

FINAL

Pursuant to notice duly given, a meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, February 6, 2025, 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. Sarah Bresolin, Chair, presided, and Mr. Sebastian Lombardi, Secretary, recorded. Ms. Bresolin welcomed the members, alternates and guests who were present, including ISO and State colleagues.

In opening remarks, Ms. Bresolin reported on the opportunity that she, along with Mr. Lombardi, had the week before met in Washington, DC with FERC Chairman Mark Christie, Commissioners Judy Chang, David Rosner, and Lindsay See, and their respective staff. They were also able to meet with other FERC staff, including representatives from the Office of Energy Market Regulation and the Office of Energy Policy and Innovation. The purpose of the meetings was primarily to provide an introduction to NEPOOL, the stakeholder process, and the roles, responsibilities, and relationships in New England. She found that, with the number of new Commissioners and new staff, the meetings proved very valuable. She noted some positive feedback passed along that the stakeholder process in New England was collaborative and beneficial for all the stakeholders in the region. Ms. Bresolin noted also the active engagement by FERC staff, who not only had questions regarding the NEPOOL process, but showed specific interest in the possible extension of the Inventoried Energy Program (IEP), winter reliability in New England generally, as well as the schedule for the Capacity Auction Reforms (CAR) project.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 9, 2025 MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Bresolin referred the Committee to the preliminary minutes of the January 9, 2025 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.

CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Bresolin then 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.

JOINT NOMINATING COMMITTEE UPDATE

Ms. Bresolin welcomed Mr. Brook Colangelo, ISO Board Member, and Chair of the Joint Nominating Committee (JNC) and the ISO Board's Nominating and Governance Committee, who was joined at the meeting by fellow Board members Ms. Cheryl LaFleur, Ms. Catherine Flax, and Mr. Mel Williams, each of whom were eligible and interested in being candidates on the slate of ISO Board Directors to be elected in 2025.

JNC Nomination Process Overview

Referring members to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting, Mr. Colangelo provided an overview of the JNC's role in managing the nomination process, as well as the role of the Board's Nominating and Governance Committee, which included overseeing Board succession and director education, as well as the Board's engagement with stakeholders. Mr. Colangelo outlined the critical factors considered in the selection of Board members, including, in addition to the kinds of expertise identified in the Participants Agreement, diversity of experience and alignment with the organizational mission and values of the ISO. He provided additional detail related to the oversight functions undertaken by the Nominating and Governance Committee and the full Board.

Elaborating on the process by which incumbent Board members are considered for reelection, he reviewed how each director was first required to affirm their wish to be re-nominated and then the rest of the Board was polled regarding the candidates and whether they should stand for reelection. He noted that this process, as well as the Board's evaluation process, mirrored practices observed by S&P 500 companies. Following that process, the ISO Board was prepared in 2025 to seek the reelection of Mmes. LaFleur and Flax and Mr. Williams. He added that each of them was an ISO Board or Board Committee Chair in 2025 (Ms. LaFleur, ISO Board Chair; Ms. Flax, Audit and Finance Committee Chair; and Mr. Williams, Compensation and Human Resources Committee Chair).

Mr. Colangelo highlighted that continuity of directors is important because of the heavy workload that will result from upcoming market changes; and he also noted how the Board's oversight responsibilities would be vital to maintaining effective governance and addressing key challenges in the region's future energy landscape. To meet these demands, the Board schedules seven two-day meetings per year, with additional meetings and commitments beyond those two-day meetings.

Mr. Colangelo then highlighted the JNC schedule planned for 2025. Discussions with the incumbent director candidates began in November, the first meeting of the 2025 JNC was held January 15, and the discussions being held at this meeting were an important step in the process. He said that feedback from the Sectors would be solicited over the coming weeks, with a Participants Committee vote on a JNC-recommended slate of candidates for 2025 projected for the April meeting. After the Participants Committee vote, formal ISO Board action on election would likely occur in May.

Following Mr. Colangelo's presentation, several members offered comments and questions on the JNC process and the three incumbent Board members. In response to a question about his experience with the process, both as a candidate and as the Chair, Mr. Colangelo

expressed his view that the JNC process is very thorough and benefits from a broad range of perspectives, with many stakeholder voices contributing to the discussions. He remarked that the ISO Board is highly active and deeply engaged, requiring a significant time commitment from its members. He stressed the shared responsibility for transforming the region's energy landscape, which falls on all stakeholders' shoulders, particularly those actively engaged around the Participants Committee table, as well as those serving on the Board, making continuity in leadership and engagement critical.

In response to an inquiry regarding Board compensation, Mr. Colangelo acknowledged that compensation for board members of public companies was generally at a higher level, but the ISO Board's lower compensation had proven not as impactful as the Code of Conduct and FERC-related limitations imposed on Board members and candidates, which noticeably limit the pool of candidates. He assured members that the ISO regularly benchmarked its compensation to ensure consistency and alignment with board compensation of comparable organizations.

When asked how the effectiveness of each director is evaluated during the review process, Mr. Colangelo explained that a director's experience, committee work, and overall responsibilities are carefully considered. The vetting of each candidate with, and endorsement by, the Participants Committee were also critical components. Looking ahead to the process for 2026, he said that the search process for a candidate to replace the one incumbent director not eligible for re-election (him), as well as the internal processes for the two directors that could be re-elected in 2026 (Messrs. Craig Ivey and Mark Vannoy) would begin in the Fall of 2025, with JNC discussions likely kicking off in December.

