PRELIMINARY

A meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, February 5, 2010 at The Colonnade Hotel, 120 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA, pursuant to notice duly given. 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 attending the meeting.

Mr. Brian Forshaw, Chair, presided and Mr. David T. Doot, Secretary, recorded.

RECOGNITION OF ROBERT DE R. STEIN AND DONALD J. SIPE

Mr. Robert de Rochemont Stein was recognized for his tenure as Chairman of the Participants Committee for 2008 and 2009. Following introductory remarks of appreciation from Mr. Forshaw, the Committee approved the following resolution of appreciation by unanimous acclamation:

> *WHEREAS*, Mr. Robert de R. Stein was the Chairman of the New England Power Pool Participants Committee during 2008 and 2009; and
>
> *WHEREAS*, in addition to his other duties in the Pool, Bob has been the elected representative of the Supplier Sector, offering guidance and leadership to that Sector with the interests of both his Sector and the Pool in focus, and has served previously as the elected officer of the Reliability Committee; and
>
> *WHEREAS*, throughout his service as Chairman of the NEPOOL Participants Committee, Bob demonstrated professionalism, integrity, dedication, understanding, and a keen sense of fairness and statesmanship in addressing numerous controversial issues confronting NEPOOL; and
>
> *WHEREAS*, Bob has long and diverse experiences in the New England electric industry, serving at various times during his career as NEPOOL staff, and as a representative for his employers or clients who were publicly owned entities, transmission owners, generators and suppliers. With the benefits of that broad perspective, clear thinking, and good humor, Bob has helped to guide the region through highly controversial issues while helping to maintain and nurture productive relationships among, and between, the NEPOOL members and their Sectors, with ISO New England, the New England Conference of Public Utilities

> Commissioners and its members, the New England Committee on Electricity, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and
>
> *WHEREAS*, Bob can fairly be credited with or blamed for (depending on perspective), key elements of FCM, the successful transformation of the interconnection queue to account for FCM, and many years of helping to work through whatever agreements were possible at the time on the region's capacity requirements and the Hydro-Quebec interconnection arrangements.
>
> *NOW, THEREFORE*, the Participants Committee of the New England Power Pool, on behalf of the NEPOOL Participants, hereby expresses its gratitude to Bob for his years of service so far to the Pool as its Chairman and looks forward to continuing to work with him for many years to come.

Mr. Stein was presented with a copy of this resolution and some small gifts in appreciation for his years of service.

Mr. Forshaw then recognized Mr. Sipe for his service as the elected representative of the End User Sector. The following resolution of appreciation was then duly made, seconded, and approved by unanimous acclamation:

> *WHEREAS*, Don represents the first Participant member of the End User Sector and served with distinction for the past nine years as the End User Sector's Participants Committee Officer; and
>
> *WHEREAS*, during his tenure as Sector representative and officer, the End User Sector has blossomed to include more than 50 Participants and become the Sector with the third most individual voting members; and
>
> *WHEREAS*, drawing from his experience as a regulator, a gymnastics coach, a landscaper, a waiter, and an epic poet, although not necessarily simultaneously, with equal success, or in that order, Don has been a valued source of guidance and leadership for the betterment of the End User Sector and the Pool; and
>
> *WHEREAS*, throughout his service as the End User Sector's Officer, Don has demonstrated professionalism, integrity, dedication, understanding, and a keen sense of fairness and statesmanship in addressing the many controversial issues confronting the End User Sector, NEPOOL, and the New England region; and
>
> *WHEREAS*, Don has been a catalyst for improving and reforming the region's governance arrangements and a champion of demand response initiatives.

> *NOW, THEREFORE*, the Participants Committee of the New England Power Pool, on behalf of the NEPOOL Participants, hereby expresses its gratitude to Don for nine years of service as the elected representative of the End User Sector and looks forward to continuing to work with him for many years to come.

Mr. Sipe, also, was presented with a copy of this resolution and a small gift of appreciation acknowledging his many years of service and his affinity for epic poems.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 8, 2010 MINUTES

Mr. Doot referred the members to the preliminary minutes for the January 8, 2010 meeting that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes of the January 8 meeting, with minor editorial changes noted, were unanimously approved.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Forshaw referred the Committee to the Consent Agenda that had been circulated in advance of the meeting, noting that Consent Agenda Item #3 had been removed to be addressed separately. Following motion duly made and seconded, the remaining items on the Consent Agenda were unanimously approved, with an abstention by GDF Suez.

REPORT OF ISO CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Mr. Gordon van Welie summarized the Board and Board Committee meetings that had occurred since his January 8 report. He noted that each of the committees and the Board met once.

Compensation and Human Resources Committee

Mr. van Welie reported that the Compensation and Human Resources Committee met on January 21 in Holyoke to discuss a variety of compensation-related matters. The Committee reviewed updated survey data on national trends regarding compensation, and concluded that the

2.5% merit and 0.5% promotional salary budget increases that were included in the ISO's 2010 budget remain at the lower end of the survey ranges. The Committee therefore approved use of these amounts for compensation purposes. In addition, the Committee received an update on negotiations with the union representing the ISO's system operators. The Committee also considered the ISO's experience to date with health insurance renewals and recommended the Board's adoption of a number of administrative amendments to the pension plans.

System Planning and Reliability Committee (SPARC)

The SPARC met on January 20 in Springfield. The Committee reviewed the union negotiations from a reliability perspective, including management's contingency planning in the event of a work stoppage. Next, the Committee received an update on renewable programs in New England and discussed a request from a Market Participant that the ISO take a proactive policy role in urging regional policymakers to modify renewable programs to locationally and temporally differentiate the energy credits for these resources. The Committee concluded that such policy matters are not in the ISO's purview but, instead, lie with state policymakers. The Committee also received an update on the ISO's Smart Grid grant from the Department of Energy and discussed generally the topic of non-transmission alternatives as part of the planning process. Finally, SPARC discussed compensation-related matters within its jurisdiction.

Audit and Finance Committee

Mr. van Welie reported that the Audit and Finance Committee met on January 21 in Holyoke. The Committee reviewed FERC's order on the 2010 administrative budget. The Committee also discussed the transfer of pension investments to a new advisor. Last, the Committee considered compensation-related matters within its jurisdiction.

Board Markets Committee

Mr. van Welie went on to report that the Board Markets Committee met on January 21 in Holyoke. The Board Markets Committee received its regular reports on market monitoring activity, market seams, and the NEPOOL Markets Committee. Like other committees, the Board Markets Committee also considered compensation-related matters within its jurisdiction. That Committee, he reported, deferred its consideration of virtual trading and load forecasting accuracy improvements to a future meeting, in order to have sufficient time to discuss the Forward Capacity Market (FCM) and the Price-Responsive Demand (PRD) programs. For both FCM and PRD, Mr. van Welie reported that management had presented the Board Markets Committee with substantial advance information regarding stakeholders' positions and management's recommendations. Regarding FCM, the Committee reviewed the proposals in the Design Basis Documents and the stakeholder votes on the various iterations. Management informed the Board Markets Committee that it did not support the Design Basis Document that had been approved by NEPOOL, and proposed developing a new set of rules that, in management's estimation, would produce a more efficient market. The Board Markets Committee supported this proposal and encouraged management to continue working with stakeholders to determine if mutually-acceptable rules could be developed. The Committee noted that this topic would be discussed by the full Board and agreed that, given the importance of the issue, the Board should ultimately determine the ISO's position on the issue.

The Board Markets Committee reviewed its materials on PRD and discussed, in particular, the appropriate payment to resources in the supply-side program. That Committee discussed the economics of paying the full locational marginal price (LMP) to supply-side PRD resources versus paying LMP less the applicable retail generation rate (G) (i.e., LMP or LMP-G).

That Committee discussed also the Participants Committee votes and the positions of state regulators and various Sectors. The Board Markets Committee noted that this issue would be discussed in detail by the full Board and agreed that, given the importance of the issue, the ultimate position should be a Board decision.

