

FINAL

A meeting of the NEPOOL Participants Committee was held at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, April 9, 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.

APPROVAL OF MARCH 5, 2010 MINUTES

Mr. Doot referred the members to the preliminary minutes of the March 5, 2010 meeting that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the preliminary minutes of the March 5 meeting were unanimously approved.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Forshaw referred the Committee to the Consent Agenda that had been circulated in advance of the meeting, with Consent Agenda Item #6 removed for discussion later in the meeting. Following motion duly made and seconded, the Consent Agenda was unanimously approved.

REPORT OF ISO CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Mr. Gordon van Welie summarized the Board and Board Committee meetings that had occurred since the March 5 report. Since March 5, the Audit and Finance Committee, System Planning & Reliability Committee, and the full Board had each met once and the Board Markets Committee had met twice.

Audit and Finance Committee

Mr. van Welie reported that the Audit and Finance Committee met on March 15 in Boston. Mr. Ray Curry, Director of the ISO's Internal Audit Department, attended the meeting and reviewed the Department's recent activities and proposed audit plan, which the Committee approved. The Committee also approved the use of Meyers Brothers Kalicka, P.C., a regional accounting firm, to perform the ISO's benefits plan audits. The Committee discussed the Internal Audit Department's increasing workload related to pre-implementation reviews of new business processes and system implementations. Dr. Vamsi Chadalavada explained to the Audit and Finance Committee that this work helps to mitigate risks related to the ISO's simultaneous implementation of a number of new capital projects. Given the increasing workload, that Board Committee asked Mr. Curry to consider the resource needs of the Internal Audit Department and to advise whether to add another staff member to his group.

Mr. van Welie reported that the Audit and Finance Committee next reviewed the ISO's performance to date against the 2010 budget, and then undertook its annual review of its charter. The Committee agreed that the charter accurately describes the Committee's responsibilities and that the Committee was fulfilling those responsibilities.

Last, Mr. van Welie reported that the ISO's external auditors, KPMG, joined the Audit and Finance Committee meeting at that point to discuss the scope of the upcoming SAS 70 Type 2 audit and the results of the 2009 financial statements audit. After management reviewed the Sarbanes-Oxley disclosures related to the financial reporting, the Committee met with KPMG in executive session. Following this portion of the meeting, the Committee approved the 2009 financial statements and recommended their adoption by the Board.

Board Markets Committee

Mr. van Welie went on to report that the Board Markets Committee met on March 18. The Committee received its regular reports on market monitoring activity, market seams, and the NEPOOL Markets Committee. The Board Markets Committee also received an update on the Internal Market Monitor's project to improve its business processes and controls, and discussed using a change management protocol to keep the processes up to date. During the regular report on reliability costs, the Board Markets Committee discussed price volatility, and the External Market Monitor observed that, when compared to other regions, New England experiences the least volatile prices. Mr. van Welie said that the Board Markets Committee discussed in detail the FERC litigation involving the ISO's proposed FCM changes, including comments of the External Market Monitor and stakeholders on the ISO's filing and the ISO's proposed answer suggesting additional stakeholder process to consider the important issues raised in those filings. Further, he reported that Mr. Robert Ethier then updated the Board Markets Committee on Price-Responsive Demand (PRD) issues, including stakeholder discussions and the FERC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on "Demand Response Compensation in Organized Wholesale Energy Markets" (DR Compensation NOPR) that was issued on the day of that meeting. Last, the Internal Market Monitor provided the Board Markets Committee with a primer on virtual trading.

Mr. van Welie further reported that on April 8, 2010, the ISO Board Markets Committee met again and discussed the DR Compensation NOPR. He explained that the NOPR proposed that ISOs and RTOs be required to pay the full LMP for demand reductions made in response to price signals in all hours in which demand resources reduce energy consumption from expected levels. After discussing the content of the NOPR, that Committee discussed stakeholder

perspectives on the NOPR and the ramifications of possible comments on and outcomes from the NOPR. Given these perspectives and the Board's prior position on the substantive issues raised by the NOPR, the Committee agreed that the ISO should continue to explain to the FERC how an economically efficient market solution can be achieved with PRD. The ISO's comments would explain how the FERC's proposed rule could be implemented while maintaining an economically efficient market. In simplest terms, a demand response resource would acquire its energy to meet expected load, which it could sell back to the market at the full LMP if it chooses to implement demand response and not consume the energy. Further, the Board Markets Committee agreed that the ISO comments should explain that, if such an approach is not adopted, difficult and complex issues of market efficiency, cost allocation and baseline computations must be addressed. For instance, the ISO would explain why paying the LMP less the retail generation rate for demand reductions – i.e., $(LMP - G)$ – is consistent with economic efficiency. Additionally, the ISO would explain how allocating the resulting costs to load-serving entities whose load was reduced by the demand response minimizes cost impacts on final consumers. Mr. van Welie indicated his understanding that the NEPOOL Markets Committee was planning to discuss its proposed comments to the DR Compensation NOPR at its April 14 meeting, where he also expected further discussion regarding the ISO's views on the DR Compensation NOPR.