Mr. Colangelo then introduced Ms. Cheryl LaFleur, ISO Board Chair and candidate for election in 2025, to provide further detail on her Board experiences and additional context on the other two Board members up for re-election.

Ms. Cheryl LaFleur

Ms. LaFleur shared her reflections on her almost four years of leadership as Chair of the ISO Board, emphasizing the importance of fostering effective collaboration and healthy debate within the Board. She described the Board's dynamic as one where disagreements are approached constructively, which she found leads to more well-rounded decision-making.

Ms. LaFleur then offered her own comments on Ms. Flax and Mr. Williams, noting the significant contributions both bring to the Board. Ms. LaFleur highlighted Ms. Flax's deep knowledge of financial markets and staying current with new technologies. Ms. LaFleur also spoke to the influence of Ms. Flax's personal background, including her New England upbringing. With regard to Mr. Williams, Ms. LaFleur praised his strong leadership and global insights, as well as his contributions as current Chair of the Compensation and Human Resources Committee. She complimented Mr. William's understanding of leadership, remarking on the fact that he co-wrote a memoir with his father on leadership and their experiences as an African American father-son pair serving in the Navy together. She also noted his strong commitment to shaping the next generation of professionals. Summarizing, she expressed her gratitude for how each of Ms. Flax and Mr. Williams contributed to one of the ISO Board's fundamental goals -- bringing together diverse perspectives to achieve better solutions for the region.

Ms. Catherine Flax

Ms. Flax introduced herself next, noting her 30 years of experience with energy markets and in her role as an ISO Board member. She described the ISO Board as the most effective and professional Board on which she has served, observing the transparent conversations, careful preparation, and active engagement of all members. She discussed the challenge of navigating the political environment and understanding all of the diverse stakeholders involved in the energy space.

In response to questions, Ms. Flax shared her insights into the evolution of the ISO Board, with a growing emphasis on transparency, as exemplified by last year's public board

meeting. She explained that periodic public Board meetings foster organic discourse and allow for more immediate feedback from stakeholders. Ms. Flax also shared her experience serving as the Board's liaison to the State of Connecticut, which facilitated collaboration with state officials on a wide range of issues.

Mr. Mel Williams

Mr. Williams introduced himself, expressing his strong alignment with the mission of the ISO and his dedication to help the region's energy market and grid operations succeed. He reflected on his experience chairing the Compensation and Human Resources (HR) Committee and emphasized the importance of fostering a good organizational culture, which he stated the ISO has. Mr. Williams concluded by sharing his perspective on leadership emphasizing that change is constant but our ability to embrace and steer that change proactively instead of being reactive is key to achieving a higher order of excellence.

General Discussion

Many members expressed appreciation for the candidates' service, the opportunity to engage with the candidates and the candidates' candor on their experiences and insights. One member urged the candidates to carefully consider the importance of oversight and cost and risk allocation related to transmission investment and expansion. In response to a question regarding the Board's approach to long-term succession planning, Ms. LaFleur elaborated on the Compensation and HR Committee's comprehensive review of the ISO's senior management succession plans, and the priority being placed on such planning in connection with the Board's oversight of senior management functions. She noted that change was already underway, with comparatively younger talent emerging and ascending to leadership roles. Mr. Williams added that the Board was focused on maintaining a strong organizational culture during hiring and staffing transitions.

A Supplier Sector member expressed appreciation for the ISO's leadership as a champion and caretaker of the wholesale power market, but also raised concerns about the erosion of competitive markets across North America. A few members expressed previously-articulated reservations with the election of Board members by slate voting as required under the Participants Agreement. Offering parting thoughts, the candidates reaffirmed the Board's commitment to effective leadership and continued collaboration with stakeholders.

ISO CEO REPORT

Mr. Gordon van Welie, ISO Chief Executive Officer (CEO), referred the Committee to the summary of ISO New England Board Committee meeting that had occurred since the January 9 meeting, which had been circulated and posted in advance of this meeting. There were no questions or comments on that summary.

Mr. van Welie raised for a brief update and discussion the recently proposed tariffs on goods originating from Canada and the US, respectively, potentially including energy resource imports from Canada, as set out in a February 1, 2025 executive order signed by President Trump, and the related implications for the New England Market. Ms. Maria Gulluni, ISO General Counsel, reported that in the few days since the executive order was signed, the ISO had been working with other affected ISO and RTOs, as well as outside counsel with expertise in this area, to obtain some clarity on the underlying order and its potential application and impacts. She noted that, earlier that week, an agreement had been reached to postpone the application of the tariffs for 30 days. During this reprieve, the ISO planned to work to get needed clarification from the administration as to the scope and applicability of the proposed tariffs to energy resources, to minimize if and to the extent possible the region's involvement in the billing and collection of duties under the tariff, and otherwise take up how to address any administrative or ISO Tariff changes required as a result of the tariffs.

In response to a member's question, Ms. Gulluni identified potential options to support billing and collection under the proposed tariffs, including use of the data already delivered to the FERC under the eTagging system developed pursuant to *Order 760*. She postulated that, should the FERC take responsibility for the provision of that data to customs and/or border patrol, ISO involvement could be quite minimal. Alternatively, if the role of working with and providing eTag data to customs and/or border patrol were to be the responsibility of the ISO, the ISO would need authority in its Tariff to provide that data to those or any other relevant organization. Similarly, authorization for ISO payment of duties would have to be added to the Tariff. In short, ISO action, including payments, in response to proposed tariffs would likely require further process, guidance from the administration, and FERC authorization.