Full Board

Mr. van Welie reported that the full Board of Directors met in Holyoke after the Board Markets Committee meeting. The Board approved the previously-mentioned amendments to the pension plans, supported the merit and promotional increases reflected in the 2010 budget recommended by the Compensation and Human Resources Committee, received Committee reports and discussed issues related to the potential jurisdiction of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. The Board also authorized management to execute an operating agreement with the New England Independent Transmission Company, LLC. The primary focus of the remainder of the Board meeting was to review FCM and PRD issues.

Regarding FCM, the Board had received detailed briefing materials. The Board reviewed these materials and received a report from the Board Markets Committee on its discussion of this topic. That Board Markets Committee recommended that management develop its own rules for filing while simultaneously working with stakeholders to develop a set of rules that could receive NEPOOL support. The Board supported this proposal, which included the possibility of rules that include the reinstatement of a time limit on the carry-forward of out-of-market capacity and an extension of the price cap. However, the Board advised that, in the absence of NEPOOL and state regulator support, management should file the rules that it believed to be most efficient.

The Board then discussed the topic of supply-side PRD payments. After a review of the briefing materials, a report from the Board Markets Committee, and discussion with management, the Board authorized management to move forward with a supply-side PRD proposal based upon the payment to Participants of LMP-G. The Board concluded that the proposal to pay the full LMP would distort the market and create inefficient prices, and that there were other more appropriate means of reducing barriers to entry for demand resources.

Mr. van Welie went on to report that, following the Board meeting, the FERC issued an order on New England's compliance filing in response to Order No. 719. In that order, the FERC noted that progress has been made in New England regarding PRD and concluded that the June 1 filing on PRD was an appropriate time to address broader issues on that subject.

Reacting to that FERC order, Mr. van Welie said that current constraints on internal resources addressing demand resource integration and settlement in FCM, combined with the length of the stakeholder process on PRD thus far, would preclude the ISO from meeting that June schedule with a full set of rules on supply- and demand-side PRD programs. Additionally, he said that the region appeared to be irreconcilably divided on the appropriate payment methodology for PRD resources. The payment methodology and cost allocation were important cornerstones in much of the development work and would affect the details of system dispatch and settlements. As a result, ISO management proposed to work with NEPOOL and state regulators to split the PRD filing into two phases. In the first phase, targeted for April, the ISO would file a narrow set of rules that will address the payment methodology and cost allocation. Depending on NEPOOL's final vote, that filing would include rules reflecting the ISO's position of paying LMP-G and, if NEPOOL approves an alternative proposal, the filing would be a jump-ball filing that would also include the proposed rules approved by NEPOOL. He said the ISO also would work with NECPUC, as it does with Participants, to assist in their development of rules that set forth their position, so that NEPOOL and FERC will have the full issues before them.

Following the CEO report, the members discussed the ISO's proposal on PRD. Some members questioned whether the region might be better served by a filing supporting the request by the Consumer Demand Response Initiative (CDRI) for a FERC order providing guidance on certain issues. The ISO made clear its position that the issues needed to be presented in the form of a specific proposed Market Rule change which it would file, hopefully with NEPOOL support, but with a NEPOOL alternative if that were the outcome. Other members urged that the phased filing not require an investment of resources that might be better spent within the stakeholder process addressing remaining issues. Still others questioned whether the issue of cost allocation, without FERC direction on payment issues, was ripe for FERC consideration, and encouraged the ISO to consider whether it would be more efficient to await further FERC guidance on payment issues before proceeding with a cost allocation proposal. It was also reported that the FERC had not yet acted on, and therefore no guidance could be gleaned from, the PJM demand response proceeding pending before the FERC in Docket No. EL09-68.

Mr. van Welie then asked Mr. Robert Ludlow to report on FERC's consideration of metrics for reporting on ISO and RTO performance. Mr. Ludlow reviewed materials on the topic that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. He also reported that a workshop would be held on the topic later in the month, that will be facilitated by Mr. Hans Mertens of the Vermont Department of Public Service for NECPUC and Mr. Paul Peterson for NEPOOL.

Finally, Mr. van Welie asked Mr. Raymond Hepper to report on the ISO's future plans with respect to future requests for waiver of the FCM pre-qualification Market Rules. Mr. Hepper explained that the ISO intends to be less supportive of future waivers. The FCM Market

Rules, he said, have now been out and implemented through several auctions and the ISO needs, in fairness to all, to expect future compliance with those Rules. A member urged the ISO to modify the Rules to remove inflexible provisions that produce the draconian result of excluding resources from an auction because of immaterial, ministerial deviations from expectations.

REPORT OF ISO CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada then reviewed highlights from the monthly COO report, which was circulated in advance of the meeting and posted on the ISO website. He indicated that January natural gas prices were 8.9% higher and oil prices 2.7% higher than the December 2009 values. He reported that January Real-Time Hub LMPs were approximately 5% higher from December averages.

Turning to Net Commitment Period Compensation (NCPC), Dr. Chadalavada reported that NCPC payments for January totaled $4 million, which was a decrease of $2.5 million from December. He indicated that January First Contingency payments totaled $3.9 million: $3.8 million paid to internal resources and $107,000 paid to resources at external locations; with $2.8 million in payments during the first week in January. He noted that NPCP payments were 0.6% of the total Energy Market value during January.

Dr. Chadalavada reported that the next Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting was scheduled for February 24 to review the 2010 load forecast, both region-wide and state-by-state, as well as an update on the Regional System Plan (RSP10) process. He reminded the Committee that the Economic Study Requests were due to be submitted by April 1. He reported that the ISO completed testifying in the proceedings relating to the Greater Springfield Reliability Project (GSRP). Parties are now awaiting a decision by the siting council’s hearing officer, and the ISO was hoping that the proceeding would come to a conclusion soon. He said that the experiences from the Massachusetts proceedings had been a good indicator for the sorts of analysis that ISO would need to prepare with respect to future transmission projects. A Massachusetts representative commended the ISO for its efforts in those proceedings.

Turning to the Winter/Spring Operable Capacity analysis, Dr. Chadalavada reported that the ISO forecasted the lowest Winter/Spring Operable Capacity Margin for the week beginning May 8, 2010, and that the projected operable capacity was adequate for both the reference load of 50/50 and the extreme load of 90/10.

Dr. Chadalavada noted that several slides in the report which identified new generation had not been updated, and that the next report would show results for both January and February.

He concluded his report by informing the Committee that the ISO would plan to be available following the conclusion of the meeting to review the details of the 2010/2011 work plan that included all of the initiatives expected to be worked on over the subsequent 18 months.

Several members then asked clarifying questions regarding the COO report. One member asked for further information concerning the increase in NCPC during late December and early January. Dr. Chadalavada explained in response that the size of the NCPC was influenced principally by forced outages and deviations between projected and actual load. He said that forced outages of the magnitude experienced in that time frame, exacerbated by colder weather and load forecasting challenges, were extremely difficult to predict accurately. The circumstances leading to the high NCPC during that time frame had since abated and the ISO had no ability to predict with any certainty when or if they would re-occur in the foreseeable future.

BILLING AND FINANCIAL ASSURANCE POLICIES CHANGES TO SUSPENSION AND PRE-PAYMENT PROVISIONS

Mr. Joel Gordon, Chair of the Budget & Finance Subcommittee, then referred the Committee to materials that were circulated in advance of the meeting regarding proposed changes to the suspension and pre-payment provisions of the Billing and Financial Assurance Policies. Noting that the two proposed changes were essentially clean-up and ministerial in nature, he explained that the first change aligned the prepayment provisions of the Policies with the timing of the issuance of Invoices, which had recently been moved to Monday or the first business day of the week. The second change, he explained, replaced the suspension provisions in the Billing Policy relating to payment defaults, with a reference to the parallel suspension provisions of the Financial Assurance Policy, which would simplify administration of the Policies going forward. Mr. Gordon reported that the ISO discussed the proposed changes with the Subcommittee during its January 11 teleconference, and that no Subcommittee members had objected to the changes.

