting some of the key dates/milestones that would precede the expected March 1, 2025 implementation date.

***August 1, 2024 OP-4 Event and Capacity Scarcity Condition***

Referring to the separate materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting, Dr. Chadalavada provided a more detailed description and summary of the August 1 Capacity Scarcity Condition and implementation of Operating Procedure No. 4 (Action During a Capacity Deficiency) (OP-4). He explained that, while the ISO began the day with a thin capacity surplus (approximately 320 MW, including 160 MW of supplemental reserves), approximately 750 MW of generator outages and reductions (from the time the Morning Report was issued to the time that the Scarcity Event played out), together with higher-than-forecasted temperatures and loads during peak hours (temperatures 1-2°F higher; loads 1-2% above forecast), eventually triggered 10-minute Reserve Constraint Penalty Factor (RCPF) and 30-minute RCPF violations for several five-minute intervals between 16:55 and 19:20, and resulted in a Master/Local Control Center Procedure No. 2 (Abnormal Conditions Alert) (M/LCC 2) declaration and implementation of OP-4.

Dr. Chadalavada reported that the average Balancing Ratio ((Load + reserve requirement) / Capacity Supply Obligation (CSO) (excluding Energy Efficiency resources)) during the August 1 event was 89.6%. Pay-for-Performance (PFP) charges to underperforming FCM resources totaled approximately $49.9 Million, with the Balancing Fund (the surplus collection or the difference between payments and charges, allocated to CSOs) at $1.7 million. He added that approximately 34% of the resources performed greater than or equal to their expected requirements (their Balancing Ratio exceeded their adjusted CSO); 66% underperformed. He compared those percentages to the June 18, 2024 Capacity Scarcity Condition, where 26% over-performed and 74% underperformed.

Dr. Chadalavada then reviewed information from the last few OP-4/Capacity Scarcity Conditions, which illustrated that those events closely follow resource outages occurring within two hours of a day's peak load. He hoped that the information would assist Market Participants in evaluating/hedging risk and to focus/inform internal strategies related to resources in the Market. He also reviewed report and notification enhancements under consideration, including enhancements to the reporting mechanisms for Real-Time Only export curtailments, to the reporting of daily forecasted surplus values (to include all, rather than just the peak, hours of the day), and the earlier release of information otherwise included in the Morning Report, following the close of the Day-Ahead Market.

In response to questions, Dr. Chadalavada clarified how, over time, changes to the resource mix had impacted operational flexibility to meet loads during peak hours. He opined that proposed Day-Ahead reserve products would have helped, but a 90-minute reserve product would have avoided all together the August 1 Capacity Scarcity Condition. He emphasized the transitory nature of the peak hour August 1 event, which in no way suggested that the system was in, or had approached, an energy deficiency. He explained further how equipment outages on August 1, which had begun prior to and thus were expected on August 1, but otherwise would not be expected during hot summer months, had further reduced operational flexibility that day. With respect to impacts on August's first contingency costs, Dr. Chadalavada estimated that roughly $600,000 to $800,000 of total first contingency costs were incurred on August 1.

Dr. Chadalavada also noted the contribution of utility demand response that provided load relief of approximately 300 MW, which for 45 minutes brought the system up to a modest surplus until the loss of the additional 400 MW during the hour ending 19:00. He noted that the ISO's load forecasting algorithm was learning from these calls made by the utilities, forecasts were improved by predictable calls, though subject to mismatch if unpredictable. He confirmed that load was consistently buying up to the forecasted amount on an hourly basis, with Day-Ahead cleared physical energy during the peak hours as percent of forecasted load often in the high 90s, if not more -- a big improvement over past experience. In response to a member's request, Dr. Chadalavada agreed to consider adding the amount of capacity shortfall to the summary of Capacity Scarcity Condition intervals.

A member provided feedback that, because small temperature fluctuations could also have a fairly significant impact on certain generators operating at or near their thermal limitations, any improvements or expansion of the sharing/reporting of updated temperature forecasts, or improvements to the processes impacted by such temperature changes, would be beneficial to the region generally and to impacted generators specifically. In response to another question related to temperature impacts on ambient ratings and performance, Dr. Chadalavada agreed that the supply fleet would be impacted during times when temperatures are in the 90s, with high dew points, potentially resulting in unplanned forced outages in the 1-1.5 GWh range as seen during the August 1 Capacity Scarcity Event. He suggested that experience would likely be repeated, so that when forecasts call for tight conditions (load in the 21-24 GWh range), he recommended that Market Participants not only pay close attention to the surplus and planned outages identified in the Morning Report, and how loaded the ties might be for that day, but to also make allowances for unplanned forced outages of this magnitude when making operational plans for their resources. A member also requested that, as the ISO considers accelerating the release of certain information included in the Morning Report, it effort to also include in the 21-day and 7-day forecasts information on uncommitted available generation that is more consistent with how that availability information is accounted for and included in the Morning Report.

In response to a question related to potential differences in how Market Participants were compensated for violations of the System 30-Minute Operating Reserve constraint or the System 10-Minute Operating Reserve constraint during the identified five-minute intervals on August 1, Dr. Chadalavada committed the ISO to provide clarification on the compensation mechanics as soon as practicable. In response to a final set of questions, he estimated that, of the generators shown as available for August 1, approximately 3-4 GW were not able to be dispatched during the needed peak hours due to startup and/or notification limitations.