Elaborating further in response to questions regarding ISO payment of potential duties, Ms. Gulluni explained that the ISO's role as central counterparty was limited and that, if the e-tag system were used to establish the purchaser of energy's identity, the ISO would almost never be the listed purchaser (with the exception of emergency energy transactions). Her hope, therefore, was that the ISO would not be required to play a role in the payment of these duties. She cautioned, however, that if there were to be such a role, the administration would have to so indicate and the ISO would have to revise its Tariff to provide for the authority to collect any such payments or otherwise participate in the tariff duties identification/collection process. She acknowledged that there were many uncertainties regarding the scope of the duties as well as on corollary pricing algorithm impacts, all of which were being or would have to be worked through.

ISO COO REPORT

Operations Report

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada, ISO Chief Operating Officer (COO), began by referring the Committee to his February operations report, which had been circulated and posted in advance of the meeting. Dr. Chadalavada noted that the data in the report was through January 29th, unless otherwise noted. The February report highlighted: (i) that the Peak Hour for January, with 19,639 MW of Revenue Quality Metered (RQM) Data (including settlement-only generation), occurred on January 22, 2025 during the hour ending at 7:00 p.m.; (ii) January averages for Day-Ahead Hub LMP (\$133.45/MWh), Real-Time Hub LMP (\$135.24/MWh), and natural gas prices (\$17.11/MMBtu); (iii) Energy Market value for January 2025 was \$1.5 billion, up from \$838 million in January 2023 and up from the updated December Energy Market value of \$1 billion (average temperatures roughly 5-6° F colder contributing to the increased costs); (iv) Ancillary Services Markets value (\$7.7 million) was down from January 2024 (\$8 million); (v) average Day-Ahead cleared physical energy during the peak hours as a percentage of forecasted load was 98.1% during January (up from 97.3% reported for December 2025); (vi) Daily Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC) payments for January totaled \$7.2 million, comprised of (a) \$7 million in First Contingency payments (including \$937,000 in Dispatch Lost Opportunity Costs, \$681,000 in Rapid Response Pricing Opportunity Costs, and \$2.5 million paid to resources at external locations), (b) \$10,000 in Second Contingency payments totaling, and (c) \$200,000 in Distribution payments; and (vii) a Forward Capacity Market (FCM) value of \$119.7 million.

Dr. Chadalavada noted that because of a cold snap, three consecutive Inventoried Energy Days were triggered on January 20 (average temperature of 17° F), January 21 (average temperature of 10° F), and January 22 (average temperature of 8° F) (those days were approximately 17° below normal). He reported that the system, and particularly the generators,

performed very well. Outages averaged approximately 1,200 MW a day, which was well below what is typically expected on days that cold. He also reported on the peak load on those three days. He attributed the peak load error on January 22 to the temperatures turning warmer than anticipated from early afternoon through the evening. As expected, natural gas prices were high during those three days. 24 million gallons of oil were used from January 14 to January 28. Dr. Chadalavada confirmed that there were no out-of-market commitments during the three-day cold snap.

Dr. Chadalavada then provided an update on the Winter 2024-25 IEP. Inventoried Energy Day (IED) spot net payments for January 20-22 were below average, at \$634,469 in terms of underperformance in aggregate, and resulted in a slight reduction to overall program costs, from \$78.8 million to \$78.4 million.

In response to questions, Dr. Chadalavada confirmed that liquefied natural gas (LNG) injections during January were from both Everett (into the Cambridge region) and from St. John in New Brunswick, though mostly from St. John. He acknowledged that delivery of those injections would also have to be reviewed in the context of the proposed Canadian tariffs/duties. As for imports of hydropower from Quebec over the Phase II and High Gate ties, which were down 40%-50%, he reported that, having reviewed the situation with the Quebec Control Area, the decrease appeared to be attributable to Canadian drought conditions and low reservoir levels. He explained a shift in the daily flows whereby, during off-peak periods, power was generally flowing from New England (and possibly from New York) to Quebec, and during times of demand, power was flowing from Quebec to New England and New York. Dr. Chadalavada expected that trend to continue for the foreseeable future, at least until such time as the situation in Quebec stabilizes.

Addressing behind-the-meter photovoltaic (PV) forecasting, Dr. Chadalavada explained that the ISO was increasing the number of weather vendors who provide input to the ISO's

models, as well as the number of solar PV forecasts that the ISO receives from vendors. The ISO was also working to make the data sets it employs more granular, which he expected would over time allow the models to better self-train and improve overall forecast accuracy.

Turning to outages, Dr. Chadalavada reported that there were not any material outages to note for the next 30-45 days. He identified a single, one-day outage scheduled for February 13 which could have a modest impact on the transfer capability between New England and New York, but was not expected to have a sustained impact in terms of commitments or uplift.

