

Peter J. Lanzalotta CV

Mr. Lanzalotta holds a Bachelor of Science in Electric Power Engineering from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and a Master of Business Administration with a concentration in Finance from Loyola College of Baltimore. He is a registered professional engineer in the States of Maryland and Connecticut.

He has more than thirty-five years experience in electric utility system planning, bulk power operations, distribution operations, electric service reliability, load and price forecasting, and market analysis and development. Mr. Lanzalotta has appeared as an expert witness on utility reliability, planning, operation, and rate matters in more than 100 proceedings in 22 states, the District of Columbia, the Provinces of Alberta and Ontario, and before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and U. S District Court. A list of his testimony appearances is attached. He has developed evaluations of electric utility system cost, value, reliability, and condition. He has participated in negotiations or other interactions between utilities and customers or regulators in more than ten states regarding transmission access, the need for facilities, electric rates, electric service reliability, the value of electric system components, and system operator structure under wholesale competition.

Prior to his forming Lanzalotta & Associates LLC in 2000, he was a Partner at Whitfield Russell Associates for fifteen years and a Senior Associate for approximately four years before that. Prior to joining Whitfield Russell Associates in 1982, Mr. Lanzalotta was employed by the Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative ("CMEEC") as a System Engineer. He was responsible for providing operational, financial, and rate expertise to Coop's budgeting, ratemaking and system planning processes. He participated on behalf of CMEEC in the Hydro-Quebec/New England Power Pool Interconnection project and initiated the development of a database to support CMEEC's pool billing and financial data needs.

Prior to his CMEEC employment, he served as Chief Engineer at the South Norwalk (Connecticut) Electric Works, with responsibility for planning, data processing, engineering, rates and tariffs, generation and bulk power sales, and distribution operations. While at South Norwalk, he conceived and implemented, through Northeast Utilities and NEPOOL, a peak-shaving plan for South Norwalk and a neighboring municipal electric utility, which resulted

in substantial power supply savings. He programmed and implemented a computer system to perform customer billing and maintain accounts receivable accounting. He also helped manage a generating station overhaul and the undergrounding of the distribution system in South Norwalk's downtown.

From 1977 to 1979, Mr. Lanzalotta worked as a public utility consultant for Van Scoyoc & Wiskup and separately for Whitman Requist & Associates in a variety of positions. During this time, he developed cost of service, rate base evaluation, and rate design impact data to support direct testimony and exhibits in a variety of utility proceedings, including utility price squeeze cases, gas pipeline rates, and wholesale electric rate cases.

Prior to that, He worked for approximately 2 years as a Service Tariffs Analyst for the Finance Division of the Baltimore Gas & Electric Company where he developed cost and revenue studies, evaluated alternative rate structures, and studied the rate structures of other utilities for a variety of applications. He was also employed by BG&E in Electric System Operations for approximately 3 years, where his duties included operations analysis, outage reporting, and participation in the development of BG&E's first computerized customer information and service order system.

Mr. Lanzalotta is a member of the Institute of Electrical & Electronic Engineers, the Association of Energy Engineers, the National Fire Protection Association, and the American Solar Energy Society. He is also registered Professional Engineer in the states of Maryland and Connecticut.

1. **In re: Public Service Company of New Mexico**, Docket Nos. ER78-337 and ER78-338 before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, concerning the need for access to calculation methodology underlying filing.
2. **In re: Baltimore Gas and Electric Company**, Case No. 7238-V before the Maryland Public Service Commission, concerning outage replacement power costs.
3. **In re: Houston Lighting & Power Company**, Texas Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 4712, concerning modeling methods to determine rates to be paid to cogenerators and small power producers.
4. **In re: Nevada Power Company**, Nevada Public Service Commission, Docket No. 83-707 concerning rate case fuel inventories, rate base items, and O&M expense.
5. **In re: Virginia Electric & Power Company**, Virginia State Corporation Commission, Case No. PUE820091, concerning the operating and reliability-based need for additional transmission facilities.
6. **In re: Public Service Electric & Gas Company**, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. 831-25, concerning outage replacement power costs.
7. **In re: Philadelphia Electric Company**, Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. P-830453, concerning outage replacement power costs.
8. **In re: Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company**, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 83-33-EL-EFC, concerning the results of an operations/fuel-use audit conducted by Mr. Lanzalotta.
9. **In re: Kansas City Power and Light Company**, before the State Corporation Commission of the state of Kansas, Docket Nos. 142,099-U and 120,924-U, concerning the determination of the capacity, from a new base-load generating facility, needed for reliable system operation, and the capacity available from existing generating units.
10. **In re: Philadelphia Electric Company**, Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. R-850152, concerning the determination of the

capacity, from a new base-load generating facility, needed for reliable system operation, and the capacity available from existing generating units.