Following this report from Mr. van Welie, there were numerous comments on the ISO's suggested approach to the DR Compensation NOPR. One member urged the ISO to explain in response to the DR Compensation NOPR the impact paying LMP in all hours would have on the market and to identify the details that would be needed to be worked out, rather than advocate for a particular solution. Mr. van Welie responded that the ISO wished to explain that the FERC

could implement paying LMP if that were its policy goal, but would need to address the issues the ISO has identified. Another member questioned why the ISO planned to respond to the NOPR with a proposal that was first raised late in 2008 and subsequently dropped from consideration. Mr. van Welie responded that, when the issue was raised 18 months ago, it was identified as one way of solving the issues of concern to the ISO. It was being raised again since it appeared to be how the FERC wished to proceed. The ISO, he explained, wished to point out to the FERC how it could achieve its stated objectives without causing other problems in the markets. A third member urged the ISO instead to take another look at what the FERC had proposed, evaluate whether it agreed or disagreed with what had been proposed, and indicate the extent to which anything else the ISO was proposing by way of PD was consistent or inconsistent with the FERC's proposal.

Focusing on Board process, a member asked if the Board had voted on the ISO's proposed comments on the DR Compensation NOPR. Messrs. van Welie and Hepper explained that the ISO Board typically votes only on the ISO budget, and addresses Market Rule filings by Committee consensus following the stakeholder process.

A member expressed support for the Board's decision given the extensive stakeholder process to date. He urged that members now work together to see if a common NEPOOL position could be achieved.

System Planning and Reliability Committee (SPARC)

Mr. van Welie then reported that SPARC met on March 18 in Holyoke. That Committee received an update on the upcoming FCM auction and discussed several issues related to this auction. The SPARC also discussed the appropriate role of non-transmission alternatives in the

planning process, and considered the various stakeholder opinions on that topic. Mr. van Welie went on to report that Mr. Stephen Rourke gave SPARC an update on a number of proposed transmission projects and the related needs assessments, which would include various scenarios based on the availability of Vermont Yankee and the Kleen Energy plant. Last, the SPARC considered the recent wind power study endorsed by the New England governors.

Full Board

Mr. van Welie reported that the full Board of Directors met on March 18, at which time he gave his CEO report, noting that a number of the ISO's capital projects were at a critical stage, including those related to FCM, Demand Response Integration and SMD. He agreed to provide the Board more information on the progress of those projects and the related risks at the Board's April meeting, a meeting at which strategic planning was intended to be of principal focus. During his report, Mr. van Welie also outlined the DR Compensation NOPR. Following that discussion, the various Committees of the Board reported on their recent activities. During the Markets Committee's report, the Board discussed the various comments on the ISO's recent FCM filing. Following the Audit and Finance Committee's report, the Board approved the 2009 financial statements.

REPORT OF ISO CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

Dr. 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 March natural gas prices were 27% lower and oil prices were 4.1% higher than February average values. Average Real-Time Hub LMPs over the period, he continued, were down 26.6% from February 2010 averages. He then reported that the total reliability costs for the month of March were about \$1.3 million, with a large portion of that in First Contingency payments. He

reviewed that there was a Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting scheduled for April 27 to discuss several topics, including stakeholder requests for the 2010 Economic Studies, which were due to the ISO by April 1.

Dr. Chadalavada then reported on the Eastern Interconnection Planning Collaborative (EIPC) that was underway. He said that a key stakeholder meeting was scheduled for April 22-23, 2010 to discuss the formation of a stakeholder steering committee and to decide who was going to be on that committee. He stated that committee would be empowered to decide on what resource scenarios the EIPC would work, and which of the scenarios would actually have a full scale reliability analysis from a transmission standpoint. Dr. Chadalavada reported that NESCOE was actively involved in the EIPC process and stressed the importance of NEPOOL's involvement. He noted for the Committee that NEPOOL's input into the EIPC stakeholder process was an item for discussion later in the meeting.

Turning to operations, Dr. Chadalavada reported that the lowest Spring Operable Capacity Margin was calculated to occur in the week beginning May 8; the lowest Summer Operable Capacity Margin, in the week beginning June 5. He noted that, starting in June, the ISO would use the aggregate Capacity Supply Obligations in performing its Operable Capacity analysis. Consequently, he noted the possibility of a lag time in producing the COO report.

Dr. Chadalavada reviewed two noticeable frequency excursions experienced across the Eastern Interconnect during March: one on March 18 when PJM was off schedule (area control error (ACE) -3,000 MW) and requested NPCC shared activation of reserves to restore frequency; and a second event on March 31 when PJM ACE was off schedule by -1,500 MW. He then referred the Committee to charts that reflected the New England ACE and to the PJM ACE and the frequency for each of the two frequency excursions. He noted the normal process was for the

industry to review frequency excursions, and NPCC and NERC working groups would review them as well. Dr. Chadalavada commented that as updates on the results of the reviews became available they would be shared with the Participants Committee and at the Reliability Committee for discussion.

Members questioned whether the two frequency excursions had any market impacts or, instead, were more of a reliability/NERC issue. Dr. Chadalavada stated that the events were primarily reliability-related. He noted that, when ACE signals that far off schedule, generation must ramp up quickly to catch up, so some price impacts might result from the ramping up. He stated that, because the impact on New England ACE was only 250 MW, there were no price spikes in New England. However, Real-Time price spikes could have occurred if the ACE impact was more pronounced and lasted for a longer period of time.

Referring to the chart, a member noted that the frequency dropped slowly and asked what corrected it, and whether there were any known voltage problems. Dr. Chadalavada responded that New England, New York and the Midwest ISO called for NPCC shared activation of reserves and reported that every Control Area that was requested contributed to the frequency restoration. Mr. Peter Brandien explained that, because both of these excursions occurred during a time change, and because he suspected that there were a number of balancing authorities that were not implementing their time change properly, he did not believe that New England would find any relationship to New England System problems. A member asked whether the ISO was concerned that it had been over a week since the excursions and there were still no answers and whether phasor measurement units (PMUs) would help to avoid this type of occurrence in the future. Dr. Chadalavada said that PMUs would help in the future and that the

data would be useful. He explained that PJM was in the process of collecting and analyzing data and that the information would be shared as it became available.