With respect to the approaching March 1 implementation of the Day-Ahead Ancillary Services Initiative (DASI), Dr. Chadalavada noted that the ISO felt prepared and ready -- systems were ready, testing complete, and the ISO did not expect any issues on their end from an information technology or implementation standpoint. Dr. Chadalavada addressed a member's prior request to publish realistic strike prices and close-out values in Real-Time. He was hopeful that by a few days before implementation, the ISO would be able to publish close to Real-Time strike prices and estimated close-out values, which he hoped would assist those on the front lines to better navigate the new market design. Also intended to be helpful in preparing the market for the implementation of DASI were (i) an example that mathematically walked through the DASI design that the ISO planned to publish and (ii) a webinar, to be held on February 12, at which the ISO would respond to stakeholder and trader questions on areas of concern or gaps in knowledge gathered ahead of time and, time permitting, possibly take questions in Real-Time. A generation representative thanked the ISO for the planned technical session and the opportunity for the exchange of information. Another member expressed his appreciation for the ISO's response to prior requests for enhancements to the DASI training module, as well as recent and on-going improvements to the Day-Ahead Energy Market reports, which Participants had found helpful in preparing for and navigating the ISO's markets. A Publicly Owned Entity representative similarly thanked the ISO for its recent enhancements to the 5-minute data reporting to include

the load forecast, behind-the-meter PV, and Demand Response values, all of which were helpful in building out products being offered to the market. Dr. Chadalavada committed to pass those expressions of appreciation and kudos on to each of the ISO teams that had been involved.

Future Plans for the IEP

Dr. Chadalavada referred members to the memorandum circulated and posted in advance of the meeting which addressed the ISO's perspective on, and plans with respect to, the IEP beyond Winter 2024-25. He summarized some of the reasons why the ISO did not see a compelling benefit to, and did not recommend, renewing or further extending the IEP. Those reasons included: (i) that the ISO was not in a position to affirmatively state that the IEP had resulted in incremental inventories across the oil or LNG fuel sources; (ii) the fact that the Probabilistic Energy Adequacy Tool (PEAT) did not forecast any measurable energy adequacy risk over the next three to four years; (iii) changes in circumstances and changes to the program itself; and (iv) the inability to identify compelling benefits that were equal to or greater than the approximately \$80 million cost of the IEP to be borne by ratepayers. The IEP, in its current or a revised form, would remain available in whole or in part for future implementation if and as needed. The regional energy shortfall threshold (REST) analytics, with criteria to be established over the next year, was expected to provide advanced notice to the region of the potential need for some future implementation/program.

Several members thanked the ISO for reevaluating the continuation of IEP and supported the ISO's decision. Members also mentioned that they looked forward to the information and analysis PEAT would provide. Addressing a question from a member, Dr. Chadalavada replied that, even though there were approximately 24-days left of winter, he did not expect that, were there to be a few additional IEDs, the analysis would change and he expected the ISO's recommendation to stand. Regarding resources that burned fuel in the IEP program taking actions to replenish, Dr. Chadalavada explained that the ISO had not seen replenishment

volumes greater under the IEP than it had in years prior -- replenishment volumes had been consistent with pre-IEP patterns. He estimated that roughly 25% of the total gas participation was by resources using pipeline gas and the remaining 75% was fired by resources using LNG.

On a related note, and in response to a question on the possible expansion of reserve products that might, as intended in the IEP, enhance fuel security and address reserve shortages, Dr. Chadalavada said that Participants could expect a presentation and discussion with Mr. Matt White, ISO's Chief Economist and VP of Markets Development and Settlements, at an upcoming Markets Committee meeting on some of the work ISO had done in this direction and some of the options that might reasonably become future proposals.

NECEC TOA

Following a break for lunch, Mr. Nick Gangi, Transmission Committee Chair, referred the Committee to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting related to the NECEC Transmission Operating Agreement (NECEC TOA) between NECEC Transmission LLC (NECEC) and the ISO. By way of background, he explained that the New England Clean Energy Connect Transmission Line was an Elective Transmission Upgrade (ETU) being developed by NECEC pursuant to Schedule 25 of the Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) and NECEC was required to enter into a TOA providing the ISO with operational authority over the NECEC Transmission Line.

Mr. Gangi reported that, over the course of three meetings, the Transmission Committee (TC) had reviewed the NECEC TOA and had ultimately recommended, at its January 29, 2025 meeting, that the Participants Committee support the NECEC TOA. He noted that, in parallel, the Reliability Committee (RC) had reviewed and recommended support for the New Appalaches-Maine Interconnection Operators Agreement (IOA), which had been supported earlier in the meeting by way of Consent Agenda Item No. 1. He said that, but for the timing of the TC action, the NECEC TOA would also have been on the Consent Agenda.

Without discussion or comment, the following motion was duly made, seconded and unanimously approved, with abstentions noted by: CPV, Harvard, the following Market Participant End Users: Bath Iron Works, Elektrisola, Garland, Hammond, Highliner, Moore Co., Nylon Corp., St. Anselm, Shipyard, and ZTECH; and the following Publicly Owned Entities: Belmont, Block Island, Braintree, Chester, Concord, Danvers, Georgetown, Groveland, Hingham, Holden, Hudson, Littleton (MA), MBTA, Mass. Dev. Finance Agency, MDC, Merrimac, Middleborough, Middleton, North Attleborough, Norwood, Pascoag, Reading, Rowley, Stowe, Taunton, Hyde Park, Wallingford DPU, Wellesley, and Westfield:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the NECEC TOA, as proposed by ISO-NE and recommended by the Transmission Committee at its January 29, 2025 meeting, and as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee in advance of this meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Transmission Committee.

PROPOSED COMPLIANCE CHANGES IN RESPONSE TO RENEW O&M COMPLAINT ORDER

Mr. Gangi then referred the Committee to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting related to Tariff revisions proposed by the Participating Transmission Owners (PTOs) and the ISO (Compliance Revisions) in response to the FERC's order granting in part and dismissing in part the December 13, 2022 complaint by RENEW Northeast, Inc. (RENEW) that sought changes to the ISO Tariff to eliminate the direct assignment of Network Upgrade Operations and Maintenance costs (O&M Costs) to Interconnection Customers and changes to the definition of Interested Party in the Transmission Rate Protocols (the *RENEW O&M Complaint Order*).