11. **In re: ABC Method Proposed for Application to Public Service Company of Colorado**, before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado, on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies ("FEA"), concerning a production cost allocation methodology proposed for use in Colorado.
12. **In re: Duquesne Light Company**, Docket No. R-870651, before the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission, on behalf of the Office of Consumer Advocate, concerning the system reserve margin needed for reliable service.
13. **In re: Pennsylvania Power Company**, Docket No. I-7970318 before the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission, on behalf of the Office of Consumer Advocate, concerning outage replacement power costs.
14. **In re: Commonwealth Edison Company**, Docket No. 87-0427 before the Illinois Commerce Commission, on behalf of the Citizen's Utility Board of Illinois, concerning the determination of the capacity, from new base-load generating facilities, needed for reliable system operation.
15. **In re: Central Illinois Public Service Company**, Docket No. 88-0031 before the Illinois Commerce Commission, on behalf of the Citizen's Utility Board of Illinois, concerning the degree to which existing generating capacity is needed for reliable and/or economic system operation.
16. **In re: Illinois Power Company**, Docket No. 87-0695 before the State of Illinois Commerce Commission, on behalf of Citizens Utility Board of Illinois, Governors Office of Consumer Services, Office of Public Counsel and Small Business Utility Advocate, concerning the determination of the capacity, from a new base-load generating facility, needed for reliable system operation, and the capacity available from existing generating units.
17. **In re: Florida Power Corporation**, Docket No. 860001-EI-G (Phase II), before the Florida Public Service Commission, on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies of the United States, concerning an investigation into fuel supply relationships of Florida Power Corporation.

18. **In re: Potomac Electric Power Company**, before the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia, Docket No. 877, on behalf of the Public Service Commission Staff, concerning the need for and availability of new generating facilities.
19. **In re: South Carolina Electric & Gas Company**, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 88-681-E, On Behalf of the State of Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs, concerning the capacity needed for reliable system operation, the capacity available from existing generating units, relative jurisdictional rate of return, reconnection charges, and the provision of supplementary, backup, and maintenance services for QFs.
20. **In re: Commonwealth Edison Company**, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 87-0169, 87-0427, 88-0189, 88-0219, and 88-0253, on behalf of the Citizen's Utility Board of Illinois, concerning the determination of the capacity, from a new base-load generating facility, needed for reliable system operation.
21. **In re: Illinois Power Company**, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 89-0276, on behalf of the Citizen's Utility Board Of Illinois, concerning the determination of capacity available from existing generating units.
22. **In re: Jersey Central Power & Light Company**, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. EE88-121293, on behalf of the State of New Jersey Department of the Public Advocate, concerning evaluation of transmission planning.
23. **In re: Canal Electric Company**, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. ER90-245-000, on behalf of the Municipal Light Department of the Town of Belmont, Massachusetts, concerning the reasonableness of Seabrook Unit No. 1 Operating and Maintenance expense.
24. **In re: New Hampshire Electric Cooperative Rate Plan Proposal**, before the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. DR90-078, on behalf of the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, concerning contract valuation.
25. **In re: Connecticut Light & Power Company**, before the Connecticut

Department of Public Utility Control, Docket No. 90-04-14, on behalf of a group of Qualifying Facilities concerning O&M expenses payable by the QFs.