Dr. Chadalavada concluded his report by reviewing the ISO's 2010 project portfolio, which he explained had 25 to 30 projects and a higher risk profile in comparison to previous years. He noted that the first half of 2010 would mark the completion of the following projects: upgrade of the Oracle database; installation of state-of-the art Communications Infrastructure to communicate with and dispatch assets; SMD Software Upgrade Phase II; FCM Phase II; and Demand Resource Integration. He then turned to project risks, noting the high degree of interdependency across projects; complexity and uniqueness of the projects being implemented; high degree of impact to ISO reliability and market functions; high degree of readiness required from market participants; and limited flexibility in implementation timelines.

NEPOOL COMMENTS ON VER NOI

Mr. Calvin Bowie, Chairman of the Variable Energy Resources (VER) Notice of Inquiry (NOI) Working Group, referred the Committee to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting concerning NEPOOL comments developed in response to the FERC's NOI regarding the integration of an increasing number of VERs (such as wind and solar generators) into the electric grid. He reported that, since the discussion at the March 5, 2010 Participants Committee meeting, proposed comments had been drafted and subsequently reviewed by the working group at a March 31 meeting. He explained that the draft comments circulated to the Participants Committee reflected comments received on the initial draft and were consistent with the outline recommended by the Reliability Committee at its February 26 meeting. He explained that, if the draft comments were approved, they would be filed by the FERC's revised April 12 deadline.

The following motion was then duly made, seconded and unanimously approved, with an abstention by the MA AG:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the NEPOOL comments in response to the FERC's Notice of Inquiry on Variable Energy Resources (VER NOI), as distributed with the materials for the April 9, 2010 Participants Committee meeting.

OPPORTUNITY FOR ADDITIONAL NEPOOL COMMENTS ON CREDIT REFORMS NOPR

In a follow-up item from the March 5, 2010 meeting, Mr. Forshaw referred the Committee to materials circulated in advance of the meeting, which included a copy of comments filed by NEPOOL on March 29, in response to the FERC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking titled "Credit Reforms in Organized Wholesale Electric Markets" in Docket No. RM10-13 (Credit Reforms NOPR). Those comments, he explained, reflected input received from the Committee at its March 5, 2010 meeting, along with input from the Budget and Finance Subcommittee received prior to and after that meeting, advocated in favor of billing and credit provisions previously approved by NEPOOL, and did not stake out any additional positions not previously voted on by NEPOOL. Consistent with commitments made at the March 5 meeting, Mr. Forshaw invited Participants to propose any additional comments or positions to be submitted by NEPOOL that would be materially different or beyond those already filed by NEPOOL in response to the Credit Reforms NOPR. No further proposals were made.

REVISIONS TO FINANCIAL ASSURANCE POLICY FCM AND LETTER OF CREDIT PROVISIONS

Mr. Joel Gordon, Chair of the Budget and Finance Subcommittee, then referred the Committee to materials that were circulated in advance of the meeting regarding two groups of changes to the Financial Assurance Policy that had been considered without objection by the

Subcommittee. He reported that the first group of changes were discussed with the Subcommittee at its March 22 teleconference. Those changes included FCM-related revisions (i) to permit a Market Participant to retain its CSO Bilaterals following a suspension so long as it has provided adequate financial assurance for those CSO Bilaterals, (ii) to conform terminology in the Policy and provide the ISO the option to terminate, rather than require automatic termination of, a resource's CSO in certain circumstances, and (iii) to address failures by certain banks to pay on letters of credit when requested to by the ISO. The second group of changes had been presented to the Subcommittee at its October 26, 2009 meeting. This second group of changes clarified Lead Market Participant responsibility for posting FCM-related financial assurance and adjusted the amount of financial assurance required from load-serving entities to better account for capacity charge liability.

The following motions were then duly made, seconded and unanimously approved:

RESOLVED, that the NEPOOL Participants Committee supports the changes to the ISO New England Financial Assurance Policy circulated to the Committee and discussed at this meeting (the FCM and Letter-of-Credit Changes), together with such further non-substantive changes as the Chief Financial Officer of the ISO and the Chairman of the Budget and Finance Subcommittee may approve; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the NEPOOL Participants Committee delegates to the Chair of the Budget and Finance Subcommittee, working with NEPOOL Counsel and ISO New England, the authority to identify and file with the FERC further amendment to the version of the ISO New England Financial Assurance Policy that is pending before the FERC for approval reflecting changes to unsecured credit in order to reflect the FCM And Letter-of-Credit Changes, it being understood that a vote in support of this resolution is without prejudice to any position of the supporting Participant on the version of the ISO New England Financial Assurance Policy that reflects the changes to unsecured credit.

REVISIONS TO FCM CONFORMING DEFINITIONS, INCLUDING REAL-TIME HIGH OPERATING LIMIT

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting regarding changes to Section I.2.2 (Definitions) of the ISO Tariff, as well as a related change in Attachment N (“Procedures for Regional System Plan Upgrades”) to Section II of the ISO Tariff, to conform those sections to FCM. He explained that the changes had been reviewed and recommended variously by the NEPOOL Markets, Reliability, and Transmission Committees, and reviewed by the NEPOOL Budget and Finance Subcommittee. All of the changes were proposed to be addressed as a single package. He then noted that the changes recommended by the Transmission Committee, which had previously been included as Item No. 6 on the Consent Agenda, had been removed from the Consent Agenda and were included in the package given their overlap with the changes recommended by the other Committees.