**2025 ISO AND NESCOE BUDGETS**

Mr. Tom Kaslow, Budget & Finance Subcommittee (B&F) Chair, referred the Committee to the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting related to the proposed 2025 ISO and NESCOE Budgets. He reported that the 2025 ISO Capital and Operating Budgets (ISO Budgets) had been reviewed and considered at B&F's August 9, 2024 meeting. He reported that no objections or concerns had been raised with respect to either those Budgets or to NESCOE's 2025 Budget, which had also been presented at that meeting. He said that the Budgets were scheduled for consideration and action at the October Participants Committee meeting.

Addressing the status of the 2025 ISO Budgets process, Mr. Bob Ludlow, ISO Chief Financial and Compliance Officer, referred members to the summary included with the meeting materials, which was largely consistent with what was shared with the Participants Committee at the June Summer Meeting. He said that the key changes to the ISO's Operating Budget since June related to refinements to professional fees, licensing (largely cyber security licensing) and employee full-time equivalent (FTE) estimates. Mr. Ludlow also remarked that, to address certain challenges associated with onboarding new employees, and given funds available resulting from an under-spend in 2024, the ISO had accelerated some of its planned hiring into

2024, allowing the ISO to benefit from a fuller FTE complement heading into 2025. The Capital Budget, he explained, reflected a $42.5 million program (up from the $40 million presented in June), reflecting improvements needed to address the workspace issues previously discussed, including improvements related to moving planning functions to the Windsor (backup control center) Campus, which would be more efficiently financed as part of the capital program.

Mr. Ludlow reported that, as part of its budget process, the ISO had also met with New England State Officials. He referred the Committee to the Questions and Answers that had emerged from that discussion and that had been included with the meeting materials. Next steps in the budget process would include: (i) receipt of State comments, which would be shared with the ISO Board at its next Board meeting; (ii) distribution to Participants of the projected 2025 revenue requirement and the resulting increases to Schedules 1-3 to Section IV of the ISO's Tariff (its Administrative Costs tariff); (iii) a Participants Committee vote at its October 10 meeting; (iv) final action by the Board promptly thereafter; and (v) a mid-October FERC filing.

There were no questions or comments on the ISO's or NESCOE's 2025 Budgets.

**ISO FAP REVISIONS TO MITIGATE RISK OF PFP PENALTY PAYMENT DEFAULTS**

Mr. Kaslow then summarized the B&F process preceding the ISO's proposed revisions to the Financial Assurance Policy (FAP) that would modify the PFP financial assurance provisions (FCM Delivery FA) by introducing a corporate liquidity assessment to evaluate PFP penalty default risk that could result in additional financial assurance requirements for higher-risk Market Participants (Corporate Liquidity Revisions) and modify the intra-month collateral (IMC) variable in the FCM Delivery FA formula to prevent unnecessary collateral spikes (IMC Revisions) (together, the ISO FAP Revisions).

At the March B&F meeting, the ISO presented specific proposed modifications to the FAP, to become effective June 1, 2025, that would modify FA requirements for capacity sellers that are not determined to have adequate corporate liquidity relative to their potential PFP obligations. In discussion at the B&F's April and May meetings, some Participants expressed concern with the ISO's initial proposal, which included a magnitude of liquidity or required collateral that they believed would exceed reasonable expectations of default risk, could unfairly add new obligations to new capacity sales transactions, or might have been a more expensive option than permitting faster transfer of CSOs to reduce default risk. NEPGA subsequently proposed a number of amendments to the ISO proposal, including proposed modifications to (i) change the proposed effective date to coincide with start of the Capacity Commitment Period (CCP) for FCA19, (ii) permit shorted lead time transfers of CSOs to reduce future period PFP exposure and default risk; and (iii) extend the period over which large magnitude PFP charges could be paid by capacity sellers (subsequently dropped and not being offered for consideration at this meeting). At the July B&F meeting, the ISO presented a revised proposal that took into account the PFP default risk-decreasing effects of portfolio diversity and was the starting point for Committee consideration at this meeting. While some supported this revised proposal, the ISO FAP Revisions, a majority of those who spoke at the B&F meeting articulated a preference for the alternative timing for implementation proposed by NEPGA.

Because one of the NEPGA amendments to be considered at this meeting involved Markets Committee (MC) review, Ms. Emily Laine, MC Chair, provided a summary of the MC's consideration of that separate proposal (the NEPGA CSO Bilateral Amendment). She further reported that, at its August 6 meeting, the MC considered, but did not recommend Participants Committee support for, the ISO FAP Revisions.

Summarizing for the ISO, Mr. Ludlow highlighted the effects that the ISO expected to see as a result of the ISO FAP Revisions, which were focused on adequate liquidity in Participants with CSOs. He suggested that roughly 20% of CSO holdings would not be impacted, 70% would have parent entities that would have an opportunity to provide parent guarantees to cover the risk of the CSOs, leaving 10% with no other opportunity than to seek an increase in liquidity or fund increased collateral requirements.

In response to clarifying questions, Mr. Chris Nolan, ISO Director, Market and Credit Risk, confirmed that the 70% figure represented the percentage of Participants that could receive a parent guarantee, but not necessarily the percentage that would actually receive a parent guarantee. Thus, the percentage of Participants that would have to ensure increased liquidity or fund increased collateral requirements would be higher than the 10% initially identified.