The following motion was then duly made, seconded and unanimously approved:

> RESOLVED, that the NEPOOL Participants Committee supports the changes to the ISO New England Financial Assurance Policy and the ISO New England Billing Policy circulated to the Committee and discussed at this meeting, together with such further non-substantive changes as the Chief Financial Officer of the ISO and the Chairman of the Budget & Finance Subcommittee may approve.

SUSPENSION OF SECONDARY FTR MARKET

Ms. Allison DiGrande, Chair of the NEPOOL Markets Committee, then reviewed materials that were circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting regarding the unanimous recommendation of the Markets Committee for approval of the suspension of the secondary market for Financial Transmission Rights (FTRs) and the removal of all provisions pertaining to that market until new systems implementing the FERC-approved Long-Term FTR (LFTR) rules were in place. She explained that the reason for suspending the thinly-traded market was to minimize the financial risk associated with leaving the market in place pending future implementation of the LFTR mechanisms.

Additionally, Ms. DiGrande explained that, following the Markets Committee's consideration and vote on the changes, additional references to the Secondary FTR Market were identified in Section I of the Tariff that should also be removed. She indicated that, absent objection, those changes would also be included for approval as part of the main motion. At Mr. Forshaw's request, NEPOOL Counsel confirmed that the changes were consistent with the intent of the Markets Committee recommendation and ministerial in nature. There was no objection to including the additional changes in the main motion.

The following motion was then duly made, seconded, and unanimously:

> RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the revisions that suspend the Secondary FTR Market provisions until new systems implementing the FERC-approved Long Term Financial Transmission Rights rules are in place, as recommended by the Markets Committee and circulated to this Committee in advance of this meeting, together with the conforming changes to Section I of the Tariff, any other changes agreed to at this meeting, and such other non-substantive changes as the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Markets Committee may approve.

RESOURCES WITH COMMON COSTS THAT SEEK TO DE-LIST

Ms. DiGrande then referred to the Committee to materials circulated in advance of the meeting regarding changes to Market Rule 1 that address resources with common costs that seek to de-list. She explained that the changes were proposed in response to a FERC order directing the ISO to address common station costs shared among capacity resources and the recovery thereof when de-list bids are rejected for reliability reasons. She stated that the proposal, originally developed by the Internal Market Monitor, was considered and supported by a 74.36% Vote in favor of by the Markets Committee at its January 26, 2010 meeting, with a number of abstentions noted.

At Mr. Forshaw's request, Mr. Marc Montalvo, on behalf of ISO, described additional revisions, circulated the evening before the meeting, that the ISO proposed be included with the changes under consideration. Mr. Montalvo explained that, during the ISO's final review, it became apparent that the proposed Market Rule language did not fully reflect the design that had been described to, and supported by, the Markets Committee. He stated that the additional changes clarified the proposed revisions, consistent with the intent of ensuring that resources that share common costs would be able to submit de-list bids that reflect economies of scale while other resources de-list out of the market, and would further the intent that resources retained for reliability receive just and reasonable compensation. He stated that such compensation should be the cost associated with the particular retained resource. Furthermore, he explained the ISO's view that any station common costs incurred should be recovered by the station as a whole. He stated that, absent the additional changes, the language voted by the Markets Committee would not sufficiently accomplish the latter part of the design intent. He stated that the revised language fully effectuated the intent and asked the Participants Committee to support the proposed changes with the additional revisions included.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

> RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the revisions to Market Rule 1 that address the treatment of Existing Generating Capacity Resources with common costs that seek to de-list, as recommended by the Markets Committee and circulated to this Committee in advance of this meeting, together with the changes agreed to at this meeting and such other non-substantive

> changes as the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Markets Committee may approve.

A member commended the ISO for its development efforts and then opined that, when common costs are incurred at a station with multiple units, it was proper to allocate common costs to unit(s) at a station whose de-list bid(s) were rejected for reliability reasons while other units at the station remain in the market. The unit retained for reliability reasons, he suggested, should be paid under a reliability agreement its fair share of the common costs. The member declined, however, to take the Committee's time with an offer to amend the main motion to include such an understanding because the issue had been fully vetted, but not supported, during Markets Committee consideration of the matter.

Following further discussion, the Market Rules as recommended by the Markets Committee, together with the additional revisions described by Mr. Montalvo, were then voted by a show of hands and passed, with oppositions from Boston Gen, Exelon, and PSEG, and abstentions by BG Dighton, BP, Brookfield, Caithness, ConEd, CSC, Dominion, Dynegy, Entergy, GDF Suez, Granite Ridge, LIPA, Millennium, Mirant, NAEA, NextEra, NRG, Pepco, PPL, and the Small Renewable Generation Group.

COMPETITIVE OFFER REQUIREMENTS FOR EXTERNAL CAPACITY RESOURCES

Ms. DiGrande then referred the Committee to materials circulated in advance of the meeting related to changes intended to enhance the competitiveness of offers from external capacity resources in FCM. She reported that the Markets Committee, at its January 12-13, 2010 meeting, had discussed and voted to recommend Participants Committee support for the changes with a 86.51 % Vote in favor. She further reported that two amendments had been offered unsuccessfully at the Markets Committee meeting, with the amendment offered by HQUS, who had requested the matter be removed from the Consent Agenda, achieving a 56.51% Vote in favor at the Markets Committee.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

> RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the revisions to Market Rule 1 that enhance the competitiveness of offers from external capacity resources effective June 1, 2010, as recommended by the Markets Committee and circulated to this Committee in advance of this meeting, together with such other non-substantive changes as the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Markets Committee may approve.

The HQUS representative then reviewed an amendment proposed by HQUS, which was duly made and seconded, that would strike from the recommended changes, the reduction, beginning June 1, 2013, of the heat rate used in the determination of the daily offer threshold from 22,000 to 14,400 btu/kwh. He went on to explain the HQUS concerns with that proposed reduction and why the proposed amendment would better reflect the opportunity costs and value associated with a hydro power facility during the periods when it is likely to deliver energy. He urged support for the amendment and stated that he would work to ensure consistent evaluation of all resources.

On behalf of the ISO, Mr. Andy Gillespie stated that the ISO did not support the amendment. He explained the ISO's view that the use of the Forward Reserve Market (FRM) heat rate (14,400 btu/kwh) would be an appropriate upper boundary and would produce a dispatch rate of approximately 3%, consistent with the derivation of the FRM heat rate. He added that the 22,000 btu/kwh heat rate had been intended to be used only as a transition method.

The HQUS motion to amend the main motion was then voted and failed to pass with a 51% Vote in favor. (Generation – 17.3%; Transmission – 2.47%; Supplier- 11.98%; Alternative

Resources – 1.95%; Publicly Owned Entity – 17.3%; and End User – 0%). (See Vote 1 on Attachment 2).

The unamended main motion was then voted by a show of hands and passed with oppositions from Dynegy and PSEG, and abstentions by BP, Brookfield, Caithness, ConEd, Constellation, CSC, Dominion, EnerNOC, Entergy, GDF Suez, Generation Sector Provisional Member Group, HQUS, Granite Ridge, International Power, LIPA, Millennium, Mirant, NAEA, NextEra, NRG, PEPCO, and the Small Renewable Generation Group.

FCM REVISIONS TO MARKET RULE 1, SECTION 13

Ms. DiGrande then reviewed materials that were circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting regarding rule changes to the FCM Market Rules. Ms. DiGrande explained that the Markets Committee, at its January 26, 2010 meeting, began its deliberations with the set of rule changes to Section 13 of Market Rule 1 that implemented the Design Basis Document that was supported by the Participants Committee at is November 6, 2009 meeting, but then considered and ultimately supported with a 86.15% Vote in favor an amendment offered by National Grid to remove and replace certain provisions relating to CONE, the price floor, MW pro-rationing, carried forward excess out-of-market capacity, and ISO requests for energy. Ms. DiGrande stated that the Markets Committee next considered, and did not support, several other amendments to Section 13 of Market Rule 1 offered by members of the Generation and Supplier Sectors. The amended motion was then considered and supported by the Markets Committee with a 71.69% Vote in favor.