Explaining further the process followed to date for considering these changes, he noted that the Reliability Committee unanimously recommended at its March 17, 2010 meeting Participants Committee support for the proposed changes it reviewed to Section 12.9 of Market Rule 1. There were no concerns or objections raised during the Budget and Finance Subcommittee’s March 22, 2010 review of the changes effecting the Financial Assurance and Billing Policies. The Transmission Committee unanimously recommended Participants Committee support for the changes it reviewed at its March 24, 2010 meeting affecting Sections I and II of the ISO Tariff and Attachment N to Section II. At its March 9-10, 2010 meeting, the Markets Committee recommended, without opposition, Participants Committee support for the changes effecting Section 13 of Market Rule 1, with multiple abstentions noted across several Sectors. Mr. Doot explained that the concerns that appeared to result in the very high number of abstentions related to the definition of “Real-Time High Operating Limit,” and specifically to

the requirement that a Market Participant report an up-to-date Real-Time High Operating Limit value at all times for a resource.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the revisions to Section I.2.2 (Definitions) of the ISO Tariff and Attachment N to Section II of the ISO Tariff to conform to the Forward Capacity Market, as reviewed by the Budget and Finance Subcommittee, and as recommended by the Markets, Reliability, and Transmission Committees, together with any non-substantive changes as the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the Markets Committee, Reliability Committee, Transmission Committee, and the Budget and Finance Subcommittee, as appropriate, may approve.

Ms. Allison DiGrande, Chair of the Markets Committee, then reported that, following the Markets Committee deliberations, NEPOOL Counsel responded to drafting concerns with the definition of Real-Time High Operating Limit, and proposed in a March 16 memorandum to the Reliability Committee, a suggested non-substantive modification to move a portion of the provisions that appeared in the definition of Real-Time High Operating Limit into a new stand-alone Section III.13.6.4.1 in Market Rule 1, but to make no other changes in the language previously recommended by the Markets Committee.

Based on that information, the following motion to amend the main motion was then duly made and seconded:

To expand the identified changes to include proposed changes to the definition of Real-Time High Operating Limit and Section III.13.6.4.1 in Market Rule 1, as reflected in NEPOOL Counsel's March 16 Memorandum to the Reliability Committee that was circulated with the materials for the meeting.

The NRG representative expressed support for the change proposed by the motion to amend the main motion, but explained that NRG would oppose the main motion, even as amended, because of concern over the proposed requirement associated with a Real-Time High Operating Limit.

Following further clarification and discussion, the motion to amend the main motion was unanimously approved.

The amended main motion was then voted and passed with opposition by Mirant and NRG; and abstentions by Bangor Hydro, BP, Brookfield, Caithness, Comverge, ConEdison, CPower, CSC, Dynegy, EnerNOC, Entergy, NAEA, NextEra, PPL and PSEG.

REVISIONS TO DEFINITIONS OF ASSET RELATED DEMAND AND DISPATCHABLE ASSET RELATED DEMAND

Ms. DiGrande reviewed materials that were circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting regarding the unanimous recommendation of the Markets Committee for support of modifications to the definitions of Asset Related Demand (ARD) and Dispatchable Asset Related Demand (DARD). She explained that the changes were proposed in response to certain requirements of the FERC's January 21 order on the April 2009 joint ISO/NEPOOL Order 719 compliance filing. The revised definitions reduced the minimum threshold for ARD and DARD from 5 MW to 1 MW and allowed aggregation of retail customers receiving electrical service from the same point of supply.

The following motion was duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the revisions to Section I.2.2 (Definitions) of the Tariff in response to FERC's January 21, 2010 order relating to the ISO and NEPOOL's April 2009 Order No. 719 compliance filing, without prejudice to any future positions, inconsistent or otherwise with the positions taken today, as to whether Dispatchable Asset Related Demands comply with the comparability requirements of Order No. 719 as they pertain to ancillary services, 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 ISO addressed questions and comments related to the proposed changes. In response to a question from the EnerNOC representative, Mr. Ethier indicated that the ISO intended to

start a project, using lessons learned from the Demand Response Reserve Pilot Program, to study opportunities for active demand resources to participate in the markets on the supply side. Mr. Ethier committed the ISO, once data from the Demand Response Reserve Pilot Program was finalized, to present a summary of the results from that program to the Markets Committee. The ISO also committed to ensure that the effective date for the definition changes would permit completion of coordination activities among the ISO and the parties responsible for supporting DARD registration and metering, including the Host Participant Meter Readers.

The EnerNOC representative indicated that EnerNOC would abstain from the motion to support the changes because the initiative, which EnerNOC otherwise supported, because it increased flexibility for participation by certain resources in the market, was being undertaken for the wrong reasons and was being incorrectly prioritized. He noted EnerNOC's view that the changes would as a practical matter present little to no additional opportunities for participation by demand response and active demand resources in the market. He explained that, because active demand resources that had already cleared in the FCM were ineligible to participate as a DARD in the near term, and with more than 1,800 MW of active demand resources already committed in one of the first FCM Capacity Commitment Periods, there were, as a practical matter, only a limited number of uncommitted resources that could show up as a DARD. He expressed his opposition to the restrictions prohibiting participation of resources both as a demand-side and a supply-side resource, and predicted that the proposed changes would not materially increase participation by DARD.

Sharing many of the concerns raised by EnerNOC, the CPower representative focused her comments on CPower's view that resources smaller than 1 MW needed an opportunity to participate, and the need for supply-side reserve offerings.

The Committee then considered and unanimously approved the motion, with abstentions noted by Converge, Dynege, EnerNOC, Harvard, Small Renewable Generation Group Member, and TEC-RI.