The following motion was then duly made and seconded:

> RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the revisions to the ISO New England Financial Assurance Policy (FAP Revisions), as proposed by the ISO and as circulated to this Committee in advance of this meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be approved by the Chair of the Budget & Finance Subcommittee.

***NEPGA Effective Date Amendment***

With the main motion before the Committee, the Chair invited a NEPGA representative to introduce the first of its amendments, as described in the materials circulated in advance of the meeting, to make the FAP Revisions effective as of June 1, 2028 (coinciding with the FCA19 Capacity Commitment Period (CCP)), rather than June 1, 2025 (the NEPGA Effective Date Amendment). That member explained NEPGA’s view that imposing an incremental FA requirement on CSO holders was likely in violation of the FERC’s filed rate doctrine and unlikely to pass FERC scrutiny.

In response to a member's questions, Mr. Lombardi clarified the thresholds required for Committee support for the NEPGA Effective Date Amendment (66.67%) as well as on the expected second motion to amend Market Rule 1 (60%) and on the overall ISO FAP Revisions if and as amended (66.67%). A motion to approve the NEPGA Effective Date Amendment was then duly made and seconded.

Members then discussed the NEPGA Effective Date Amendment. Those supporting the NEPGA Effective Date Amendment argued that the Amendment recognized the commercial reality that the ISO's proposed changes add additional costs that could not have been, and were not, priced into auctions that had already been conducted; putting the fundamental commerical doctrine underlying the filed rate doctrine squarely in play. Others suggested that the ISO was underplaying the magnitude of the proposed changes and increase in FA requirements, with the inability to recover the costs of the proposal and the uncertainty of requirements associated with CSOs likely to undermine confidence in the markets.

Many also opposed the NEPGA Effective Date Amendment. While they expressed sympathy for the logic behind NEPGA's Amendment, some found that addressing the clearinghouse-type risk currently being assumed by Market Participants outweighed the concerns expressed, and they were generally unwilling to take on the significant Payment Default risk that would accompany any such delay. The ISO explained its opposition, particularly in light of increasing PFP penalty rates, to a delay in addressing the risks identified.

The NEPGA Effective Date Amendment was then voted and did not pass with a 48.02%[1] Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 16.67%; Transmission Sector – 0%; Supplier Sector –

11.11%; AR Sector – 16.67%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector – 0%; End User Sector – 3.57%;[1] and Provisional Members – 0.00%). (*see* Vote 1 on Attachment 2).

***NEPGA CSO Bilateral Amendment***

The Committee considered a second motion by NEPGA to amend the main motion so as to allow a Market Participant to submit a CSO Bilateral up to five business days before the Obligation Month and require the ISO to complete its Tariff-mandated review within five Business Days of receiving the CSO Bilateral in order to shorten the lead time for CSO transfers (NEPGA CSO Bilateral Amendment).

The NEPGA representative explained that the NEPGA CSO Bilateral Amendment would faciliate more nimble trading of those positions and would allow Market Participants subject to incemental FA requirements to better manage their monthly and FA positions. The NEPGA CSO Bilateral Amendment was then duly moved and seconded.

An AR Sector member commended NEPGA for proposing to address what was not, in his view, addressed by the ISO's collateralization proposal design, namely managing risk through markets. Others, echoing those sentiments, supported the NEPGA CSO Bilateral Amendment because it would allow Paricipants to manage additional financial requirements through liquidity in the markets, would in their view mitigate risk, significantly improve and complement the ISO's proposal, and was thus worthy of the efforts required to implement the Amendments.

Though generally supportive of the overall substance or goals of the NEPGA CSO Bilateral Amendment, other members pointed to the tight work plan and significant efforts ahead

[1] The Vote percentage increased slightly from the percentage announced during the meeting, reflecting three fewer votes in opposition cast by proxy (incorrectly registered during the meeting) in the End User Sector; the Vote outcome was not impacted.

of the region, including the implementation of Capacity Auction Reforms (CAR), which could be adversely impacted by the efforts required to implement the NEPGA CSO Bilateral Amendment, as influencing their decision not to support the Amendment at that time. Some suggested that the NEPGA CSO Bilateral Amendment could and should be addressed as part of the larger CAR project.

On behalf of the ISO, Mr. Nolan explained the challenges presented by adopting the NEPGA CSO Bilateral Amendment, which included a not insignificant effort to understand the impacts on ISO systems and processes. The ISO believed that the NEPGA CSO Bilateral Amendment could be considered as part of the broader efforts toward a prompt and seasonal market design, but opposed pursuing the CSO Bilateral Amendment at this time.

The CSO Bilateral Amendment was then voted and did not pass with a 53.87%[1] Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 16.67%; Transmission Sector – 0%; Supplier Sector – 14.58%; AR Sector – 16.67%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector – 0%; End User Sector – 5.95%;[1] and Provisional Members – 0.00%). (*see* Vote 2 on Attachment 2).

***Unamended Main Motion (ISO FAP Proposal)***

Members offered final thoughts on the unamended ISO FAP Proposal. Certain members thanked the ISO for their time and effort explaining and refining the ISO FAP Proposal, including reflecting Participant feeback received along the way. Others reiterated their concerns with the ISO's proposed effective date, the inability of some Participants to lean on affiliate relationships for credit support, and the failure of the ISO FAP Proposal to incorporate additional market mechanisms to mitigate the penalty payment default risk. A Supplier Sector member suggested that the impacts from an increasing PFP penalty rate and overall market design choices could have been addressed differently, particularly as to how the penalty payment default risk would be spread or allocated, and could have been limited to those participating in the capacity market.

