

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Moraga Storage, LLC	)	
River Mill Storage, LLC	)	
Hecate Energy Medway Energy Center LLC	)	
Brough Storage, LLC	)	
Partridge Storage, LLC	)	Docket No. EL26-112-000
Complainants,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
ISO New England Inc.	)	
Respondent	)	
	)	

**COMMENTS OF THE NEW ENGLAND STATES
COMMITTEE ON ELECTRICITY**

Pursuant to the Notice on Comment Period issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (the “Commission”) on October 5, 2026, in the above-captioned proceeding, the New England States Committee on Electricity (“NESCOE”) hereby submits these comments. As described at greater length herein, NESCOE makes these comments (1) to express its concern with the negative consequences that would result from redoing the Transitional Cluster Study (“TCS”) and (2) to emphasize that any changes to ISO New England’s (“ISO-NE”) Transmission, Markets and Services Tariff (the “Tariff”) regarding cost allocation should be done through New England’s robust stakeholder process.

I. DESCRIPTION OF COMMENTER

NESCOE is the Regional State Committee (“RSC”) for New England. It is governed by a board of managers appointed by the Governors of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont and is funded through a regional tariff that ISO-NE

administers.¹ NESCOE’s mission is to represent the interests of the citizens of the New England region by advancing policies that will provide electricity at the lowest possible price over the long term, consistent with maintaining reliable service and environmental quality.² These comments represent the collective view of the six New England states.

II. BACKGROUND

On September 30, 2026, several Interconnection Customers (hereinafter, the “Complainants”)³ who had entered the TCS filed the Complaint against ISO New England Inc. (“ISO-NE”). The Complaint challenges ISO-NE’s implementation of the TCS, alleging that ISO-NE improperly assigned network upgrade costs to Interconnection Customers in violation of the Commission’s cost-causation principles and those included in the Tariff. As primary relief, the Complainants request that the Commission (1) find that ISO-NE’s TCS process is unjust, unreasonable, and a violation of the Tariff and (2) direct ISO-NE to conduct a new TCS study process that addresses Complainants’ concerns with the completed TCS process.⁴ As alternative relief, Complainants request that the Commission “order ISO-NE to modify its cluster study approach to assessing project deliverability to address the flaws raised herein on a going forward basis, starting with the First Cluster Study.”⁵ As part of that alternative relief, the Complainants further request that the going-forward process allow TCS Interconnection Customers to

¹ *ISO New England Inc.*, 121 FERC ¶ 61,105 (2007).

² See Sept. 8, 2006 NESCOE Term Sheet that was filed for information as Exhibit A to the Memorandum of Understanding among ISO-NE, NEPOOL, and NESCOE (the “NESCOE MOU”). Informational Filing of the New England States Committee on Electricity, Docket No. ER07-1324-000 (filed Nov. 21, 2007). Pursuant to the NESCOE MOU, the Term Sheet is the binding obligation of ISO-NE, NEPOOL, and NESCOE.

³ Specifically, the Complainants are Moraga Storage, LLC; River Mill Storage, LLC; Hecate Energy Medway Energy Center LLC; Brough Storage, LLC; and Partridge Storage, LLC.

⁴ Complaint at 31.

⁵ *Id.* at 31–32.

downgrade their service from CNR to NR service and participate in the first cluster study for CNR service without an additional readiness deposit and that the Commission order ISO-NE to allow projects to withdraw from the TCS without incurring a withdrawal penalty.⁶

III. COMMENTS

Given the extremely expedited nature of this complaint about a highly technical process, NESCOE did not have the ability to retain the technical expertise that would be required to conduct an in-depth assessment of ISO-NE's TCS process. For that reason, NESCOE is not positioned to offer an expert opinion on the issue for the Commission's consideration at this time. ISO-NE has committed to a lessons learned and study improvement process and, to inform those discussions, NESCOE intends to conduct an independent comparative assessment of Regional Transmission Organization interconnection processes and methodologies.⁷ Notwithstanding the foregoing, NESCOE has significant concerns with the negative impacts from the Complainants' primary requested relief to redo the TCS. Redoing the TCS would cause delays to other projects, potentially delay future cluster studies, and diminish participant confidence in the predictability of future cluster studies.

The Complainants request, as alternative relief, that the Commission order ISO-NE to make certain changes to its Cluster Study process going forward. If the Commission conducts technical analysis and concludes that ISO-NE's process is not just and reasonable, the Complainants' alternative relief should be considered in an attempt to avoid redoing the TCS. As described above, the region has already committed to examining interconnection procedures

⁶ *Id.* at 32.

⁷ See NESCOE Comment's on Transitional Cluster Study and Forward-Looking Enhancements (September 8, 2026), <https://nescoe.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/09/NESCOE-TCS-Comments.pdf>.

ahead of the next cluster study, and NESCOE expects to express its views in a robust stakeholder engagement process that will lead to durable interconnection solutions. The Complaint here raises questions about the proper allocation of costs between customers and resources seeking to interconnect—and in particular, the application of the provisions and principles of ISO-NE’s Open Access Transmission Tariff (“OATT”), OATT Schedule 11 and Schedule 22, and certain ISO-NE Planning Procedures.⁸ NESCOE, which has “jump ball” rights to Section 205 filings seeking to change Schedule 11, must be included in any discussion about changing Schedule 11 and similarly has a vested interest in questions relating to its application.⁹ Although other stakeholders do not have the same claim to Schedule 11, they have interests that are affected as well and should also have an opportunity to participate. Therefore, any order from the Commission in favor of the Complaint should allow for New England’s stakeholder process to address those questions in the first instance.

⁸ See, e.g., Complaint, at 14–17, 20–21, 24–29, 32

⁹ See Transmission Operating Agreement, § 3.04(h)(vi)(C).

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, NESCOE respectfully requests that the Commission consider these comments.

Respectfully Submitted,

On behalf of NESCOE:

/s/ Nathan Forster

Nathan Forster
General Counsel
New England States Committee on Electricity
P.O. Box 322
Osterville, MA 02655
Tel: (617) 431-0462
Email: nathanforster@nescoe.com

/s/ Shannon Beale

Shannon Beale
Assistant General Counsel
New England States Committee on Electricity
P.O. Box 322
Osterville, MA 02655
Tel: (617) 400-9000
Email: shannonbeale@nescoe.com

Attorneys for the New England States Committee
on Electricity

Date: October 30, 2026

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In accordance with Rule 2010 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, I hereby certify that I have this day served by electronic mail a copy of the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding.

Dated at Osterville, Massachusetts this 30th day of October, 2026.

/s/ Nathan Forster

Shannon Beale, Assistant General Counsel

Nathan Forster, General Counsel

New England States Committee on Electricity

P.O. Box 322

Osterville, MA 02655

Tel: (617) 431-0462

Email: nathanforster@nescoc.com

Email: shannonbeale@nescoc.com