HQICCS FOR 2013/2014

Mr. Donald Gates, Chair of the Reliability Committee, referred the Committee to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting concerning the Hydro-Québec Interconnection Capability Credits (HQICC) values for the Forward Capacity Auction for the 2013/2014 Capability Year (FCA4) that were initially proposed by the ISO and had been recommended for approval by the Reliability Committee. He reported that the Reliability Committee voted on that recommendation at its March 18 meeting, and the motion to recommend Participants Committee support passed with five members opposing (2 Generation Sector, 3 Supplier Sector) and one member in the Supplier Sector abstaining.

The following motion was then duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the HQICC values for the Forward Capacity Auction for the 2013/2014 Capability Year recommended by the Reliability Committee, as reflected in materials circulated to the Participants Committee in advance of this meeting.

The representatives of LIPA and CSC indicated they would oppose the motion as well as the motion to support the 2013/2014 Installed Capacity Requirements (ICR) and associated values because of what they perceived to be a lack of recognition of the reliability benefits of the Cross Sound Cable. The LIPA and CSC representatives also noted their hope that stakeholder discussions regarding the improvement of the methodology for addressing internal interface limitations, recently deferred to the end of 2010, would be completed without further delay, given the associated capacity implications for the Cross Sound Cable. The NSTAR

representative also noted his objection to the motion because, as previously expressed, he believed that the credits were understated and did not properly reflect the reliability benefits.

The motion was then voted and passed with a 77.98% Vote in favor (Generation – 0%; Transmission – 17.3%; Supplier – 12.58%; Alternative Resources – 13.5%; Publicly Owned Entity – 17.3%; and End User – 17.3%). (See Vote 1 on Attachment 2).

ICR AND ASSOCIATED VALUES FOR 2013/2014

Mr. Gates then referred the Committee to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting regarding the ISO's proposed megawatt values for the New England ICR, Connecticut and NEMA/Boston Local Sourcing Requirements (LSR), and Maine Maximum Capacity Limit (MCL) to be used in FCA4, which values were also recommended for Participants Committee support by the Reliability Committee, by a vote of 65.83% in favor.

The following motion was then duly made and seconded:

RESOLVED, that the Participants Committee supports the New England Installed Capacity Requirement (ICR), Connecticut and NEMA/Boston Local Sourcing Requirements (LSR) and Maine Maximum Capacity Limit (MCL) for the Forward Capacity Auction for the 2013/2014 Capability Year recommended by the Reliability Committee reflected in materials circulated to the Participants Committee in advance of this meeting.

Members then proceeded to identify concerns and questions concerning aspects of the calculation of ICR and associated values. Addressing the impact of voltage reduction on the calculations, the CMEEC representative, reiterating concerns identified at the Reliability Committee, noted a concern that the ICR and associated values appeared to understate the region's voltage reduction capability, and hoped that the number would be re-considered in the future. In response to questions, Mr. Marc Karl indicated that the fixed number for voltage reduction used in the ICR calculation, 1.5%, was intended to reflect the Control Room's physical

experience and observations during voltage reduction tests. He indicated that the ISO intended to monitor the continued suitability of the percentage and would re-visit the percentage to the extent that experience suggested such reconsideration was necessary or appropriate. A member, noting the impact of the percentage on the overall calculation, urged resolution of any lingering concerns so that future time and effort could be focused on ICR-related issues of broader impact.

The representative of NRG raised a continuing concern, identified in previous discussions concerning the ICR and associated values, regarding the treatment of new versus existing imports. He noted his view that there were roughly 937 MW of imports that were improperly classified in the ICR calculation, lowering overall ICR by 40 MW. He urged that the import classification issue be addressed before the 2014/2015 ICR was established.

In addition to his previously articulated concern that the ICR continued to be established at an unacceptably low level, particularly when viewed against the requirements in other Control Areas, the Caithness and NAEA representative identified a concern with the MCL associated with Maine. In that calculation, he asserted, tie benefits were assigned a higher priority than internal generation, which negatively impacted internal generation. For this reason, as well as for the improved, but not yet adequate reserve margin, he indicated that Caithness and NAEA would oppose the proposed values. Also as previously articulated, the CSC representative reaffirmed that the basis for the CSC and LIPA opposition was the failure of the ICR to recognize the reliability value of the Cross Sound Cable and treat the Cross Sound Cable comparably with the other ties into New England.

The MA AG representative stated, consistent with its position at the Reliability Committee, that it would vote in favor of this proposal, but that its vote should not be construed as an endorsement of the underlying calculation method as a permanent process.

The motion was voted and failed to pass with a 48.94% Vote in favor (Generation – 2.47%; Transmission – 17.3%; Supplier – 6.1%; Alternative Resources – 0%; Publicly Owned Entity – 17.3%; and End User – 5.77%). (See Vote 2 on Attachment 2).

EIPC STAKEHOLDER PROCESS

Mr. Forshaw referred the Committee to the materials circulated in advance of the meeting concerning the Eastern Interconnection Planning Collaborative (EIPC) Stakeholder Process and explained that the Committee needed to decide whether it wished NEPOOL organizationally to participate in the EIPC stakeholder process. Mr. Doot noted that Dr. Chadalavada would be discussing this issue, as he indicated earlier in the meeting, and MA DPU Chairman Paul Hibbard, who had since joined the meeting as a guest, also would provide input on the Eastern Interconnection planning process.