There being no further discussion, the unamended ISO FAP Proposal was voted and failed to pass with a 62.50% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 0%; Transmission Sector – 16.67%; Supplier Sector – 12.50%; AR Sector – 0%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector – 16.67%; End User Sector – 16.67%; and Provisional Members – 0.00%). (*see* Vote 3 on Attachment 2).

The Committee then broke for a brief lunch recess and subsequently reconvened to address the following:

**NEPOOL GIS HOURLY CERTIFICATES RULE CHANGES**

Ms. Samantha Regan, NEPOOL Counsel, referred the Committee to, and summarized the materials circulated and posted in advance of the meeting related to, Constellation's request for Committee approval of changes to the Generation Information System (GIS) and the GIS Operating Rules to accommodate the tracking of certificates on an hourly basis through a separate register maintained by APX, Inc. (GIS Administrator). She explained that, under the proposed GIS rule changes, only generators opting in to the tracking would be subject to hourly tracking and generators could later opt out of hourly tracking. She further stated that the GIS Administrator estimated that the hourly certificates rule changes would take 1,245 development hours to implement, and would be covered in part by the remaining annual allotted development hours for 2024 and 2025, leaving a remaining estimated cost of roughly $75,000.

Ms. Laine noted that the GIS hourly tracking proposal was first referred by the MC to the GIS Operating Rules Working Group in August 2022. Following refinements, she reported that the MC considered, but did not recommend, Participants Committee approval of the rule changes at its July 2024 summer meeting by a vote just short of the requisite two-thirds threshold.

Members asked clarifying questions related to the creation of the hourly certificates and what kinds of resources would be able to opt in/be available for supply. In response, Ms. Regan clarified that rounding of hourly certificates would occur so that only whole MWh certificates would be retired. She further noted that only Market Settlement System (MSS) Generators would be permitted to opt in to hourly tracking. The Constellation representative added that a NEPOOL Generator that is a zero emissions generator may opt to have their hourly generation tracked, but the hourly tracking would not be tied to an RPS program and therefore an hourly generator that is not enrolled in an RPS program would still be able to opt in to hourly tracking.

Ms. Bresolin invited the proposal sponsor to provide any additional remarks. The Constellation representative emphasized her view that the voluntary, more granular tracking of energy production and consumption would lead to more informed decisions regarding clean energy investment, procurement and deployment. She also noted that the ecosystem for hourly accounting was growing nationally, and approving and implementing the hourly tracking of Certificates regionally would be a natural next step and would ensure that the region would continue to be a leader in generation resource tracking.

The following motion was then duly made and seconded:

> RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee approves the changes to the NEPOOL Generation Information System (GIS) and the NEPOOL GIS Operating Rules proposed and discussed at this meeting related to transferring Certificates on an hourly basis, with such non-material changes thereto as the Chair of the Participants Committee may approve.

In discussion, members expressed both willingness and reluctance to support the GIS rule changes. Those supporting the hourly tracking proposal suggested that it could drive investment for resources in the region, provide resources with an additional value stream, and would advance the region into the future of certificate trading as other RTOs had already implemented hourly tracking. Explaining that the hourly tracking changes would facilitate voluntary transactions between willing buyers and willing sellers for a legitimate product, one member stressed that the proposal was consistent with the foundational purpose of the region's arrangements. Those inclined not to support the proposal focused on potential upward price pressure on GIS certificates in the market, the potential for the hourly tracking to become mandatory instead of voluntary, and concerns with hourly certificates not rounding or "banking" until reaching 1 MWh for retirement. Some members suggested that a working group effort could be established to subsequently address the rounding-related concerns raised.

Without further discussion, the motion was then voted and was approved, with a 70.47% Vote in favor (Generation Sector – 15.00%; Transmission Sector – 16.67%; Supplier Sector – 15.00%; AR Sector – 13.80%; Publicly Owned Entity Sector – 1.67%;[2] End User Sector – 8.77%;[2] and Provisional Members – 0.00%). (*See* Vote 4 on Attachment 2.)

**GOVERNANCE ONLY END USER MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION**

Mr. Brad Swalwell, Membership Subcommittee Chair, referred the Committee to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting related to approval of the application for Governance Only End User membership (Application) by Alan Sliski (Applicant). He also referred to material from certain End User Sector representatives whose opposition to Subcommittee approval of the Application pursuant to the Subcommittee's delegated authority prompted Participants Committee consideration of the Application. Mr. Swalwell explained that Applicant was a Massachusetts residential customer of Eversource who has solar panels on the

---

[2] The Vote percentage in favor on the NEPOOL GIS Hourly Certificate Rule Changes reflected herein also increased slightly from the percentage announced during the meeting, reflecting, in addition to the three fewer votes in the End User Sector as noted in fn. 1, an abstention (instead of an erroneously marked opposition) by one Publicly Owned Entity Sector Participant; the Vote outcome was not impacted.

roof of his home (Rooftop System). Applicant had applied to become a Governance Only End User Participant, and his Application, together with data on his consumption in relation to the production of his Rooftop System, had been considered over the course of two Subcommittee meetings. The Application was before the Participants Committee in light of some concern and disagreement amongst Subcommittee members as to whether Applicant met the definition of End User Participant and was or should be eligible for membership in the End User Sector.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

> RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee approves the application of Alan Sliski (Applicant) to be a Governance Only End User (Application) subject to the following conditions: (1) that NEPOOL Counsel and the ISO find the Application complete; (2) that the Applicant sign and return the Standard Membership Conditions, Waivers and Reminders letter; and (3) that Applicant execute an Indemnification Agreement to permit an expedited membership effective date.