Mr. Gangi reported that, at the January 29 TC meeting, the PTOs presented the Compliance Revisions in response to the *RENEW O&M Complaint Order* that contained revisions to OATT Schedules 11, 22, 23, and 25, and Appendix C to Attachment F of the Tariff.

He explained that the Compliance Revisions aimed primarily to remove any references to assignment of network upgrade O&M Costs to interconnection customers and revise the definition of Interested Party. The Compliance Revisions were voted but were not recommended for Participants Committee support by the TC. Mr. Gangi noted that, earlier in the week, the PTOs had issued a memo providing additional information and Tariff clarifications in response to stakeholder feedback.

At Ms. Bresolin's invitation, Mr. Dave Burnham, in his role as Vice-Chair of the PTO Administrative Committee (PTO AC), explained that the PTO AC had issued a revised memo earlier in the week, which had been circulated and posted with the materials for the meeting, that provided additional information and background, as well as a revised set of Compliance Revisions (Modified Compliance Revisions), that the PTOs believed fully complied with the *RENEW O&M Complaint Order* and would be offered for Participants Committee consideration.

Members then asked clarifying questions of Mr. Burnham. Regarding the impact of the revised changes to the allocation of the cost of repairs and replacement of network upgrades, Mr. Burnham explained that the \$9 million dollar cost shift estimate, which was a rough estimate based on aggregate 2022 billings to interconnection customers, happened already to account for the additional cost shift that the revised changes would effect, thus the statement that the additional changes proposed for consideration would not have any *additional* impact on the estimated \$9 million shift in costs from Generation Owners to Regional Network Load. He confirmed that payroll and property taxes would continue to be the taxes that flow through the O&M charge to interconnection customers.

In response to further questions, Mr. Burnham elaborated on the example provided in the PTO AC memo that illustrated how O&M calculations would be modified to assess those charges only to Interconnecting Transmission Owner Interconnection Facilities (ITOIFs) (e.g. sole-use upgrades that are not part of the network once constructed), noting that the breakdown

of costs as between network upgrade O&M costs (no longer recoverable) and ITOIF O&M costs (that would continue to be recovered) would be unique to each interconnection configuration, and any percentage of cost shift derived from the example calculation should not be read to be representative of any specific cost shift.

Following clarification from Mr. Lombardi that the changes to be voted were the Modified Compliance Revisions, as circulated and posted on February 4, the following motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the Tariff revisions as in compliance with the FERC's Order in Docket No. EL23-16, as proposed by ISO-NE and the PTOs, and as reflected in the materials distributed to the Participants Committee in advance of this meeting, together with such non-substantive changes as may be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Transmission Committee.

In discussion, the RENEW Northeast President expressed RENEW's support for the Modified Compliance Revisions as reflected in the PTO-AC's revised memo. He thanked the PTO-AC leadership for their hard work and collaboration on the revisions. Others, who also supported the changes, similarly thanked the PTO-AC leadership for their efforts. One member expressed her belief that what had emerged was sound policy and the right result for the region, for ratepayers, for future project development, and for interconnection customers. She encouraged full support for the Modified Compliance Revisions. Another member, while acknowledging the abbreviated process, agreed that the Modified Compliance Revisions complied with the *RENEW O&M Complaint Order's* directives, and served as another good example of a successful NEPOOL process. She noted her support and encouraged other stakeholders to support the proposal as well.

Those that were in opposition or abstaining, while echoing appreciation for the hard work that had resulted in the Modified Compliance Revisions, explained the reasons for their positions. Some indicated that they simply could neither support nor oppose the Modified

Compliance Revisions at that time because information on final consumer cost implications was not yet available. They requested that the PTOs share the consumer cost implication information as soon as possible to all stakeholders, and not just to the affected interconnecting customers. Others felt that the Modified Compliance Revisions went beyond what the FERC asked for. They also believed that these costs were not being born out of the regional system planning process that assures the reliability of the system and that is paid for through regional and local network service, but were instead “but for” costs that should be assessed to Interconnection Customers and not to load. Still others preferred the Compliance Revisions as considered by the TC, suggesting that the Modified Compliance Revisions might expand the types of cost that would be included in the cost shift to load.

Without further discussion, the Committee then considered and approved the motion to support the Modified Compliance Revisions with an 82.68% Vote in favor (Generation – 16.67%; Transmission – 16.67% (1 abstention); Supplier – 16.67% (5 abstentions); Alternative Resources – 16.67% (1 abstention); Publicly Owned Entity – 11.10% (50 abstentions); and End User – 4.90% (5 abstentions)). (*See Attachment 2*).

LITIGATION REPORT

Mr. Lombardi referred the Committee to the February 5, 2025 Litigation Report that had been circulated and posted before the meeting. He highlighted the following developments from that Report:

(i) FERC acceptance of: the Mystic Cost-of-Service Global Settlement Agreement (ER18-1639-029); the Canal Marketing Winter 2023/2024 IEP Withdrawal Settlement Agreement (ER25-56; ER24-1407) (which permits the return of revenues relating to Canal’s participation in the prior winter’s IEP); the ICR-Related Values and HQICCs for the third, second and first ARAs for the 2025-26, 2026-27, and 2027-28 Capability Years, respectively

(ER25-519); and Financial Assurance Policy Revisions to Mitigate Risk of Pay-for-Performance Penalty Payment Defaults to be implemented June 1, 2025 (ER24-3071).