Dr. Chadalavada described the composition of the EIPC as an organization comprised of 24 planning authorities in the Eastern Interconnection and their stakeholders, that is being formed to conduct interregional system planning across the Eastern Interconnection. He noted there was a high level of EIPC activity, with most of the focus on the formation of the EIPC stakeholder steering committee (EIPC SSC). He said that, when the EIPC made its proposal to the Department of Energy (DOE), it committed to study eight macro-economic future cases with up to 72 scenarios. Further, from those eight cases, three would be selected for a full scale transmission build out study, including a reliability analysis. Dr. Chadalavada explained that the assumptions and the cases studied would be decided by the EIPC SSC, which was also tasked with picking the three cases for the transmission build-out reliability analysis. He stated that the composition of the stakeholder steering committee was not yet decided, nor had a decision been made as to the base case upon which all of these studies will be performed. He explained that

there was agreement to use the 10-year roll-up of each of the planning authorities' system plans, but there was no agreement on how to address the fact that the scenarios and the sensitivities would reflect a 20-year horizon, for which there were not available system plans from all the planning authorities. Dr. Chadalavada reported that the ISO was working closely with state public utility regulators and NESCOE representatives to address this issue by proposing that each region present a 20-year system plan for its region. For example, in New England, with the states and through the PAC, the region would decide upon what the 20-year plan for New England would look like and that would be the input to the EIPC base case. Summarizing, Dr. Chadalavada explained that there were two major issues then confronting the EIPC: (1) what would be the base case for EIPC; and (2) what would be the composition of the stakeholder steering committee. He opined that, among NEPOOL, ISO and the New England states, the region's views on these two issues were aligned. He explained that it was important for EIPC to be aware of that alignment and for NEPOOL to become actively involved.

Chairman Hibbard added that the EIPC base case needed to allow a way to compare future scenarios identified in the EIPC process to how each region believed that it would have evolved without interregional planning. He stated his strong belief that each planning authority must construct a 20-year reference case, and that those cases should be the basis for rolling up into an interconnection-wide reference case against which those future scenarios can be compared. Chairman Hibbard stated his belief that this was the right way to go. He indicated that an alternative, in which a base case would be developed by the EIPC SSC, could result in the New England regional interests and voices overwhelmed by those of other EIPC regions.

Mr. Doot explained that it was not entirely clear how the composition of the stakeholder steering committee would be finalized. Dr. Chadalavada added that the Keystone Center, the

group retained to manage the EIPC stakeholder process, was expected to formulate a stakeholder steering committee that would receive broad support, but absent consensus on the composition of the EIPC SSC, EIPC and the DOE would have to determine how to proceed. Mr. Doot reported that, at the request of the NEPOOL Officers, NEPOOL counsel would participate in the planned meeting of the EIPC in St. Louis later that month.

Mr. Eric Runge, NEPOOL counsel, then reviewed the NEPOOL proposal for the EIPC stakeholder steering committee that was circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting. He summarized the three parts to NEPOOL's proposed response to the formation of the EIPC SSC:

(1) the creation of a NEPOOL Steering Committee to facilitate NEPOOL coordination of its organizational interests, with at least one representative from each Sector (the elected Participants Committee Officer from each Sector or his designee);

(2) NEPOOL counsel as the point person for NEPOOL (i) coordinating with NEPOOL, the New England States, the ISO, and the EIPC SSC representatives from New England; (ii) monitoring and engaging in SSC/EIPC meetings and activities and reporting back to NEPOOL; and (iii) interacting with the NEPOOL Steering Committee and mobilizing that group as necessary; and

(3) support for the following broad principle in the development of the EIPC SSC: equal representation from each geographic region is important; therefore, SSC representation should be equal from each region with a balancing of business interests regardless of what other details are agreed upon for the SSC. This aspect of the proposal would be consistent with the Transmission Owners' proposal to the EIPC and would be consistent with any others that ensure equal geographic/regional representation.

Following further discussion and clarification, the Committee considered and supported the NEPOOL straw proposal for the EIPC stakeholder steering committee, as circulated in advance of the meeting, but with item 3 revised to reflect the Committee's agreement to seek equal geographic representation as among the industry representatives that balances the business interests across the region.

LITIGATION REPORT

Mr. Doot referred the Committee to the Litigation Report circulated in advance of the meeting. He noted that the Report continued to reflect an intense level of activity and encouraged anyone with questions on the Report to raise them with any member of the NEPOOL counsel team.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

On behalf of the Joint Nominating Committee, Mr. Forshaw reported that, subject to a final check of references, the Committee was prepared to present a slate of ISO Board candidates for Participants Committee approval at the May 7, 2010 meeting.

Mr. Joe Staszowski announced that a golf outing was being organized for June 21, 2010, the Monday before the 2010 Summer Meeting at Lyman Orchards Golf Club in Middlefield, CT, and encouraged those interested in participating to contact either him or Mr. Bowie for additional details.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Doot then discussed the calendar for April, May and June that had been distributed at the meeting. He noted the April 22-23 EIPC stakeholder meeting in St. Louis and, referring to the earlier discussion, indicated that the New England EIPC steering committee would meet by

conference call at 3:00 p.m. on April 16 to prepare for the EIPC meeting in St. Louis. Those interested in participating on that steering committee were encouraged to contact Messrs. Doot or Runge by e-mail to ensure they received future notices and materials. Mr. Doot also noted the April 29 Annual Meeting of the Energy Bar Association, open to attorneys and non-attorney professionals. He noted the next Participants Committee meetings were scheduled for May 7 at the Colonnade Hotel and June 4 at the Seaport Hotel, each in Boston, MA. Looking further ahead, he asked Participants to mark their calendars for the 2010 Summer Meeting scheduled for June 22-23, with a welcome reception on Monday, June 21 for those who are able to come in early, at the Water's Edge Resort and Spa in Westbrook, Connecticut. Mr. Doot indicated that plans were for individual Sector meetings with the Board early on the morning of the June 22, with the Summer Meeting to official open, with remarks by the FERC's newest Commissioner, John Norris.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David T. Doot, Secretary

**MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES ATTENDING
APRIL 9, 2010 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
511 Plaza LP	End User	William P. Short III		
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Associated Industries of Massachusetts	End User			Roger Borghesani
Bangor Hydro-Electric Company	Transmission	Jeffrey Jones		
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
Brookfield Energy Marketing /Cross-Sound Cable (CSC)	Supplier	Nicolas Bosse (tel)		Jose Rotger
Caithness New England Services Company	Generation		Ken Bekman	
Central Maine Power Company	Transmission	Eric Stinneford (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	Julie Cammarata	
Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel (CT OCC)	End User		Richard Steeves (tel)	
Conservation Law Foundation	End User	Seth Kaplan		
Conservation Services Group (CSG)	AR	Doug Hurley		
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc. (ConEd)	Supplier	Jeff Dannels	Ken Bekman	
Constellation Energy Commodities Group, Inc.	Supplier		Dan Allegretti	
Corinth Wood Pellets	End User			William P. Short III
CPower, Inc.	AR	Janette Dudley (tel)		
DC Energy, LLC	Supplier	Bruce Bleiweis		
Dragon Products Company LLC	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Dynegy/Calpine	Supplier	Glenn Haake		
Elektrisola, Inc.	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Energy America, LLC	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
EnerNOC, Inc.	AR	Herb Healy		
Entergy Nuclear Power Marketing LLC	Generation	Ronald Mackowiak		William Fowler
Exelon Generation Company, LLC	Supplier	William Fowler		
Fairchild Semiconductor Corporation	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Food City, Inc.	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Gas Recovery Systems, LLC (GRS)	AR		Doug Hurley	
GDF SUEZ Energy Marketing NA/FirstLight	Supplier	Thomas Kaslow		
Generation Group Member	Generation	Dennis Duffy		
Granite Ridge Energy, LLC	Supplier		William Fowler	
Groton Electric Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	Supplier	Louis Guilbault	Robert Stein	
Hardwood Products Company	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	End User			Roger Borghesani
Hess Corporation	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
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 (tel)		
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Integrays Energy Services Inc.	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz

**MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES ATTENDING
APRIL 9, 2010 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
International Power America (ANP Funding I)	Generation	Dorothy Capra		
Kimberly-Clark Corporation	Supplier			Vicki Karandrikas (tel)
Lavalley Lumber Co.	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Linde Energy Services	Supplier			Vicki Karandrikas (tel)
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department	Publicly Owned		Craig Kiemy (tel)	
Long Island Lighting Company (LIPA)	Supplier	William Killgoar		
Maine Skiing, Inc.	End User	Donald Sipe (tel)		
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 Reyes	David Cetola	Jim Stetson (tel)
Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Co.	Publicly Owned	Gary Will		
Mead Oxford	End User	Donald Sipe (tel)		
Middleborough Gas and Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Middleton Municipal Electric Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Mirant Energy Trading, LLC	Generation	Phil Smith		
NAEA Energy Massachusetts, LLC	Generation	Ken Bekman		
New England Power Company	Transmission	Timothy Brennan	Terron Hill	
New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate (NH OCA)	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		Bob Clarke	
PalletOne of Maine	End User	Gus Fromuth		
Paxton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Pepco Energy Services, Inc.	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
PowerOptions, Inc.	End User	Cindy Arcate		
PPL EnergyPlus	Supplier			Michelle Greening (tel)
Praxair, Inc.	End User			Vicki Karandrikas (tel)
Princeton Municipal Light Department	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Provisional Group Member – Generation Sector	Generation		Dennis Duffy	
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	
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	Publicly Owned		Gary Will	
Sempra Energy Trading Corp.	Supplier			Nancy Chafetz
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	

**MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES ATTENDING
APRIL 9, 2010 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

PARTICIPANT NAME	SECTOR	MEMBER NAME	ALTERNATE NAME	PROXY
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 (tel)	
Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS)	End User		Paul Peterson	
United Illuminating Company, The	Transmission	Rich Peters	Alan Trotta	
Vermont Electric Cooperative	Publicly Owned	Craig Kienny (tel)		
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			Gary Will
Westerly Hospital	End User		Gus Fromuth	
Whole Foods Market Group, Inc.	End User	Gus Fromuth		
ZTECH, LLC	End User		Gus Fromuth	

**VOTES TAKEN AT THE
APRIL 9, 2010 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING**

TOTAL

Participant Name	VOTE 1	VOTE 2
GENERATION	0.00	2.47
TRANSMISSION	17.30	17.30
SUPPLIER	12.58	6.10
ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES	13.50	0.00
PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY	17.30	17.30
END USER	17.30	5.77
% IN FAVOR	77.98	48.94

GENERATION SECTOR

Participant Name	VOTE 1	VOTE 2
BG Dighton Power, LLC	--	A
Boston Generating, LLC	--	F
Caithness New England Services Co	O	O
Entergy Nuclear Power Marketing LLC	A	A
International Power America (ANP Funding I, LLC)	A	O
Mirant Energy Trading, LLC	A	O
NAEA Energy Massachusetts, LLC	O	O
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	A	O
NRG Power Marketing, LLC	A	O
TransCanada Power Marketing Ltd.	A	A
IN FAVOR (F)	0	1
OPPOSED (O)	2	6
TOTAL VOTES	2	7
ABSTENTIONS (A)	6	3