Those with concerns and/or opposed to approving the Application for End User Sector membership identified characteristics of the Application that, for them, called into question whether End User Sector membership was appropriate, either definitionally or as a policy matter. Those that supported approving the Application found that the Application satisfied the eligibility requirements to be an End User Participant and believed that, in this case, Applicant's choice of End User Sector membership was appropriate for the Applicant. While certain members acknowledged that Sector eligibility requirements could reasonably be revisited in the future, they cautioned that revising eligibility requirements might not ensure more accurate Participant groupings (pointing, by way of example, to the variety of interests that already participate in each of the Sectors) and found, at least in the circumstances presented, that such efforts were not warranted.

Without further discussion, the Application was approved by a show of hands, with oppositions registered by Maine Power, Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited, and the following additional Market Participant End Users: Bath Iron Works, Elektrisola, Garland Manufacturing, Hammond Lumber, The Moore Company, St. Anselm College, and Shipyard Brewing. An abstention by Mr. Lamson was also recorded.

## LITIGATION REPORT

Mr. Lombardi referred the Committee to the September 3, 2024 Litigation Report that had been circulated and posted before the meeting. He highlighted the following three developments: (i) Committee-supported DASI Conforming Changes had been filed jointly by the ISO and NEPOOL (ER24-2883), with any comments due on or before September 17, 2024; (ii) the FERC had set for settlement judge procedures the pending waiver request filed by Canal Marketing to enable it to withdraw Canal 3 from the Winter 2023-24 Inventoried Energy Program (IEP) and return the net revenues it had received for that participation; and (iii) numerous Petitions for Review of FERC *Order 1920* (Transmission Planning Reforms), filed in nearly all of the US District Courts of Appeal, had been consolidated and assigned to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals by the Federal Courts' Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation. Mr. Lombardi encouraged anyone with questions on any matter in the Litigation Report to reach out to NEPOOL Counsel.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

***Markets Committee.*** Mr. Bill Fowler, MC Vice-Chair, reported that the next MC meeting would be on September 10, 2024 at the DoubleTree Hotel in Westborough. He indicated that key topics would include discussion on the work scope of the Capacity Auction

Reforms (CAR) project, introduction to DASI-conforming changes to the manuals, and a presentation by the Internal Market Monitor on its Spring 2024 Quarterly Markets Report.

***Reliability Committee.*** Mr. Bob Stein, RC Vice-Chair, reported that the RC would next meet on September 17, 2024, also at the Westborough DoubleTree. In addition to the RC's regular business items to review proposed plan and transmission cost allocation applications, the RC would review revisions to the Coordination Agreement with New Brunswick, and changes to certain operating and planning procedures.

***Transmission Committee (TC).*** Mr. Dave Burnham, TC Vice-Chair, reported that the TC would next meet on September 25, 2024 by Webex/teleconference, with key topics for discussion to include Order 881-conforming Tariff changes and compliance with Order 1920.

***Budget & Finance Subcommittee.*** Mr. Kaslow reported that the B&F had no scheduled meetings in September. The next scheduled meeting was October 11, 2024.

***Membership Subcommittee.*** Mr. Brad Swalwell, Membership Subcommittee Chair, reported that the next Membership Subcommittee meeting would be by Zoom on September 16, 2024.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT – PAUL ROBERTI

Ms. Bresolin announced that Mr. Paul Roberti, End User Vice-Chair, would be leaving the Rhode Island Division of Public Utilities Carriers for the private sector, which would take him away, at least for the foreseeable future, from the NEPOOL table. She thanked Mr. Roberti for his service over the past two years as a NEPOOL officer, noted that he would be missed, and invited him to attend a future Participants Committee meeting, particularly one convening in his home state of Rhode Island. The Committee congratulated and thanked Mr. Roberti with a round of applause.

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

Mr. Lombardi advised members that the remaining Participants Committee meetings for 2024 would all be held in Boston, with the October 10 meeting at the Renaissance Boston Waterfront, the November 7 meeting at the Seaport Hotel (preceded the day before by the ISO's Annual Public Board meeting, and the morning of by the Sector meetings with the ISO Board and State Officials) and the December Annual Meeting at the Colonnade Hotel.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 2:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_______________________________
Sebastian Lombardi, Secretary