Mr. Forshaw clarified for the Committee that it was being asked to provide input on two sets of FCM rule changes, one set that was recommended by the Markets Committee to Section 13, and one set that was recommended by the Reliability Committee to Section 12. Mr. Forshaw stated that the Committee would proceed first through all of the Section 13 changes and, when completed, would then address the Section 12 changes.

The following main motion was then duly made and seconded:

> RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports revisions to Section 13 of Market Rule 1 and related definitions relating to the Forward Capacity Market as recommended by the Markets Committee, as supported by the ISO, and as circulated to this Committee in advance of this meeting, together with such other non-substantive changes as the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Markets Committee may approve.

Mr. Michael Harrington, of the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission, stated that NECPUC supported the main motion, and, as it had at the Markets Committee, encouraged support for the package of revisions. Mr. Thomas Kaslow, on behalf of GDF Suez, then offered a motion to amend the main motion to permit generating and import capacity resources to sell capacity under the same terms as Real-Time Demand Response Resources and Real-time Emergency Generation and in so doing, to accept the same sets of obligations and participation in the markets should they clear under those conditions.

The motion to amend the main motion as proposed by GDF Suez was then voted and failed with a 27.90% Vote in favor (Generation – 17.3%; Transmission – 0%; Supplier 8.65%; Alternative Resources – 1.95%; Publicly Owned Entity – 0%; and End User – 0%). (See Vote 2 on Attachment 2).

The Mirant representative next offered a motion to amend the main motion to revise certain language addressing the review by the Internal Market Monitor of offers from new generating capacity and demand resources below 0.75 times CONE. He stated that the Design Basis Document that came out of the FCM Working Group (FCMWG) process clearly indicated that expected net revenues excluded revenues that were only for new resources but not existing and further that the proposed tariff language did not specifically capture that agreement and he had concerns that the intent could be lost over time. He next clarified that in order to accommodate concerns expressed by the Markets Committee that "or its vintage" could be interpreted to apply to the reference regarding economic development incentives, he had revised his amendment by adding a period after the phrase "or its vintage" and inserting the phrase "provided, however" at the start of a new sentence regarding economic development incentives. Finally, noted also Mirant's proposal struck the word "expressly" from the language out of an interest not to handcuff the ISO with the use of that term. He explained this proposal was slightly different from the request at the Markets Committee, reflecting additional discussions with Market Participants in the interim.

Mr. Doot requested that the ISO confirm whether it remained opposed to this amendment, given the changes from the versions presented to the Markets Committee. The ISO confirmed its continued opposition. State regulators, as well, confirmed their opposition to this amendment. At the request of Participants, Mr. Montalvo explained further the ISO's opposition. He explained a couple of general concerns with the proposed language recommended by Mirant, none of which, he indicated, had changed as a result of Mirant's proposed revisions, stating first that there may be situations where contractual arrangements sought by parties for capacity in which the evaluation of new versus existing or other parameter was part of the selection decision, and that may be more broad than the particular instance of economic development. As such, the ISO did not want to expressly exclude that from consideration. Mr. Montalvo then stated that the ISO supported the inclusion of the term "expressly" in the proposed language given that, absent any written document, the ISO would have to infer what was intended and that would not be sufficient to reject offers under this Tariff provision.

The motion to amend the main motion as proposed by Mirant was then voted and failed with a 36.55% Vote in favor (Generation – 17.3%; Transmission – 0%; Supplier 17.3%; Alternative Resources – 1.95%; Publicly Owned Entity – 0%; and End User – 0%). (See Vote 3 on Attachment 2).

The NRG representative next offered a motion to amend the main motion, which he stated was the same motion offered at the Markets Committee, that would allow all static, export, administrative export, and permanent de-list bids that have been reviewed and approved by the Internal Market Monitor and FERC under the current mitigation rules to be eligible to set the price in Capacity Zones. He explained that this was a fairly complex issue and he had not drafted language, but rather would be seeking support from the Committee for direction to the ISO and stakeholders to prepare Market Rule language that would implement the understanding in time for the fifth Forward Capacity Auction (FCA5).

A member of the End User Sector expressed his support for this motion to amend, explaining that it raises an important issue worth evaluating that could have a significant impact on prices in the region and could mask inefficiencies that the market was set up to address. The NGrid representative spoke in opposition to the motion to amend, stating that the region had already spent a considerable time evaluating how de-list bids should affect price and that to go any further than the proposed rules would require a full evaluation of the current market design.

After further discussion, the motion to amend the main motion as proposed by NRG was then seconded, voted and failed with a 41.74% Vote in favor (Generation – 17.3%; Transmission

– 0%; Supplier 17.3%; Alternative Resources – 1.95%; Publicly Owned Entity – 0%; and End User – 5.19%). (See Vote 4 on Attachment 2).

Next, the PSEG representative offered a motion to amend the main motion to revise the definition of FCM Pivotal Supplier. He explained that this amendment was slightly different than the one presented to the Markets Committee. He stated that, under this amendment, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting, there would be certain exemptions from the definition of FCM Pivotal Suppliers under two circumstances, one in which the resource owner seeks to de-list all of its capacity in a particular capacity zone and the second where the resource owner has less then five percent of the total capacity in that zone. The PSEG representative explained that, without these exemptions, there could be circumstances that would produce undesirable consequences. For example, he stated that if the capacity zone were modeled such that there was only 1 MW of shortage in that zone, every resource that was greater than 1 MW would be ineligible to set the price in that zone and there could be multiple resources in that area that could fit in that category. Second, he stated that there could be a situation where there would be 100 MW needed for reliability (and units are unable to de-list as a result) but the capacity zone would not be modeled because none of the resources in the zone were able to set the price. He stated that PSEG's proposed amendment would help to remedy such circumstances.

Mr. Doot asked for confirmation of the ISO and state regulator's positions on this amendment given the changes following the Markets Committee's consideration. Mr. Montalvo stated that the ISO opposed this amendment on the basis that they had not had a chance to fully examine its impacts. Mr. Harrington indicated that the state regulators were not in support of this amendment. The PSEG member expressed surprise that the ISO had not yet reviewed the impact of this proposed amendment, since it was first offered at the FCM Working Group last summer and at several Markets Committee meetings since then.

The motion to amend the main motion as proposed by PSEG was then voted and failed with a 36.55% Vote in favor (Generation – 17.3%; Transmission – 0%; Supplier 17.3%; Alternative Resources – 1.95%; Publicly Owned Entity – 0%; and End User – 5.19%). (See Vote 5 on Attachment 2).

The PSEG member then offered a second motion to amend the main motion regarding ISO requests for energy from resources that do not have a Capacity Supply Obligation (CSO). He explained that this proposed amendment would treat resources that do not have a CSO similar to the manner in which external resources are treated under the rules governing Emergency Energy Transactions (EETs). Under those rules, if the ISO concluded it had a need for emergency energy, it would issue a request for EETs and invite all external resources that do not have a CSO to respond. He stated that the current rules only permit external resources to participate and that PSEG's second proposed amendment would open the door for internal generation to compete on the same footing as external generation. The PSEG representative further explained that there would be uplift payments given that EETs would not be eligible to set price, but that there would be greater competition among EETs overall.

Support was expressed for further evaluation of whether the region should expand eligibility for EETs, with some noting beliefs that the reason for such restriction today may be a result of how external resources are scheduled as compared to internal generation. Mr. Doot confirmed that this amendment was the same as that which was presented to the Markets Committee.

The motion to amend the main motion as proposed by PSEG was then voted and failed with a 29.74% Vote in favor (Generation – 17.3%; Transmission – 0%; Supplier 10.49%; Alternative Resources – 1.95%; Publicly Owned Entity – 0%; and End User – 5.19%). (See Vote 6 on Attachment 2).