TRANSMISSION SECTOR

Participant Name	VOTE 1	VOTE 2
Bangor Hydro-Electric Company	F	F
New England Power Company	F	F
Northeast Utilities System Companies	F	F
NSTAR Electric Company	A	A
The United Illuminating Company	F	F
Vermont Electric Power Company	F	F
IN FAVOR (F)	5	5
OPPOSED	0	0
TOTAL VOTES	5	5
ABSTENTIONS (A)	1	1

SUPPLIER SECTOR

Participant Name	VOTE 1	VOTE 2
BP Energy Company	A	A
Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc./CSC	S	S
Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc.	A	A
Cross-Sound Cable Company	O	O
Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.	A	O
Constellation Energy Commodities Group	F	A
DC Energy, LLC	A	A
Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc.	A	O
Energy America, LLC	F	F
Exelon Generation, LLC	--	A
GDF SUEZ Energy Marketing NA, Inc. / FirstLight	A	O
Granite Ridge/Merrill Lynch Commodities/BoA	--	A
Hess Corporation	F	F
H.Q. Energy Services (U.S.) Inc.	A	A
Integrus Energy Services, Inc.	F	F
Kimberly-Clark Corporation	A	A
Linde Energy Services, Inc.	A	A
LIPA	O	O
PPL EnergyPlus, LLC	A	A
PSEG Energy Resources & Trade	A	O
IN FAVOR (F)	4	3
OPPOSED	1.5	5.5
TOTAL VOTES	5.5	8.5
ABSTENTIONS (A)	10.5	9.5

ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES SECTOR

Participant Name	VOTE 1	VOTE 2
Renewable Generation Sub-Sector		
Gas Recovery Systems, Inc.	F	A
Small Renewable Generation Group	A	A
Distributed Generation Sub-Sector		
Small DG Group Member	F	A
Load Response Sub-Sector		
Comverge, Inc.	A	A
Conservation Services Group	F	A
CPower, Inc.	A	A
EnerNOC, Inc.	A	A
Vermont Energy Investment Corp.	F	A
Small LR Group Member	F	A
IN FAVOR (F)	5	0
OPPOSED	0	0
TOTAL VOTES	5	0
ABSTENTIONS (A)	4	9

**VOTES TAKEN AT THE
APRIL 9, 2010 PARTICIPANTS COMMITTEE MEETING
END USER SECTOR**

PUBLICLY OWNED ENTITY SECTOR

Participant Name	VOTE 1	VOTE 2
Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant	F	F
Belmont Municipal Light Department	F	F
Boylston Municipal Light Department	F	F
Chicopee Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Conn. Municipal Electric Energy Coop.	F	F
Concord Municipal Light Plant	F	F
Danvers Electric Division	F	F
Georgetown Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Groton Electric Light Department	F	F
Holden Municipal Light Department	F	F
Holyoke Gas & Electric Department	F	F
Hudson Light and Power Department	F	F
Hull Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Ipswich Municipal Light Department	F	F
Littleton (MA) Electric Light Dept.	F	F
Littleton (NH) Water & Light Department	F	A
Mansfield Municipal Electric Dept.	F	F
Marblehead Municipal Light Dept.	F	F
Mass. Municipal Wholesale Electric Co	F	F
Middleborough Gas and Electric Dept.	F	F
Middleton Municipal Electric Dept.	F	F
North Attleborough Electric Dept.	F	F
Pascoag Utility District	F	F
Paxton Municipal Light Department	F	F
Peabody Municipal Light Plant	F	F
Princeton Municipal Light Department	F	F
Rowley Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Shrewsbury's Electric & Cable Ops	F	F
South Hadley Electric Light Dept.	F	F
Sterling Municipal Electric Light Dept.	F	F
Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Templeton Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Vermont Electric Cooperative	F	A
Wakefield Municipal Gas & Light Dept.	F	F
West Boylston Municipal Lighting Plant	F	F
Westfield Gas & Electric Light Dept.	F	F
IN FAVOR (F)	36	34
OPPOSED	0	0
TOTAL VOTES	36	34
ABSTENTIONS (A)	0	2

Participant Name	VOTE 1	VOTE 2
511 Plaza, LP	F	A
Associated Industries of Mass.	--	A
Conservation Law Foundation	A	A
Corinth Wood Pellets, LLC	F	A
CT Office of Consumer Counsel	--	O
Dennis Beverage	F	A
Dragon Products Company	F	A
Fairchild Semiconductor Corporation	F	A
Food City, Inc.	F	A
Garland Manufacturing Company	F	A
Hammond Lumber Company	F	A
Hardwood Products Company	F	A
Harvard Dedicated Energy Limited	F	A
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	F	A
LaBree's Inc.	F	A
Lavalley Lumber Co.	F	A
Maine Skiing, Inc.	F	A
Maine Woods Pellet Company	F	A
Marden's Inc.	F	A
Mass. Attorney General's Office	F	F
Mead Oxford	F	A
Merchant's Plaza LLC	F	A
NH Office of Consumer Advocate	F	O
PalletOne of Maine	F	A
PowerOptions, Inc.	F	A
Praxair, Inc.	A	A
Quality Egg of New England	F	A
RJF – Morin Brick LLC	F	A
Robbins Lumber	F	A
St. Anselm College	F	A
St. Joseph Health Services of RI	F	A
The Energy Consortium	F	A
The Energy Council of Rhode Island	F	A
Union of Concerned Scientists	F	A
Westerly Hospital	F	A
Whole Foods Market Group, Inc.	F	A
Z-TECH, LLC	F	A
IN FAVOR (F)	33	1
OPPOSED	0	2
TOTAL VOTES	33	3
ABSTENTIONS (A)	2	34