26. **In re: Duke Power Company**, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 91-216-E, on behalf of the State of South Carolina Department of Consumer Advocate, concerning System Planning, Rate Design and Nuclear Decommissioning Fund issues.
27. **In re: Jersey Central Power & Light Company**, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. ER91-480-000, on behalf of the Boroughs of Butler, Madison, Lavallette, Pemberton and Seaside Heights, concerning the appropriateness of a separate rate class for a large wholesale customer.
28. **In re: Potomac Electric Power Company**, before the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia, Formal Case No. 912, on behalf of the Staff of the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia, concerning the Application of PEPCO for an increase in retail rates for the sale of electric energy.
29. **Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, House of Representatives**, General Assembly House Bill No. 2273. Oral testimony before the Committee on Conservation, concerning proposed Electromagnetic Field Exposure Avoidance Act.
30. **In re: Hearings on the 1990 Ontario Hydro Demand\Supply Plan**, before the Ontario Environmental Assessment Board, concerning Ontario Hydro's System Reliability Planning and Transmission Planning.
31. **In re: Maui Electric Company**, Docket No. 7000, before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Hawaii, on behalf of the Division of Consumer Advocacy, concerning MECO's generation system, fuel and purchased power expense, depreciation, plant additions and retirements, contributions and advances.
32. **In re: Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc.**, Docket No. 7256, before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Hawaii, on behalf of the Division

of Consumer Advocacy, concerning need for, design of, and routing of proposed transmission facilities.

33. **In re: Commonwealth Edison Company**, Docket No. 94-0065 before the Illinois Commerce Commission on behalf of the City of Chicago, concerning the capacity needed for system reliability.
34. **In re: Commonwealth Edison Company**, Docket No. 93-0216 before the Illinois Commerce Commission on behalf of the Citizens for Responsible Electric Power, concerning the need for proposed 138 kV transmission and substation facilities.
35. **In re: Commonwealth Edison Company**, Docket No. 92-0221 before the Illinois Commerce Commission on behalf of the Friends of Illinois Prairie Path, concerning the need for proposed 138 kV transmission and substation facilities.
36. **In re: Commonwealth Edison Company**, Docket No. 94-0179 before the Illinois Commerce Commission on behalf of the Friends of Sugar Ridge, concerning the need for proposed 138 kV transmission and substation facilities.
37. **In re: Public Service Company of Colorado**, Docket Nos. 95A-531EG and 95I-464E before the Colorado Public Utilities Commission on behalf of the Office of Consumer Counsel, concerning a proposed merger with Southwestern Public Service Company and a proposed performance-based rate-making plan.
38. **In re: South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, Duke Power Company, and Carolina Power & Light Company**, Docket No. 95-1192-E, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission on behalf of the South Carolina Department of Consumer Advocate, concerning avoided cost rates payable to qualifying facilities.
39. **In re: Lawrence A. Baker v. Truckee Donner Public Utility District**, Case No. 55899, before the Superior Court of the State of California on behalf of Truckee Donner Public Utility District, concerning the reasonableness of electric rates.

40. **In re: Black Hills Power & Light Company**, Docket No. OA96-75-000, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on behalf of the City of Gillette, Wyoming, concerning the Black Hills' proposed open access transmission tariff.
41. **In re: Metropolitan Edison Company and Pennsylvania Electric Company** for Approvals of the Restructuring Plan Under Section 2806, Docket Nos. R-00974008 and R-00974009 before the Pennsylvania PUC on behalf of Operating NUG Group, concerning miscellaneous restructuring issues.
42. **In re: New Jersey State Restructuring Proceeding** for consideration of proposals for retail competition under BPU Docket Nos. EX94120585U; E097070457; E097070460; E097070463; E097070466 before the New Jersey BPU on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate, concerning load balancing, third party settlements, and market power.
43. **In re: Arbitration Proceeding In City of Chicago v. Commonwealth Edison** for consideration of claims that franchise agreement has been breached, Proceeding No. 51Y-114-350-96 before an arbitration panel board on behalf of the City of Chicago concerning electric system reliability.
44. **In re: Transalta Utilities Corporation**, Application No. RE 95081 on behalf of the ACD companies, before the Alberta Energy And Utilities Board in reference to the use and value of interruptible capacity.
45. **In re: Consolidated Edison Company**, Docket No. EL99-58-000 on behalf of The Village of Freeport, New York, before FERC in reference to remedies for a breach of contract to provide firm transmission service on a non-discriminatory basis.
46. **In re: ESBI Alberta Ltd.**, Application No. 990005 on behalf of the FIRM Customers, before the Alberta Energy And Utilities Board concerning the reasonableness of the cost of service plus management fee proposed for 1999 and 2000 by the transmission administrator.
47. **In re: South Carolina Electric & Gas Company**, Docket No. 2000-0170-E on behalf of the South Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs before the

Public Service Commission of South Carolina concerning an application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Convenience and Necessity for new and repowered generating units at the Urquhart generating station.