(ii) The ISO request for a two-year extension of time for regional compliance with *Order 1920*, which was pending before the Commission and if granted would permit the region additional time to work through compliance with *Order 1920*; and

(iii) The Wholesale Distribution Access Tariff filings by certain New England Transmission Owners (which provide for the recovery of costs associated with providing Wholesale Distribution service to distribution-connected energy storage resources who participate in the ISO Markets). Three of those had been accepted by the Commission, two were pending, and a few others expected to be filed.

Mr. Lombardi encouraged anyone with questions on any other matter in the Litigation Report, or those discussed at the meeting, to feel free to reach out to NEPOOL Counsel.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Markets Committee (MC). Mr. Ben Griffiths, MC Vice-Chair, reported that the next MC meeting would be held for one day, on February 11, 2025, at the DoubleTree Hotel in Westborough. The meeting would include continued discussion on the deactivation process under the Capacity Auction Reforms (CAR) project and consideration of the proposed Tariff changes under the MC's purview in response to *Order 904* (the FERC's Final Rule re: Compensation for Reactive Power Within the Standard Power Factor Range).

Reliability Committee. Mr. Nick Gangi, RC Chair, reported that the next RC meeting would be a virtual meeting on February 13, 2025. In addition to routine business, the TC would be asked to consider a small conforming change related to Phase II of the Economic Study Process Improvements project.

Transmission Committee. Mr. Burnham, TC Vice-Chair, reported that the TC would next meet on February 27, 2025. He said that the TC would be asked to consider and vote on

Order 904 compliance changes; and relevant pieces of the ISO's proposed process improvements in connection with the Economic Studies Phase II project. Looking further ahead, he predicted that, absent a shorter than expected timeline on *Order 1920* compliance or further compliance requirements in connection with *Order 2023*, TC agendas were likely to be light, and meetings held virtually, for a period of time.

Budget & Finance Subcommittee (B&F). Mr. Tom Kaslow, B&F Chair, reported that the next B&F meeting would be on February 7, 2025. The substantive item on the agenda was a set of conforming changes to the Billing Policy given that the FERC had approved the FCM Delivery Financial Assurance changes on January 31, 2025.

Membership Subcommittee. Mr. Brad Swalwell, Membership Subcommittee Chair, reported that the next Membership Subcommittee meeting would be held by Zoom on February 10, 2025 and encouraged all those interested to participate and reach out to NEPOOL counsel for the Zoom information.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Mr. George Twigg, NECPUC Executive Director, informed the Committee that registration would be opening up in a few weeks for the 2025 NECPUC Symposium to be held in Mystic, CT. FERC Commissioner Judy Chang was confirmed as one of the speakers. He encouraged all those interested to attend.

Mr. Lombardi reported that the March 6, 2025 Participants Committee meeting would be held in person at the AC Hotel in Portsmouth, NH. He welcomed all to join in person.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

There being no other general business, and after non-Participant representatives left the room and webex, the Committee went into executive session to afford Participants an opportunity to provide feedback confidentially on the three incumbent ISO Board Directors whose terms were scheduled to expire later this year and had each been recommended by the ISO for an additional three-year term. Together with that feedback, non-JNC members expressed their appreciation for the time and commitment by the Board members to engage in the earlier discussion. Some Committee members reiterated their long-standing preference that votes on candidates be conducted on an individual basis rather than by slate as provided under the Participants Agreement. Following some feedback on the process, Ms. Bresolin encouraged anyone with additional feedback on the candidates and/or the time and information shared earlier in the meeting that had not already been shared in executive session to provide that feedback to their Sector JNC representative.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sebastian Lombardi, Secretary

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN THE FEBRUARY 6, 2025 MEETING**

| PARTICIPANT NAME | SECTOR/GROUP | MEMBER NAME | ALTERNATE NAME | PROXY |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Acadia Center | End User | | Carolyn Dykma (tel) | |
| Advanced Energy United | Assoc. Non-Voting | Caitlin Marquis (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 Avangrid Renewables | Transmission | Alan Trotta (tel) | Jason Rauch (tel) | |
| Bath Iron Works | End User | | | Bill Short |
| 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 (tel) |
| 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) |
| CLEARresult Consulting Inc. | AR-DG | Tamera Oldfield (tel) | | |
| Clearway Power Marketing | Supplier | | | Pete Fuller (tel) |
| 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 | Claire Coleman (tel) | Jamie Talbert-Slagle (tel) | Chelsea Mattioda |
| Conservation Law Foundation | End User | Phelps Turner (tel) | | |
| Constellation Energy Generation (Constellation) | Supplier | | Bill Fowler (tel) | |
| CPV Towantic, LLC (CPV) | Generation | Joel Gordon | | |
| Cross-Sound Cable Company (CSC) | Supplier | | José Rotger (tel) | |
| Danvers Electric Division | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Deepwater Wind Block Island | Generation | | | Abby Krich (tel) (item 7 only) |
| DTE Energy Trading, Inc. | Supplier | | | José Rotger (tel) |
| Dominion Energy Generation Mktg | Generation | Wes Walker (tel) | | |
| ECP Companies Calpine Energy Services, LP New Leaf Energy | Generation | Andy Gillespie (tel) | | Bill Fowler (tel) Abby Krich (tel) (item 7 only) |
| Elektrisola, Inc. | End User | | | Bill Short |
| Emera Energy Services | Supplier | | | Bill Fowler (tel) |
| ENGIE Energy Marketing NA, Inc. | AR-RG | Sarah Bresolin | | |
| Environmental Defense Fund | End User | Jollette Westbrook (tel) | | |
| Eversource Energy | Transmission | Vandan Divatia | Dave Burnham (tel) | |
| FirstLight Power Management, LLC | Generation | Tom Kaslow | | |
| Galt Power, Inc. | Supplier | José Rotger (tel) | Jeff Iafrazi (tel) | |
| Garland Manufacturing Company | End User | | | Bill Short |
| Generation Bridge Companies | Generation | | Bill Fowler (tel) | |
| Generation Group Member | Generation | Dennis Duffy (tel) | Abby Krich (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 | | | Bill Short |
| Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited (Harvard) | End User | | | Chelsea Matioda Stefan Koester (tel) Ariella Fuzaylov (tel) |
| High Liner Foods (USA) Inc. | End User | | Bill Short | |