The representative of GDF Suez next offered a motion to amend the main motion to revise the language regarding ISO requests for energy. This member noted that he has revised his amendment from the version that had been circulated in advance to this Committee in order to remove from consideration (1) the insertion "after activation of all capacity subject to a Capacity Supply Obligation" and (2) the two phrases from Section III.13.6.4 inserted by the Markets Committee that stated "under Section III.13 of this Tariff by such a request." The effect of this motion to amend essentially would be to restore the language in these respects back to what is now in the present Market Rules (with the exception of the added phrase "that is not subject to a Capacity Supply Obligation").

Mr. Doot asked the ISO and state regulators whether this change would have any impact on their positions with respect to this amendment. Both the ISO and state regulators indicated they remained opposed to this amendment. In response to a question from the sponsor, Mr. Robert Ethier indicated that there are no obligations imposed outside of Section 13 of Market Rule 1 on resources without a CSO that would obligate those resources. Mr. Ethier explained that ISO includes this language in the Market Rule to clarify that when interpreting and implementing Section 13, references in Section 13.6.4 are referring only to Section 13 obligations.

The motion to amend the main motion as proposed by GDF Suez was then voted and failed with a 36.55% Vote in favor (Generation – 17.3%; Transmission – 0%; Supplier 17.3%;

Alternative Resources – 1.95%; Publicly Owned Entity – 0%; and End User – 5.19%). (See Vote 7 on Attachment 2).

Mr. Harrington requested that the minutes of this Committee reflect the commitment made by the ISO that they would keep track of all generating resources that do not have a CSO that participate in the energy market and collect that information for two years and going forward in the future to see if we can draw any conclusions about their reliability. Mr. Mark Karl, on behalf of the ISO, concurred with that commitment and stated that the ISO will accumulate that data for all time periods, not just during emergency periods, and will come back at least within two years to discuss with stakeholders what conclusions can be drawn from those results.

Following these series of failed motions to amend, representatives of companies with supply resources in the region expressed their concerns with the resulting Market Rule changes. One member expressed appreciation for the time and effort involved in identifying these reforms, but expressed the view that the region has lost an opportunity to make meaningful reforms. Others also echoed that sentiment, expressing appreciation for the work done especially by the load parties during the effort, but noting that the market would be doomed to fail unless the region addresses the issues regarding out-of-market resources. The member representing the CT OCC and NH OCA, noted that both offices support the Rule changes but would be abstaining at this meeting due to concerns regarding the extension of the carried forward OOM capacity from 5 to 7 years. On behalf of NECPUC, Mr. Harrington sought and received assurances from ISO that it would include negotiated language with the State of Maine in the filing letter to address future review of these Market Rules. Mr. Ethier explained that the negotiated language included a commitment to look at the definitions of out-of-market capacity and the functioning of the APR rules as well as the hiring of an economic consultant. In response to a further inquiry, Mr.

Karl also confirmed that the filing letter would include language similar to the commitment made in the Design Basis Document addressing enhancements to the Regional System Planning process.

The unamended main motion was then voted and passed with a 70.10% Vote in favor (Generation – 0%; Transmission – 17.3%; Supplier – 6.65%; Alternative Resources – 11.55%; Publicly Owned Entity – 17.3%; and End User – 17.3%). (See Vote 8 on Attachment 2).

FCM REVISIONS TO MARKET RULE 1, SECTION 12

Mr. Donald Gates, Chair of the NEPOOL Reliability Committee, then reviewed materials that were circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting regarding Rule changes to Section 12 pertaining to the Forward Capacity Market. Similar to the Markets Committee, Mr. Gates stated that the Reliability Committee at its January 28, 2010 meeting began its deliberations with the set of rule changes to Section 12 of Market Rule 1 that implemented the Design Basis Document that was supported by the Participants Committee at its November 6, 2009 meeting. The Reliability Committee then considered and ultimately supported with a vote reflecting no opposition and eleven abstentions an amendment offered by NGrid to remove certain provisions in that section. Mr. Gates reported also that the Reliability Committee considered, and did not support, two proposed amendments to Section 12 of Market Rule 1, one offered by NRG and another by GDF Suez. Mr. Gates stated that the Reliability Committee recommended Participants Committee support for the Section 12 changes by a 65.4% Vote in favor.

The following main motion was then duly made and seconded:

> RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports revisions to Section 12 of Market Rule 1 relating to the Forward Capacity Market as recommended by the Reliability Committee, as

> supported by the ISO, and as circulated to this Committee in advance of this meeting, together with such other non-substantive changes as the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Reliability Committee may approve.

Mr. Harrington reported that this motion is supported by NECPUC and urged the Committee to approve it.

The NRG member offered a motion to amend the main motion to provide that, using the ISO's methodology and where such zones can be modeled, all capacity zones should be modeled at all times. He stated that this was the same amendment that was offered at the Reliability Committee. He explained that the issue of when zones are modeled is not a reliability issue, but rather is a markets issue, and as described in NRG's amendment presented to the Markets Committee, there are comprehensive mitigation rules in place to ensure there are no market power issues once you do model zones. The NGrid representative noted that NGrid had the same concerns with this amendment as it did with the NRG's proposed amendment to Section 13 that had been proposed at the Markets Committee.

The motion to amend the main motion as proposed by NRG was then voted and failed with a 36.55% Vote in favor (Generation – 17.3%; Transmission – 0%; Supplier 17.3%; Alternative Resources – 1.95%; Publicly Owned Entity – 0%; and End User – 5.19%). (See Vote 9 on Attachment 2).

The GDF Suez member next offered a motion to amend the main motion to ensure that the Local Sourcing Requirement (LSR) or the capacity requirement for the Rest of System is not understated in situations where a valid Transmission Security Analysis (TSA) may exist for the Rest of System zone. He explained that the Market Rule changes recommended by the Reliability Committee would change the calculation of the Maximum Capacity Limit (MCL). He said that the existing Rules currently define the MCL as the ICR less the LSR and the changes recommended by the Reliability Committee would amend that to be the ICR less the Local Resource Adequacy requirement. He explained that GDF Suez's proposed amendment was intended to maintain the definition of MCL as the ICR less the LSR, but to add a new section dealing with LSR that would state that in the event there is no valid TSA for the Rest of System zone, one cannot be used in the calculation of LSR for the Rest of System. He explained that this amendment was intended to maintain the existing symmetry between the MCL and the LSR calculations and to ensure that there is no understatement of the capacity requirement for the Rest of System.

Mr. Karl indicated that the ISO opposed this amendment. The ISO had reviewed the issue presented but was unsure of what criteria would apply in order to calculate a TSA for an unconstrained zone. Further, the ISO was concerned that the amendment if passed would negatively impact auction design. The sponsor of this motion to amend responded with his view that concerns regarding impacts on the auction should not be a reason not to evaluate this issue.

After further discussion, the motion to amend the main motion as proposed by GDF Suez was then voted and failed with a 33.8% Vote in favor (Generation – 17.3%; Transmission – 0%; Supplier 14.55%; Alternative Resources – 1.95%; Publicly Owned Entity – 0%; and End User – 0%). (See Vote 10 on Attachment 2).

The unamended main motion was then voted and passed with a 71.69% Vote in favor (Generation – 0%; Transmission – 17.3%; Supplier – 6.29%; Alternative Resources – 13.5%; Publicly Owned Entity – 17.3%; and End User – 17.3%). (See Vote 11 on Attachment 2).

ISO PROPOSAL REGARDING SCHEDULE FOR RESOLUTION OF TIE BENEFITS ISSUES

Addressing a matter that, during the January Participants Committee meeting had been sent to the Reliability Committee for a recommendation, Mr. Gates reported on the Reliability Committee's action regarding the ISO's process proposal for addressing tie benefit issues. He reminded the Committee that the ISO proposed to comprehensively review and attempt to resolve all outstanding and identified tie benefits issues through a NEPOOL stakeholder process in the appropriate NEPOOL committees during 2010 and to make a filing with the FERC on or before a date that would allow any related Rule or Tariff changes to be effective in time for FCA5. He indicated that the Reliability Committee discussed and voted the proposal at its January 20, 2010 meeting, but that there was not sufficient support on any proposed response to the ISO request in order to present a recommendation to the Participants Committee. He mentioned that Cross Sound Cable and LIPA offered an amendment that would have carved out one of the so-called "Reserved Issues", but that, too, was not supported.