48. **In re: BGE**, Case No. 8837 on behalf of the Maryland Office of People's Counsel before the Maryland Public Service Commission concerning proposed electric line extension charges.
49. **In re: PEPCO**, Case No. 8844 on behalf of the Maryland Office of People's Counsel before the Maryland Public Service Commission concerning proposed electric line extension charges.
50. **In re: GenPower Anderson LLC**, Docket No. 2001-78-E on behalf of the South Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina concerning an application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Convenience and Necessity for new generating units at the GenPower Anderson LLC generating station.
51. **In re: Pike County Light & Power Company**, Docket No. P-00011872, on behalf of Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission concerning the Pike County request for a retail rate cap exception.
52. **In re: Potomac Electric Power Company and Conectiv**, Case No. 8890, on behalf of the Maryland Office of People's Counsel before the Maryland Public Service Commission concerning the proposed merger of Potomac Electric Power Company and Conectiv.
53. **In re: South Carolina Electric & Gas Company**, Docket No. 2001-420-E on behalf of the South Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina concerning an application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Convenience and Necessity for new generating units at the Jasper County generating station.
54. **In re: Connecticut Light & Power Company**, Docket No. 217 on behalf of the Towns of Bethel, Redding, Weston, and Wilton, Connecticut before the Connecticut Siting Council concerning an application for a Certificate of

Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for a new transmission line facility between Plumtree Substation, Bethel and Norwalk Substation, Norwalk.

55. **In re: The City of Vernon, California,** Docket No. EL02-103 on behalf of the City of Vernon before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission concerning Vernon's transmission revenue balancing account adjustment reflecting calendar year 2001 transactions.
56. **In re: San Diego Gas & Electric Company et. al.,** Docket No. EL00-95-045 on behalf of the City of Vernon, California before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission concerning refunds and other monies payable in the California wholesale energy markets.
57. **In re: The City of Vernon, California,** Docket No. EL03-31 on behalf of the City of Vernon before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission concerning Vernon's transmission revenue balancing account adjustment reflecting 2002 transactions.
58. **In re: Jersey Central Power & Light Company,** Docket Nos. ER02080506, ER02080507, ER02030173, and EO02070417 on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities concerning reliability issues involved in the approval of an increase in base tariff rates.
59. **In re: Proposed Electric Service Reliability Rules, Standards, and Indices To Ensure Reliable Service by Electric Distribution Companies,** PSC Regulation Docket No. 50, on behalf of the Delaware Public Service Commission Staff before the Delaware Public Service Commission concerning proposed electric service reliability rules, standards and indices.
60. **In re: Central Maine Power Company,** Docket No. 2002-665, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate and the Town of York before the Maine Public Utilities Commission concerning a Request for Commission Investigation into the New CMP Transmission Line Proposal for Eliot, Kittery, and York.
61. **In re: Metropolitan Edison Company,** Docket No. C-20028394, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission concerning the reliability service complaint of

Robert Lawrence.

62. **In re: The California Independent System Operator Corporation**, Docket No. ER00-2019 *et al.* on behalf of the City of Vernon, California, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission concerning wholesale transmission tariffs, rates and rate structures proposed by the California ISO.
63. **In re: The Narragansett Electric Company**, Docket No. 3564 on behalf of the Rhode Island Department of Attorney General, before the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission concerning the proposed relocation of the E-183 transmission line.
64. **In re: The City of Vernon, California**, Docket No. EL04-34 on behalf of the City of Vernon before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission concerning Vernon's transmission revenue balancing account adjustment reflecting 2003 transactions.
65. **In re: Atlantic City Electric Company**, Docket No. ER03020110 on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities concerning reliability issues involved in the approval of an increase in base tariff rates.
66. **In re: Connecticut Light & Power Company and the United Illuminating Company**, Docket No. 272 on behalf of the Towns of Bethany, Cheshire, Durham, Easton, Fairfield, Hamden, Middlefield, Milford, North Haven, Norwalk, Orange, Wallingford, Weston, Westport, Wilton, and Woodbridge, Connecticut before the Connecticut Siting Council concerning an application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for a new transmission line facility between the Scoville Rock Switching Station in Middletown and the Norwalk Substation in Norwalk, Connecticut.
67. **In re: Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, and Pennsylvania Power Company**, Docket No. I-00040102, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission concerning electric service reliability performance.
68. **In re: Entergy Louisiana, Inc.** Docket No. U-20925 RRF-2004 on behalf of Bayou Steel before the Louisiana Public Service Commission concerning a proposed increase in base rates.