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN THE FEBRUARY 6, 2025 MEETING**

| PARTICIPANT NAME | SECTOR/GROUP | MEMBER NAME | ALTERNATE NAME | PROXY |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 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) |
| Hudson Light & Power Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | | Dave Cavanaugh |
| Hull Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Ipswich Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Jericho Power LLC (Jericho) | AR-RG | Ben Griffiths | Nancy Chafetz (tel) | |
| KCE Companies | AR-DG | | | Pete Fuller (tel) |
| Littleton (MA) Electric Light and Water Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Craig Kieny (tel) | |
| Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) | Supplier | Bill Kilgoar (tel) | | |
| Maine Public Advocate's Office | End User | Drew Landry | | |
| 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 | | Kelly Caiazzo | Jamie Donovan |
| Mass. Bay Transportation Authority | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Mass. Dept. Capital Asset Management | End User | | Paul Lopes (tel) | Nancy Chafetz (tel) |
| Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Company | Publicly Owned Entity | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) | |
| MDC – The (CT) Metropolitan District | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Mercuria Energy America, LLC | Supplier | | | José Rotger (tel) |
| 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 | | | Bill Short |
| Nautilus Power, LLC | Generation | | Bill Fowler (tel) | |
| New England Power (d/b/a National Grid) | Transmission | | Tim Martin (tel) | |
| New England Power Gens. Assoc. (NEPGA) | Associate Non-Voting | Bruce Anderson | | |
| New Hampshire Electric Cooperative | Publicly Owned Entity | | | Brian Forshaw (tel) |
| New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate | End User | Matthew Fossum (tel) | | Stefan Koester (tel) |
| NextEra Energy Resources, LLC | Generation | Michelle Gardner | | |
| North Attleborough Electric Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Norwood Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| NRG Business Marketing | Supplier | | Pete Fuller (tel) | |
| Nylon Corporation of America | End User | | | Bill Short |
| Onward Energy (Blue Sky West) | AR-RG | Stacey Fitts (tel) | | |
| Pascoag Utility District | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| 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, Inc. | End User | | | Chelsea Mattioda |
| Princeton Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Reading Municipal Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Rhode Island Energy (Narragansett Electric Co.) | Transmission | Brian Thomson (tel) | Robin Lafayette (tel) | Janelle Fabiano (tel) |
| 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 | | | Bill Short |
| Shell Energy North America (US) LP | Supplier | Jeff Dannels | | |
| Shipyard Brewing LLC | End User | | | Bill Short |
| Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Operations | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| Sierra Club | End User | | | Claire Lang-Ree |

**PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
PARTICIPATING IN THE FEBRUARY 6, 2025 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 | |
| Tangent Energy | AR-LR | Brad Swalwell | | |
| Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Dave Cavanaugh | |
| Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (tel) |
| The Energy Consortium | End User | | Mary Smith (tel) | |
| Union of Concerned Scientists | End User | Susan Muller (tel) | | Francis Pullaro (tel) |
| Vermont Electric Company | Transmission | Frank Etori (tel) | | |
| Vermont Electric Cooperative | Publicly Owned Entity | Craig Kieny (tel) | | |
| Vermont Energy Investment Corporation | AR-LR | | Stefan Koester (tel) | Chelsea Matioda |
| 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 | | |
| Vistra (Dynegy Marketing and Trade, Inc.) | Supplier | Ryan McCarthy | | Bill Fowler (tel) |
| Vitol Inc. | Supplier | Seth Cochran (tel) | | |
| Wakefield Municipal Gas & Light Department | Publicly Owned Entity | | Matt Ide (tel) | Dan Murphy (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 (tel) | |
| ZTECH, LLC | End User | | | Bill Short |

**VOTE TAKEN AT
FEBRUARY 6, 2025 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING ON
COMPLIANCE CHANGES IN RESPONSE TO RENEW O&M COMPLAINT ORDER**

TOTAL

| Sector/Group | Vote |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| GENERATION | 16.67 |
| TRANSMISSION | 16.67 |
| SUPPLIER | 16.67 |
| ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES | 16.67 |
| PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY | 11.10 |
| END USER | 4.90 |
| | |
| % IN FAVOR | 82.68 |