In the absence of a formal recommendation, Mr. Forshaw asked whether any Participant wished to move the motion that was considered by the Reliability Committee at its January 20 meeting. The following motion was then duly made and seconded:

> RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the ISO's proposal to comprehensively review and attempt to resolve all outstanding and identified tie benefits issues (including, without limitation, the so-called "Reserved Issues" specified in Docket No. ER08-41) through a NEPOOL stakeholder process in the appropriate NEPOOL committees during 2010 and to make a filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on or before a date that will allow any related Rule or Tariff changes to be effective in time for the fifth Forward Capacity Auction covering the 2014-2015 Capacity Commitment Period.

The LIPA representative raised a concern that the Reserved Issues were again being deferred. He reminded the Committee that, in November 2008, the Participants Committee had considered the three issues referred to as the "Reserved Issues" and agreed to a process to address them by February 2010. He stated that, at that time, LIPA was opposed to the resolution because of its view that the issues should be addressed prior to February 2010. He reminded the Committee of its support for that resolution and the subsequent inclusion of that agreement in a FERC filing. He noted that the ISO's latest proposal, yet again, extended the time for addressing the Reserved Issues. The LIPA representative also stated that Power Supply Planning Committee (PSPC) had done a lot of work on the issues and seemed to be ready to make a recommendation on how to proceed. He noted LIPA's objection to rolling the Reserved Issues into the larger tie benefits project, noted LIPA's opposition to the proposal before the Committee, and urged others to vote against the proposal as well. Several other members raised similar process concerns and the ISO's delay in addressing issues that Participants had legitimately raised. The CSC representative reiterated LIPA's concerns and urged members to vote against the ISO proposal because of the process; he stated that, regardless of position on the substance of the Reserved Issues, the ISO proposal should not be supported because of how the issue had evolved to date. Those opposing the motion urged the Committee not to validate ISO's process in terms of not addressing this issue and meeting its commitment to do so by February 2010. He urged members to consider how they would respond if they were treated similar to CSC and LIPA on an issue important to them.

An AR Sector representative stated that some of his clients would vote against the ISO proposal based on the process concerns raised by CSC and LIPA. He added, though, that several of those clients would prefer to have the commencement of the tie benefits issues stakeholder process put off until the last quarter of 2010 so that they could deal with the issues associated with the implementation of FCM.

Other members spoke up in support of the resolution, one member noting that the ISO had already made its filing at the FERC, and that Participants should not oppose a proposal that reflects pragmatically the ISO's conclusion as to how to advance multiple objectives. The MA AG expressed support for the ISO proposal on a contingent basis, stating that the ISO should come up with a timeline for action on the various pieces of the ICR tie benefits issues.

One member stated that the Participants he represented could otherwise support the suggestion to address all these issues together and comprehensively in 2010, but would be opposing the resolution here because the ISO failed to provide timely notice of its plans and to consult with NEPOOL before committing to a schedule change.

Mr. Karl noted that the Participants were being asked only to vote on their position with respect to ISO's FERC filing and explained why the ISO had decided to consolidate all the tie benefits issues and that the ISO has a large list of such issues to address. He said that the Reliability Committee had assembled a working document on these issues in its discussions of FCM, even before the creation of the FCMWG. Indeed, he noted that the FCMWG was formed partly in response to the prior commitment that was made to deal with the zonal requirements issue. He explained that the FCMWG ended up absorbing the attention and resources of the ISO and Participants, preventing the ISO from fully addressing sooner the tie benefits issues. The comprehensive list of tie benefits issues demonstrates that the volume of work overwhelms the available resources of ISO and the Participants and a more realistic and holistic work plan and schedule was needed. Mr. Karl concluded his remarks by indicating that discussions at the Reliability Committee would be held on the work plan to see if a schedule could be created that works for everyone and completes the task in time for FCA5.

Focusing on the resolution before the Committee, some members expressed further concerns regarding the process. While they were supportive generally of dealing with all these issues comprehensively, they were concerned about trying to complete the task by year-end given other time commitments and priorities. In response to further questions, Mr. Doot explained that the issue for the Committee was whether it wished in the circumstances to support the ISO's proposal to complete a comprehensive review by year end. Embedded in that question are the questions of (1) Does the Committee support the timeframe that the ISO has identified, and (2) What message does the Committee wish send to FERC in the ongoing proceeding. Mr. Doot then summarized what he would expect the filing to include depending on the outcome of the vote.

After further discussion, the motion was then voted and failed with a 43.25 % Vote in favor and abstentions noted (Generation – 0%; Transmission – 17.3%; Supplier – 0%; Alternative Resources – 0 %; Publicly Owned Entity – 17.3%; and End User – 8.65 %). (See Vote 12 on Attachment 2).

CONFORMING CHANGE TO MARKET RULE 1, SECTION 12.6 (RETIREMENT OF CAPACITY RESOURCES UNDER FCM)

Mr. Gates referred the Committee to materials circulated in advance of the meeting regarding an amendment to Market Rule 1, Section 12.6 that had been unanimously recommended by the Reliability Committee. He explained that the amendment would conform that section of Market Rule 1 to changes made earlier to the Tariff that subject the retirement of certain capacity resources to provisions of the Market Rules rather than Section I.3.9 of the Tariff. But for the timing of the Reliability Committee action, he explained, the item would have been on the Consent Agenda.

Without further discussion, the following motion was duly made, seconded and unanimously approved:

> RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the amendment to Section 12.6 of Market Rule 1, as recommended by the Reliability Committee at its January 28, 2010 meeting, together with such other non-material changes as may be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Reliability Committee following the meeting.

REVISIONS TO PP-10 (ADDRESSING OVERLAPPING IMPACT ANALYSIS TO BE APPLIED TO DEMAND RESOURCES PARTICIPATING IN FCM)

Mr. Gates then referred the Committee to materials circulated in advance of the meeting regarding revisions to Planning Procedure No. 10 (PP-10). He explained that the revisions addressed the overlapping impact analysis that would be applied to demand resources participating in FCM and were unanimously recommended by the Reliability Committee. Additionally, he noted that the ISO had committed to consider further enhancements to PP-10 to address certain aspects raised during the Reliability Committee's consideration of the changes.

Without further discussion, the Committee unanimously approved the following motion, with abstentions by NextEra, NRG, and PPL:

> RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the revisions to PP-10, as recommended by the Reliability Committee at its January 28, 2010 meeting, together with such other non-material changes as may be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Reliability Committee following the meeting.

LITIGATION REPORT

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the Litigation Report and to materials summarizing three general proceedings initiated by the FERC that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. He indicated that NEPOOL needed to decide whether, and to what extent, it wished to submit comments in the FERC proceedings– a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NOPR) on Credit Reforms (Credit Reform NOPR), and Notice of Inquiries (NOIs) regarding the integration of Variable Energy Resources (VER NOI) and Electricity Market Transparency (EQR NOI) – each. To that end, he reported that the Credit Reform NOPR would be considered by the Budget & Finance Subcommittee; the VER NOI, by a working group to be chaired by Mr. Calvin Bowie; and the EQR NOI, by the Markets Committee. Notice of those discussions would be circulated in due course and Mr. Doot noted that members would be advised of any plans to comment following those discussions and further discussions with the NEPOOL Officers. Similarly, as reported earlier in the meeting, the FERC's proposed RTO/ISO metrics would be considered at a workshop to be scheduled the following week, with any decision on whether and to what extent NEPOOL comments might be appropriate or desirable to be determined following the workshop.