69. **In re: Jersey Central Power & Light Company**, Docket No. ER02080506, Phase II, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities concerning reliability issues involved in the approval of an increase in base tariff rates.
70. **In re: Maine Public Service Company**, Docket No. 2004-538, on behalf of the Main Public Advocate before the Maine Public Utilities Commission concerning a request to construct a 138 kV transmission line from Limestone, Maine to the Canadian border near Hamlin, Maine.
71. **In re: Pike County Light and Power Company**, Docket No. M-00991220F0002, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission concerning the Company's Petition to amend benchmarks for distribution reliability.
72. **In re: Atlantic City Electric Company**, Docket No. EE04111374, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities concerning the need for transmission system reinforcement, and related issues.
73. **In re: Bangor Hydro-Electric Company**, Docket No. 2004-771, on behalf of the Main Public Advocate before the Maine Public Utilities Commission concerning a request to construct a 345 kV transmission line from Orrington, Maine to the Canadian border near Baileyville, Maine.
74. **In re: Eastern Maine Electric Cooperatve**, Docket No. 2005-17, on behalf of the Main Public Advocate before the Maine Public Utilities Commission concerning a petition to approve a purchase of transmission capacity on a 345 kV transmission line from Maine to the Canadian province of New Brunswick.
75. **In re: Virginia Electric and Power Company**, Case No. PUE-2005-00018, on behalf of the Town of Leesburg VA and Loudoun County VA before the Virginia State Corporation Commission concerning a request for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for transmission and substation facilities in Loudoun County.
76. **In re: Proposed Electric Service Reliability Rules, Standards, and Indices To Ensure Reliable Service by Electric Distribution Companies**, PSC

Regulation Docket No. 50, on behalf of the Delaware Public Service Commission Staff before the Delaware Public Service Commission concerning proposed electric service reliability reporting, standards, and indices.

77. **In re: Proposed Merger Involving Constellation Energy Group Inc. and the FPL Group, Inc.**, Case No. 9054, on behalf of the Maryland Office of Peoples' Counsel before the Maryland Public Service Commission concerning the proposed merger involving Baltimore Gas & Electric Company and Florida Light & Power Company.
78. **In re: Proposed Sale and Transfer of Electric Franchise of the Town of St. Michaels to Choptank Electric Cooperative, Inc.**, Case No. 9071, on behalf of the Maryland Office of Peoples' Counsel before the Maryland Public Service Commission concerning the sale by St. Michaels of their electric franchise and service area to Choptank.
79. **In re: Petition of Rockland Electric Company for the Approval of Changes in Electric Rates, and Other Relief**, BPU Docket No. ER06060483, on behalf of the Department of the Public Advocate, Division of Rate Counsel, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, concerning electric service reliability and reliability-related spending.
80. **In re: The Complaint of the County of Pike v. Pike County Light & Power Company, Inc.**, Docket No. C-20065942, et al., on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission, concerning electric service reliability and interconnecting with the PJM ISO.
81. **In re: Application of American Transmission Company to Construct a New Transmission Line**, Docket No. 137-CE-139, on behalf of The Sierra Club of Wisconsin, before the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, concerning the request to build a new 138 kV transmission line.
82. **In re: The Matter of the Self-Complaint of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company Regarding the Implementation of Programs to Enhance Distribution Service Reliability**, Case No. 06-222-EL-SLF, on behalf of The Office of The Ohio Consumers' Counsel, before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, concerning distribution system reliability and related topics.