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PARTICIPATING IN THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2024 MEETING**

| PARTICIPANT NAME | SECTOR/ GROUP | MEMBER NAME | ALTERNATE NAME | PROXY |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Acadia Center | End User | Joe LaRusso (tel) | | Claire Lang-Ree (tel) |
| Advanced Energy United | Associate Non-Voting | | Alex Lawton (tel) | |
| AR Renewable Generation (RG) Large Group Seat | AR-RG | | Aidan Foley (tel) | |
| Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| AVANGRID: CMP/UI | Transmission | Alan Trotta | Jason Rauch | |
| Bath Iron Works | End User | | | Gus Fromuth |
| Belmont Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Block Island Utility District | Publicly Owned Entity | Dave Cavanaugh | | |
| Boylston Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | Matt Ide (tel) | | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| BP Energy Company | Supplier | | | José Rotger |
| Braintree Electric Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Brookfield Energy Trading and Marketing LLC | Supplier | Aleks Mitreski | | |
| Castleton Commodities Merchant Trading | Supplier | | | Bob Stein |
| Chester Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| CLEAResult Consulting, Inc. | AR-DG | Tamera Oldfield (tel) | | |
| Clearway Power Marketing LLC | Supplier | | | Pete Fuller |
| Concord Municipal Light Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Coop. | Publicly Owned Entity | Brian Forshaw (tel) | | |
| Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel | End User | | Jamie Talbert-Slagle | |
| Conservation Law Foundation (CLF) | End User | Phelps Turner | | |
| Constellation Energy Generation (Constellation) | Supplier | Gretchen Fuhr | Bill Fowler | |
| CPV Towantic, LLC | Generation | Joel Gordon | | |
| Cross-Sound Cable Company (CSC) | Supplier | | José Rotger | |
| Danvers Electric Division | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| DTE Energy Trading, Inc. | Supplier | | | José Rotger |
| Dynegy Marketing and Trade, Inc. | Supplier | Ryan McCarthy | | Bill Fowler |
| Earthjustice | End User | | Ada Statler (tel) | |
| ECP Companies<br>Calpine Energy Services, LP<br>New Leaf Energy | Generation | Andy Gillespie | Alex Chaplin (tel) | Bill Fowler |
| Elektrisola, Inc. | End User | | Gus Fromuth | |
| Emera Energy Services | Supplier | | | Bill Fowler |
| Engie Energy Marketing NA, Inc. | AR-RG | Sarah Bresolin | | |
| Environmental Defense Fund | End User | Jolette Westbrook (tel) | | |
| Eversource Energy | Transmission | | Dave Burnham (tel) | |
| FirstLight Power Management, LLC | Generation | Tom Kaslow | | |
| Galt Power, Inc. | Supplier | José Rotger | Jeff Iafrati (tel) | Steve Conant (tel) |
| Garland Manufacturing Company | End User | Gus Fromuth | | |
| Generation Bridge Companies | Generation | | Bill Fowler | |
| Generation Group Member | Generation | | Abby Krich (tel) | Casey Roberts (tel) |
| Georgetown Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Groton Electric Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Granite Shore Companies | Generation | | | Bob Stein |
| Groveland Electric Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc. (HQUS) | AR-RG | Louis Guilbault (tel) | Bob Stein | |
| Hammond Lumber Company | End User | Gus Fromuth | | |
| Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited | End User | | | Stefan Koester |
| Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Holden Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Holyoke Gas & Electric Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |

ATTACHMENT 1

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES**
**PARTICIPATING IN THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2024 MEETING**

| PARTICIPANT NAME | SECTOR/ GROUP | MEMBER NAME | ALTERNATE NAME | PROXY |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hull Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Icetec Energy Services, Inc. | AR-LR | Doug Hurley | | |
| Industrial Energy Consumer Group | End User | | Todd Griset | |
| Ipswich Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Jericho Power LLC (Jericho) | AR-RG | Ben Griffiths | | |
| Lamson, Jon | End User | Jon Lamson (tel) | | |
| Littleton (MA) Electric Light and Water Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) | Supplier | Bill Kilgoar (tel) | | |
| Maine Power LLC | Supplier | Jeff Jones | | |
| Maine Public Advocate's Office | End User | Drew Landry | | Stefan Koester |
| Maine Skiing | End User | | Todd Griset | |
| Mansfield Municipal Electric Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Marble River | Supplier | | John Brodbeck (tel) | |
| Marblehead Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Mass. Attorney General's Office (MA AG) | End User | Jacquelyn Bihrle | | Jamie Donovan (tel) |
| Mass. Bay Transportation Authority | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Mass. Climate Action Network (MCAN) | End User | | | Casey Roberts (tel) |
| Mass. Dept. Capital Asset Management | End User | | Paul Lopes (tel) | |
| Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Company | Publicly Owned Entity | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) | |
| Mercuria Energy America, LLC | Supplier | | | José Rotger |
| Merrimac Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Middleborough Gas & Electric Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Middleton Municipal Electric Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Moore Company | End User | | | Gus Fromuth |
| Narragansett Electric Co. (d/b/a RI Energy) | Transmission | Brian Thomson | Robin Lafayette (tel) | |
| Natural Resources Defense Council | End User | Claire Lang-Ree (tel) | | |
| Nautilus Power, LLC | Generation | | Bill Fowler | |
| New England Power (d/b/a National Grid) | Transmission | Tim Brennan (tel) | Tim Martin | |
| New England Power Generators Assoc. (NEPGA) | Associate Non-Voting | Bruce Anderson | Dan Dolan | |
| New Hampshire Electric Cooperative | Publicly Owned Entity | | | Brian Forshaw (tel) |
| New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate | End User | Matthew Fossum | | Stefan Koester |
| NextEra Energy Resources, LLC | Generation | Michelle Gardner | Nick Hutchings | |
| North Attleborough Electric Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Norwood Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| NRG Power Marketing LLC | Supplier | | Pete Fuller | |
| Pascoag Utility District | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Pawtucket Power Holding Company | Generation | Dan Allegretti | | |
| Paxton Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Peabody Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| PowerOptions | End User | | | Stefan Koester |
| Princeton Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Reading Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| RI Division of Public Utilities Carriers | End User | Paul Roberti | | |
| Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Russell Municipal Light Dept. | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Saint Anselm College | End User | Gus Fromuth | | |
| Shell Energy North America (US) LP | Supplier | Jeff Dannels (tel) | | |
| Shipyard Brewing LLC | End User | Gus Fromuth | | |
| Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Operations | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Sierra Club | End User | Casey Roberts (tel) | | |