GENERATION SECTOR

| Participant Name | Vote |
|--|------|
| CPV Towantic, LLC | F |
| Deepwater Wind Block Island | F |
| Dominion Energy Generation Marketing, Inc. | F |
| ECP Companies | S |
| Calpine | F |
| New Leaf Energy | F |
| FirstLight Power Management, LLC | F |
| Generation Bridge Companies | F |
| Generation Group Member | F |
| Granite Shore Power Companies | F |
| Nautilus Power, LLC | F |
| NextEra Energy Resources, LLC | F |
| | |
| IN FAVOR (F) | 11 |
| OPPOSED (O) | 0 |
| TOTAL VOTES | 11 |
| ABSTENTIONS (A) | 0 |

ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES SECTOR

| Participant Name | Vote |
|--|------|
| Renewable Generation Sub-Sector | |
| ENGIE Energy Marketing NA, Inc. | F |
| H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc. | F |
| Jericho Power LLC | F |
| Onward Energy | F |
| Wheelabrator/Macquarie | F |
| Large RG Group Member | F |
| Distributed Gen. Sub-Sector | |
| CLEAResult Consulting, Inc. | F |
| KCE Companies | F |
| Load Response Sub-Sector | |
| Tangent Energy Solutions, Inc. | F |
| Vermont Energy Investment Corp. | A |
| | |
| IN FAVOR (F) | 9 |
| OPPOSED (O) | 0 |
| TOTAL VOTES | 9 |
| ABSTENTIONS (A) | 1 |

TRANSMISSION SECTOR

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

SUPPLIER SECTOR

| Participant Name | Vote |
|--|------|
| BP Energy Company | A |
| Brookfield Renewable Trading & Mktg | F |
| Castleton Comm. Merchant Trading | F |
| Clearway Power Marketing LLC | F |
| Constellation Energy Generation | F |
| Cross-Sound Cable Company | A |
| DTE Energy Trading, Inc. | A |
| Emera Energy Companies | F |
| Galt Power, Inc. | F |
| LIPA | A |
| Marble River, LLC | F |
| Mercuria Energy America, Inc | A |
| NRG Business Marketing, LLC | F |
| Shell Energy North America (US) LP | F |
| Vistra (Dynergy Marketing and Trade, Inc.) | F |
| Vitol | F |
| | |
| IN FAVOR (F) | 11 |
| OPPOSED (O) | 0 |
| TOTAL VOTES | 11 |
| ABSTENTIONS (A) | 5 |

**VOTE TAKEN AT
FEBRUARY 6, 2025 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING ON
COMPLIANCE CHANGES IN RESPONSE TO RENEW O&M COMPLAINT ORDER**

END USER SECTOR

| Participant Name | Vote |
|---|------|
| Acadia Center | F |
| Bath Iron Works | O |
| Conn. Office of Consumer Counsel | A |
| Conservation Law Foundation | F |
| Elektrisola, Inc. | O |
| Environmental Defense Fund | F |
| Garland Manufacturing Co. | O |
| Hammond Lumber Co. | O |
| Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited | O |
| High Liner Foods | O |
| Maine Public Advocate Office | F |
| Mass. Attorney General's Office | A |
| Mass. Dept. of Capital Asset Management | A |
| Moore Company | O |
| NH Office of Consumer Advocate | A |
| Nylon Corporation | O |
| PowerOptions, Inc. | O |
| St. Anslem | O |
| Shipyard Brewing Co. | O |
| The Energy Consortium | A |
| Union of Concerned Scientists | F |
| Z-TECH, LLC | O |
| | |
| | |
| IN FAVOR (F) | 5 |
| OPPOSED (O) | 12 |
| TOTAL VOTES | 17 |
| ABSTENTIONS (A) | 5 |

PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR

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

PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR (cont.)

| Participant Name | Vote |
|--|------|
| Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant | A |
| Holden Municipal Light Dept. | A |
| Holyoke Gas & Electric Dept. | A |
| Hudson Light and Power Dept. | A |
| Hull Municipal Lighting Plant | A |
| Ipswich Municipal Light Dept. | A |
| Littleton (MA) Electric Light Dept. | A |
| Littleton (NH) Water & Light Dept. | A |
| Mansfield Municipal Electric Dept. | A |
| Marblehead Municipal Light Dept. | A |
| Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Co. | A |
| Mass. Bay Transportation Authority | A |
| MDC – The (CT) Metropolitan District | A |
| Merrimac Municipal Light Dept. | A |
| Middleborough Gas and Elec. Dept. | A |
| Middleton Municipal Electric Dept. | A |
| New Hampshire Electric Cooperative | A |
| North Attleborough Electric Dept. | A |
| Norwood Municipal Light Dept. | A |
| Pascoag Utility District | A |
| Paxton Municipal Light Dept. | A |
| Peabody Municipal Light Plant | A |
| Princeton Municipal Light Dept. | A |
| Reading Municipal Light Dept. | A |
| Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant | F |
| Russell Municipal Light Dept. | A |
| Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Operations | A |
| South Hadley Electric Light Dept. | A |
| Sterling Municipal Electric Light Dept. | A |
| Stowe (VT) Electric Dept. | A |
| Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant | A |
| Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant | A |
| Vermont Electric Coop. | A |
| VT Public Power Supply Authority | A |
| Village of Hyde Park (VT) Electric Dept. | A |
| Wakefield Municipal Gas and Light Dept. | A |
| Wallingford (CT), Town of | O |
| Wellesley Municipal Light Plant | A |
| West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant | A |
| Westfield Gas & Electric Light Dept. | A |
| | |
| | |
| IN FAVOR (F) | 2 |
| OPPOSED (O) | 1 |
| TOTAL VOTES | 3 |
| ABSTENTIONS (A) | 50 |