83. **In re: Central Maine Power Company**, Docket No. 2006-487, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate before the Maine Public Utilities Commission concerning CMP's Petition for Finding of Public Convenience & Necessity to build a 115 kV transmission line between Saco and Old Orchard Beach.
84. **In re: Bangor Hydro Electric Company**, Docket No. 2006-686, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate before the Maine Public Utilities Commission concerning BHE's Petition for Finding of Public Convenience & Necessity to build a 115 kV transmission line and substation in Hancock County.
85. **In re: Commission Staff's Petition For Designation of Competitive Renewable Energy Zones**, Docket No. 33672, on behalf of the Texas Office of Public Utility Counsel, concerning the Staff's Petition and the determination of what areas should be designated as CREZs by the Commission.
86. **In re: Virginia Electric and Power Company**, Case No. PUE-2006-00091, on behalf of the Towering Concerns and Stafford County VA before the Virginia State Corporation Commission concerning a request for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for electric transmission and substation facilities in Stafford County.
87. **In re: Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company**, Docket Nos. A-110172 et al., on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, concerning a request for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for electric transmission and substation facilities in Pennsylvania.
88. **In re: Commonwealth Edison Company**, Docket No. 07-0566, on behalf of the Illinois Attorney General, before the Illinois Commerce Commission, concerning electric transmission and distribution projects promoted as smart grid projects, and the rider proposed to pay for them.
89. **In re: Commonwealth Edison Company**, Docket No. 07-0491, on behalf of the Illinois Attorney General, before the Illinois Commerce Commission, concerning the applicability of electric service interruption provisions.

90. **In re: Hydro One Networks**, Case No. EB-2007-0050, on behalf of Pollution Probe, before the Ontario Energy Board, concerning a request for leave to construct electric transmission facilities in the Province of Ontario.
91. **In re: PEPCO Holdings, Inc.**, Docket No. ER-08-686-000, on behalf of the Maryland Office of Peoples' Counsel, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, concerning a request for incentive rates of return on transmission projects.
92. **In re: PPL Electric Utilities Corporation and Public Service Electric and Gas Company**, Docket No. ER-08-23-000, on behalf of the Joint Consumer Advocates, including the state consumer advocacy offices for the States of Maryland, West Virginia, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, concerning a request for incentive rates of return on transmission projects.
93. **In re: PPL Electric Utilities Corporation**, Docket Nos. A-2008-2022941 and P-2008-2038262, on behalf of Springfield Township, Bucks County, PA, before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, concerning the need for and alternatives to proposed electric transmission lines and a proposed electric substation.
94. **In re: PEPCO Holdings, Inc.**, Docket No. ER08-1423-000, on behalf of the Maryland Office of Peoples' Counsel, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, concerning a request for incentive rates of return on transmission projects.
95. **In re: Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Inc.**, Docket No. ER09-249-000, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, concerning a request for incentive rates of return on transmission projects.
96. **In re: New York Regional Interconnect Inc.**, Case No. 06-T-0650, on behalf of the Citizens Against Regional Interconnect, before the New York Public Service Commission, concerning the economics of and alternatives to proposed transmission facilities.
97. **In re: Central Maine Power Company and Public Service of New Hampshire**, Docket No. 2008-255, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate, before the Maine Public Utilities Commission, concerning CMP's and PSNH's

Petition for Finding of Public Convenience & Necessity to build the Maine Power Reliability Project, a series of new and rebuilt electric transmission facilities to operate at 345 kV and 115 kV in Maine and New Hampshire.

98. **In re: PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, Docket No. A-2009-2082652 et al.**, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, concerning the Company's application for approval to site and construct electric transmission facilities in Pennsylvania.
99. **In re: Bangor Hydro-Electric,** Docket No. 2009-26, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate, before the Maine Public Utilities Commission, concerning BHE's Petition for Certificate of Public Convenience & Necessity to build a 115 kV transmission line in Washington and Hancock Counties.
100. **In re: United States, et al. v. Cinergy Corp., et al.** Civil Action No. IP99-1693 C-M/S, on behalf of Plaintiff United States and Plaintiff-Intervenors State of New York, State of New Jersey, State of Connecticut, Hoosier Environmental Council, and Ohio Environmental Council, before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, concerning the electric system reliability impacts of the potential retirement of Gallagher Power Station Unit 1 and Unit 3.
101. **In re: Application of Potomac Electric Power Company, et al.** Case No. 9179, on behalf of the Maryland Office of Peoples' Counsel before the Maryland Public Service Commission concerning the application for a determination of need under a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the Maryland portion of the MAPP transmission line, and related facilities.