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES**
**PARTICIPATING IN THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2024 MEETING**

| PARTICIPANT NAME | SECTOR/ GROUP | MEMBER NAME | ALTERNATE NAME | PROXY |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| South Hadley Electric Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Sterling Municipal Electric Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Stowe Electric Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Sunrun Inc. | AR-DG | | | Pete Fuller |
| Tangent Energy | AR-LR | Brad Swalwell (tel) | | |
| Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Union of Concerned Scientists | End User | | | Francis Pullaro (tel) |
| Vermont Electric Power Company (VELCO) | Transmission | Frank Ettori (tel) | | |
| Vermont Energy Investment Corporation | AR-LR | | Stefan Koester | |
| Vermont Public Power Supply Authority | Publicly Owned Entity | | | Brian Forshaw (tel) |
| Versant Power | Transmission | Dave Norman | | |
| Village of Hyde Park (VT) Electric Department | Publicly Owned Entity | Dave Cavanaugh | | |
| Wakefield Municipal Gas & Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Walden Renewables Development LLC | Generation | | | Abby Krich (tel) |
| Wallingford DPU Electric Division | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Wellesley Municipal Light Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Westfield Gas & Electric Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Wheelabrator North Andover Inc. | AR-RG | | Bill Fowler | |
| ZTECH, LLC | End User | | Gus Fromuth | |

ATTACHMENT 2

VOTES TAKEN AT
SEPTEMBER 5, 2024 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING

**TOTAL**

| Sector/Group | Vote 1 | Vote 2 | Vote 3 | Vote 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| GENERATION | 16.67 | 16.67 | 0.00 | 15.00 |
| TRANSMISSION | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.67 | 16.67 |
| SUPPLIER | 11.11 | 14.58 | 12.50 | 15.00 |
| ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES | 16.67 | 16.67 | 0.00 | 13.80 |
| PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY | 0.00 | 0.000 | 16.67 | 1.67 |
| END USER | 3.57 | 5.95 | 16.67 | 8.77 |
| | | | | |
| **% IN FAVOR** | **48.02** | **53.87** | **62.50** | **70.91** |

**GENERATION SECTOR**

| Participant Name | Vote 1 | Vote 2 | Vote 3 | Vote 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CPV Towantic, LLC | F | F | O | F |
| ECP Companies | S | S | S | S |
| Calpine | F | F | O | O |
| New Leaf Energy | F | F | O | F |
| FirstLight Power Management, LLC | F | F | A | F |
| Generation Bridge Companies | F | F | O | F |
| Generation Group Member | F | -- | -- | F |
| Granite Shore Power Companies | F | F | A | F |
| Nautilus Power, LLC | F | F | O | F |
| NextEra Energy Resources, LLC | A | F | A | F |
| Pawtucket Power Holding Co. | F | F | O | F |
| Walden Renewables Development | A | -- | -- | -- |
| | | | | |
| IN FAVOR (F) | 9 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| OPPOSED (O) | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| TOTAL VOTES | 9 | 9 | 6 | 9 |
| ABSTENTIONS (A) | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

**ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES SECTOR**

| Participant Name | Vote 1 | Vote 2 | Vote 3 | Vote 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Renewable Generation Sub-Sector** | | | | |
| ENGIE Energy Marketing NA, Inc. | F | F | A | F |
| H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc. | F | A | A | F |
| Jericho Power LLC | F | F | O | O |
| Wheelabrator/Macquarie | F | F | O | F |
| Large RG Group Member | F | F | O | F |
| **Distributed Gen. Sub-Sector** | | | | |
| CLEAResult Consulting, Inc. | A | A | A | A |
| Sunrun Inc. | A | A | A | A |
| **Load Response Sub-Sector** | | | | |
| Icetec Energy Services, Inc. | F | F | O | A |
| Tangent Energy Solutions, Inc. | F | F | O | F |
| Vermont Energy Investment Corp. | A | A | A | A |
| | | | | |
| IN FAVOR (F) | 7 | 6 | 0 | 5 |
| OPPOSED (O) | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| TOTAL VOTES | 7 | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| ABSTENTIONS (A) | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 |

**TRANSMISSION SECTOR**

| Participant Name | Vote 1 | Vote 2 | Vote 3 | Vote 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Avangrid (CMP/UI) | O | A | F | F |
| Eversource Energy | O | O | F | F |
| Rhode Island Energy | O | A | F | F |
| National Grid | O | A | F | F |
| VELCO | O | A | F | A |
| Versant Power | O | A | F | A |
| | | | | |
| IN FAVOR (F) | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 |
| OPPOSED (O) | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL VOTES | 6 | 1 | 6 | 5 |
| ABSTENTIONS (A) | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 |