A member requested that ISO participate actively in those efforts and, where appropriate, summarize what, and to what extent, existing New England arrangements might be impacted by, or relevant or responsive to the FERC's initiatives.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

On behalf of the Joint Nominating Committee, Mr. Forshaw reported that a search firm had been retained to assist the Committee with the identification of potential Board candidates. He indicated that the Committee hoped to present a slate for Participants Committee approval either at the April or May 2010 meeting, with the ISO Board scheduled to act on the final slate of candidates at its September 2010 meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Doot then discussed the calendar for the remainder of February and March that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. He noted the next Participants Committee meeting was scheduled for March 5 at the Seaport Hotel in Boston. He highlighted the NARUC Winter

Committee Meetings that were to take place in Washington later that month. Mr. Doot also noted, as reported in the litigation report, a March 3 FERC technical conference on market-based rate and electric quarterly report filings.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David T. Doot, Secretary

ATTACHMENT 1

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES ATTENDING
FEBRUARY 5, 2010 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
511 Plaza LP	End User	William P. Short III	Gus Fromuth	
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Bangor Hydro-Electric Company	Transmission		Stacy Dimou	
BG Dighton Power, LLC	Generation		William Fowler	
Boston Generating, LLC	Generation		William Fowler	
Boylston Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
BP Energy Company	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
Braintree Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		John Coyle (tel)	
Brookfield Energy Marketing /Cross-Sound Cable (CSC)	Supplier	Nicolas Bosse		Jose Rotger
Caithness New England Services Company	Generation		Ken Bekman	
Central Maine Power Company	Transmission			Sue Clary (tel)
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Comverge, Inc.	AR	Brad Swalwell (tel)		
Concord Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Coop.	Publicly Owned	Brian Forshaw		
Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel (CT OCC)	End User		Richard Steeves	Paul Peterson
Conservation Law Foundation	End User			Cindy Arcate
Conservation Services Group (CSG)	AR	Doug Hurley		
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	Supplier		Ken Bekman	
Constellation Energy Commodities Group, Inc.	Supplier	Dan Allegretti (tel)		
Corinth Wood Pellets LLC	End User		Gus Fromuth	
CPower, Inc.	AR	Janette Dudley (tel)		
DC Energy, LLC	Supplier	Bruce Bleiweis (tel)		
Dennis Beverage	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Dominion Energy Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Ron Hart (tel)		
Dragon Products Company LLC	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Dynegy/Calpine	Supplier	Glenn Haake		
Edison Mission Marketing and Trading	Supplier	Raymond Stalter (tel)		
Elektrisola, Inc.	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Energy America, LLC	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
EnerNOC, Inc.	AR	Herb Healy (tel)		
Entergy Nuclear Power Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Ronald Mackowiak (tel)		William Fowler
Exelon Generation Company, LLC	Supplier	William Fowler		
Fairchild Semiconductor Corporation	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Food City, Inc.	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Garland Manufacturing Company	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Gas Recovery Systems, LLC (GRS)	AR		Doug Hurley	
GDF SUEZ Energy Marketing NA/FirstLight	Supplier		Thomas Kaslow	
Granite Ridge/Merrill Lynch/BOA	Supplier		William Fowler	
Groton Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	Supplier	Louis Guilbault (tel)	Robert Stein	
Hammond Lumber Company	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Hardwood Products Company	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User			Roger Borghesani
Hess Corporation	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		John Coyle (tel)	

ATTACHMENT 1

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES ATTENDING
FEBRUARY 5, 2010 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Holden Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Holyoke Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned			Gary Will
Hudson Light and Power Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	End User	Donald Sipe		
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Integrys Energy Services Inc.	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
International Power America (ANP Funding I)	Generation	Dorothy Capra		
LaBree’s Inc.	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Lavalley Lumber Co.	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department	Publicly Owned		Craig Kieney	
Long Island Lighting Company (LIPA)	Supplier	William Killgoar		
Maine Skiing, Inc.	End User	Donald Sipe		
Maine Woods Pallet Company	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Mansfield Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Marblehead Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Marden’s Inc.	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Massachusetts Attorney General’s Office	End User	Jesse S. Reyes	David Cetola	
Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Co.	Publicly Owned	Gary Will		
Mead Oxford	End User	Donald Sipe		
Merchants Plaza, LLC	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Middleborough Gas and Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Millennium Power Partners	Generation		Ken Dell Orto	
Mirant Energy Trading, LLC	Generation	Phil Smith		
NAEA Energy Massachusetts, LLC	Generation	Ken Bekman		
New England Power Company	Transmission	Timothy Brennan		
New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate	End User	Paul Peterson		
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	Generation	Fernando DaSilva		
Northeast Utilities Service Company (NU)	Transmission	Joseph Staszowski	Cal Bowie	
NRG Power Marketing, Inc.	Generation	Pete Fuller		
NSTAR Electric Company	Transmission	James Daly		
PalletOne of Maine	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Pascoag Utility District	Publicly Owned		John Coyle (tel)	
Paxton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Pepco Energy Services, Inc.	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
Pinpoint Power LLC	Supplier			Bob Stein
PowerOptions, Inc.	End User	Cindy Arcate		
PPL EnergyPlus	Supplier		Sharon Weber (tel)	Michelle Graening (tel)
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Provisional Group Member – Generation Sector	Generation	Ken Dell Orto		
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC	Supplier	Joel Gordon		
Quality Egg of New England, LLC	End User	Gus Fromuth		
RJF-Morin Brick	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Robbins Lumber, Inc.	End User	Gus Fromuth		

ATTACHMENT 1

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES ATTENDING
FEBRUARY 5, 2010 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Operations	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Small Distributed Generation Group Member	AR	Doug Hurley		
Small Load Response Group Member	AR	Doug Hurley		
Small Renewable Generation Group Member	AR			Doug Hurley
South Hadley Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
St. Anselm College	End User	Gus Fromuth		
St. Joseph Health Services of Rhode Island	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Taunton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Brian Forshaw	
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
The Energy Consortium (TEC)	End User	Roger Borghesani		
The Energy Council of RI (TEC-RI)	End User			Roger Borghesani
TransCanada Power Marketing Ltd.	Generation		Michael Hachey	
Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS)	End User		Paul Peterson	
United Illuminating Company, The	Transmission	Rich Peters		
Vermont Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned	Craig Kieny		
Vermont Electric Power Company, Inc.	Transmission		Kirk Shields (tel)	
Vermont Energy Investment Corporation (VEIC)	AR		Doug Hurley	
Wakefield Municipal Gas and Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Westfield Gas & Electric Department	Publicly Owned	Anthony Contrino	Gerald Tomasko	Gary Will
Westerly Hospital	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Whole Foods Market Group, Inc.	End User	Gus Fromuth		
ZTECH, LLC	End User	Gus Fromuth		

**ROLL CALL VOTES TAKEN AT FEBRUARY 5, 2010
NEPOOL PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

TOTAL

SECTOR	VOTE 1	VOTE 2	VOTE 3	VOTE 4	VOTE 5	VOTE 6	VOTE 7	VOTE 8	VOTE 9	VOTE 10	VOTE 11	VOTE 12
GENERATION	17.30	17.30	17.30	17.30	17.30	17.30	17.30	0.00	17.30	17.30	0.00	0.00
TRANSMISSION	2.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.30	0.00	0.00	17.30	17.30
SUPPLIER	11.98	8.65	17.30	17.30	17.30	10.49	17.30	6.65	17.30	14.55	6.29	0.00
ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES	1.95	1.95	1.95	1.95	1.95	1.95	1.95	11.55	1.95	1.95	13.50	0.00
PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY	17.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.30	0.00	0.00	17.30	17.30
END USER	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.30	0.00	0.00	17.30	8.65
% IN FAVOR	51.00	27.90	36.55	41.74	36.55	29.74	36.55	70.10	36.55	33.80	71.69	43.25

Vote 1: HQ US Amendment (Competitive Offer Requirement for External Capacity Resources)

Vote 2: GDF Suez Amendment No. 1 Regarding Generation and Import Capacity Participation

Vote 3: Mirant Amendments (INTMMU Review of New Offers Below 0.75 times CONE)

Vote 4: NRG Amendment Regarding De-List Bids and Price Setting in Capacity Zones

Vote 5: PSEG Amendment No. 1 (Pivotal Supplier Definition)

Vote 6: PSEG Amendment No. 2 (ISO Requests for Energy)

Vote 7: GDF Suez Amendment No. 1 (ISO Requests for Energy)

Vote 8: Main Motion (FCM Revisions to Market Rule 1, Section 13)

Vote 9: NRG Amendment Regarding Capacity Zones

Vote 10: GDF Suez Amendment Regarding TSA Requirements

Vote 11: Main Motion (FCM Revisions to Market Rule 1, Section 12)

Vote 12: ISO Proposal Regarding Schedule for Resolution of Tie Benefits Issues

**ROLL CALL VOTES TAKEN AT FEBRUARY 5, 2010
NEPOOL PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

GENERATION

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6	Vote 7	Vote 8	Vote 9	Vote 10	Vote 11	Vote 12
BG Dighton Power	A	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	A	O
Boston Generating	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	A	O
Caithness New England	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	A
Dominion Energy Marketing	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	O
Entergy Nuclear Power	A	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	A
International Power America	A	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	A
Millennium Power Partners	A	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	O
Mirant Energy Trading	A	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	O
NAEA Energy of Massachusetts	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	A
NextEra Energy Resources	--	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	A
NRG Power Marketing	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	A
TransCanada Power Marketing	A	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	A
Provisional Member Group	A	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	O
IN FAVOR (F)	5	12	12	12	12	12	12	0	12	12	0	0
OPPOSED (O)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	10	5
TOTAL VOTES	5	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	10	5
ABSTENTIONS (A)	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7

TRANSMISSION

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6	Vote 7	Vote 8	Vote 9	Vote 10	Vote 11	Vote 12
Bangor Hydro-Electric Co.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	A	O	F	F
Central Maine Power Co.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
New England Power Co.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Northeast Utilities System Co.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
NSTAR Electric Co.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
United Illuminating Co.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Vermont Electric Power Co.	F	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
IN FAVOR (F)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	7	7
OPPOSED (O)	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	6	7	0	0
TOTAL VOTES	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	7
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

**ROLL CALL VOTES TAKEN AT FEBRUARY 5, 2010
NEPOOL PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

SUPPLIER

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6	Vote 7	Vote 8	Vote 9	Vote 10	Vote 11	Vote 12
BP Energy Co.	A	A	A	A	A	O	A	A	A	A	A	A
Brookfield / CSC[1]												
Brookfield Energy Marketing	F	A	F	A	F	F	F	O	A	O	O	O
Cross-Sound Cable Company	F	A	A	A	A	A	F	O	A	A	O	O
Consolidated Edison Energy	A	A	A	F	A	A	F	A	F	F	O	O
Constellation Energy Commodities Grp	F	O	A	A	A	A	A	F	F	F	O	A
DC Energy	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	--	--	--	A
Dynegy/Calpine	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	--	O	O	A
Energy America	O	O	A	F	A	O	F	F	F	F	F	A
Exelon Generation	F	A	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	A	O
GDF SUEZ / FirstLight	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	A
Granite Ridge / Merrill Lynch / BoA	A	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	A	O
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.)	F	A	F	F	F	F	F	A	F	F	A	O
Hess Corporation	O	O	A	F	A	O	F	F	F	A	F	A
Integrys Energy Services	O	O	A	F	A	O	F	F	F	A	F	A
LIPA	F	F	A	A	A	A	A	O	A	A	O	O
Pepco Energy Services	O	O	A	A	A	O	F	F	A	A	F	A
Pinpoint Power	F	A	A	F	A	A	A	A	F	F	A	O
PPL EnergyPlus	A	A	F	F	F	F	F	O	--	--	A	A
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	O	A
IN FAVOR (F)	9.0	5.0	7.7	12.0	7.7	7.7	13.0	5.0	11.0	9.0	4.0	0.0
OPPOSED (O)	4.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	1.7	7.0	7.0
TOTAL VOTES	13.0	10.0	7.7	12.0	7.7	12.7	13.0	13.0	11.0	10.7	11.0	7.0
ABSTENTIONS (A)	5.0	8.0	10.3	6.0	10.3	5.3	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.3	6.0	11.0

[1] Brookfield and CSC, which are Related Persons, have elected to split their vote as follows: Brookfield - 70%; CSC – 30%.

ROLL CALL VOTES TAKEN AT FEBRUARY 5, 2010
NEPOOL PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING

ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6	Vote 7	Vote 8	Vote 9	Vote 10	Vote 11	Vote 12
Renewable Generation												
Gas Recovery Systems	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	O
Small RG Group Member	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	O	F	F	F	O
Distributed Generation												
Small DG Group Member	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	O
Load Response												
Comverge	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	O
Conservation Services Group	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	O
CPower	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	
EnerNOC	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	O
Vermont Energy Investment Corp.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	O
Small LR Group Member	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	O
IN FAVOR (F)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1	1	9	0
OPPOSED (O)	5	8	8	8	8	8	8	1	8	8	0	8
TOTAL VOTES	6	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	8
ABSTENTIONS (A)	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

ROLL CALL VOTES TAKEN AT FEBRUARY 5, 2010
NEPOOL PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING

PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6	Vote 7	Vote 8	Vote 9	Vote 10	Vote 11	Vote 12
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Boylston Municipal Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Braintree Electric Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Concord Municipal Light Plant	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Conn. Municipal Electric Energy Coop.	F	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Groton Electric Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Holden Municipal Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Holyoke Gas & Electric Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Hudson Light and Power Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Ipswich Municipal Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Mansfield Municipal Electric Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Marblehead Municipal Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Co.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Middleborough Gas and Electric Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Middleton Municipal Electric Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Pascoag Utility District	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Paxton Municipal Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Princeton Municipal Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Shrewsbury Electric & Cable Ops.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
South Hadley Electric Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Vermont Electric Cooperative	F	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Wakefield Municipal Gas & Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Westfield Gas & Electric Light Dept.	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
IN FAVOR (F)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	33	33
OPPOSED (O)	0	33	33	33	33	33	33	0	33	33	0	0
TOTAL VOTES	2	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
ABSTENTIONS (A)	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**ROLL CALL VOTES TAKEN AT FEBRUARY 5, 2010
NEPOOL PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

END USER

Participant Name	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6	Vote 7	Vote 8	Vote 9	Vote 10	Vote 11	Vote 12
511 Plaza	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
CT Office of Consumer Counsel	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	F	O
Conservation Law Foundation	O	O	O	A	A	A	A	F	A	A	F	A
Corinth Wood Pellets	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Dennis Beverage	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Dragon Products Co.	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Elektrisola, Inc.	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Fairchild Semiconductor Corp.	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Food City, Inc.	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Garland Manufacturing Co.	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Hammond Lumber Co.	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Hardwood Products Co.	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	A
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	A	O	O	F	O	O	O	F	--	--	--	--
LaBree's	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Lavalley Lumber Co.	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Maine Skiing	A	O	O	F	O	O	O	F	--	--	--	--
Maine Woods Pellet Co.	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Marden's	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Mass. Attorney General's Office	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
Mead Oxford	A	O	O	F	O	O	O	F	--	--	--	--
Merchants Plaza	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
NH Office of Consumer Advocate	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	A	O	O	F	O
PalletOne of Maine	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
PowerOptions	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	A
Quality Egg of New England	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
RJF – Morin Brick	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Robbins Lumber	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
St. Anselm College	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
St. Joseph Health Services of RI	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
The Energy Consortium	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	F
The Energy Council of RI	A	O	O	O	O	O	O	F	O	O	F	A
Union of Concerned Scientists	A	O	O	A	A	A	A	F	A	A	F	A
Westerly Hospital	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Whole Foods Market Group	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
Z-TECH, LLC	O	O	O	A	O	O	O	F	A	A	F	A
IN FAVOR (F)	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	34	0	0	33	2
OPPOSED (O)	30	36	36	7	34	34	34	0	7	7	0	2
TOTAL VOTES	30	36	36	10	34	34	34	34	7	7	33	4
ABSTENTIONS (A)	6	0	0	26	2	2	2	2	26	26	0	29