**SUPPLIER SECTOR**

| Participant Name | Vote 1 | Vote 2 | Vote 3 | Vote 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| BP Energy Company | A | A | A | F |
| Brookfield Renewable Trading & Mktg | F | F | A | F |
| Castleton Comm. Merchant Trading | F | F | A | F |
| Clearway Power Marketing LLC | A | F | A | A |
| Constellation Energy Generation | A | A | A | F |
| Cross-Sound Cable Company | A | A | A | A |
| DTE Energy Trading, Inc. | A | A | A | F |
| Dynegy Marketing and Trade, LLC | F | F | F | A |
| Emera Energy Companies | A | F | A | F |
| Galt Power, Inc. | A | A | O | F |
| LIPA | A | A | A | A |
| Maine Power, LLC | O | O | F | O |
| Marble River, LLC | A | -- | -- | -- |
| Mercuria Energy America, Inc | A | A | A | F |
| NRG Business Marketing, LLC | O | F | F | A |
| Shell Energy North America (US) LP | F | F | A | F |
| | | | | |
| IN FAVOR (F) | 4 | 7 | 3 | 9 |
| OPPOSED (O) | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL VOTES | 6 | 8 | 4 | 10 |
| ABSTENTIONS (A) | 10 | 7 | 11 | 5 |

ATTACHMENT 2

**VOTES TAKEN AT**
**SEPTEMBER 5, 2024 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

**END USER SECTOR**

| Participant Name | Vote 1 | Vote 2 | Vote 3 | Vote 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Acadia Center | F | F | F | F |
| Bath Iron Works | O | O | F | O |
| Conn. Office of Consumer Counsel | A | A | A | F |
| Conservation Law Foundation | A | A | A | F |
| Earthjustice | A | -- | A | F |
| Elektrisola, Inc. | O | O | F | O |
| Environmental Defense Fund | A | A | A | -- |
| Garland Manufacturing Co. | O | O | F | O |
| Hammond Lumber Co. | O | O | F | O |
| Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited | A | F | A | O |
| Lamson, Jon | A | A | A | A |
| Maine Public Advocate Office | A | F | A | F |
| Mass. Attorney General's Office | O | A | F | F |
| Mass. Climate Action Network | -- | -- | -- | F |
| Mass. Dept. of Capital Asset Management | F | F | A | -- |
| Moore Company | O | O | F | O |
| Natural Resources Defense Council | A | A | A | F |
| NH Office of Consumer Advocate | O | A | F | A |
| PowerOptions, Inc. | F | F | A | F |
| RI Division of Public Utilities Carriers | O | O | F | A |
| St. Anslem | O | O | F | O |
| Shipyard Brewing Co. | O | O | F | O |
| Sierra Club | A | A | A | F |
| The Energy Consortium | -- | A | A | A |
| Z-TECH, LLC | O | O | F | O |
| | | | | |
| IN FAVOR (F) | 3 | 5 | 12 | 10 |
| OPPOSED (O) | 11 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| TOTAL VOTES | 14 | 14 | 12 | 19 |
| ABSTENTIONS (A) | 9 | 9 | 12 | 4 |

**PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR**

| Participant Name | Vote 1 | Vote 2 | Vote 3 | Vote 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant | O | O | F | O |
| Belmont Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | F |
| Block Island Utility District | O | O | F | A |
| Boylston Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| Braintree Electric Light Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| Chester Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant | O | O | F | A |
| Concord Municipal Light Plant | O | O | F | F |
| Conn. Municipal Electric Energy Coop. | O | O | F | A |
| Danvers Electric Division | O | O | F | A |
| Georgetown Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| Groton Electric Light Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| Groveland Electric Light Dept. | O | O | F | A |

**PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR (cont.)**

| Participant Name | Vote 1 | Vote 2 | Vote 3 | Vote 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant | O | O | F | A |
| Holden Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| Holyoke Gas & Electric Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| Hull Municipal Lighting Plant | O | O | F | O |
| Ipswich Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| Littleton (MA) Electric Light Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| Littleton (NH) Water & Light Dept. | O | A | F | A |
| Mansfield Municipal Electric Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| Marblehead Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Co. | O | O | F | A |
| Mass. Bay Transportation Authority | O | O | F | A |
| Merrimac Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| Middleborough Gas and Elec. Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| Middleton Municipal Electric Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| New Hampshire Electric Cooperative | O | O | F | A |
| North Attleborough Electric Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| Norwood Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| Pascoag Utility District | O | O | F | A |
| Paxton Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| Peabody Municipal Light Plant | O | O | F | O |
| Princeton Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| Reading Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant | O | O | F | A |
| Russell Municipal Light Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Operations | O | O | F | A |
| South Hadley Electric Light Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| Sterling Municipal Electric Light Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| Stowe (VT) Electric Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant | O | O | F | A |
| Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant | O | O | F | O |
| Vermont Electric Coop. | O | A | F | A |
| VT Public Power Supply Authority | O | O | F | A |
| Village of Hyde Park (VT) Electric Dept. | O | O | F | O |
| Wakefield Municipal Gas and Light Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| Wallingford (CT), Town of | O | O | F | A |
| Wellesley Municipal Light Plant | O | O | F | A |
| West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant | O | O | F | O |
| Westfield Gas & Electric Light Dept. | O | O | F | A |
| | | | | |
| IN FAVOR (F) | 0 | 0 | 51 | 2 |
| OPPOSED (O) | 51 | 49 | 0 | 18 |
| TOTAL VOTES | 51 | 49 | 51 | 20 |
| ABSTENTIONS (A) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 31 |