Penelec Statement No. 1

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY
DOCKET NO. R-2016-2537352

Direct Testimony
of
Charles V. Fullem

List of Topics Addressed

Overview of Distribution Base Rate Filing
Settlement Commitments from Docket No. R-2014-2428743
Reasons for the Requested Increase
Organization of the Filing and Introduction of Witnesses
Importance of Adequate Rate Relief to the Company

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SETTLEMENT COMMITMENTS	4
III.	OVERVIEW OF RATE REQUEST AND REASONS FOR PROPOSED INCREASE	9
IV.	ORGANIZATION OF THE FILING, OTHER WITNESSES AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CASE TO THE COMPANY AND ITS CUSTOMERS	14

APPENDIX A

DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
CHARLES V. FULLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Charles V. Fullem, and my business address is 2800 Pottsville Pike, Reading, Pennsylvania 19605.

Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A. I am employed by FirstEnergy Service Company, which is a direct subsidiary of FirstEnergy Corp. ("FirstEnergy"). I am the Director, Rates and Regulatory Affairs – Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania Rate Department of FirstEnergy Service Company provides regulatory support for each of FirstEnergy's wholly-owned Pennsylvania operating companies ("Companies"), including Pennsylvania Electric Company ("Penelec").

I am responsible to the Vice President of Rates and Regulatory Affairs for the development, coordination, preparation and presentation of the Companies' rate-related matters before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission ("Commission") and the New York State Public Service Commission, including their default service programs. My responsibilities encompass the preparation of various statements and reports addressing, among other things, distribution revenue requirement, energy costs, non-utility generation costs, quarterly earnings, and other financial matters. I am also responsible for administering the Companies' tariffs, including developing retail electric rates, rules and regulations and ensuring their uniform application and interpretation.

Q. What is your educational and professional background?

A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Mineral Economics from the Pennsylvania State University in November 1981. I have over thirty years of experience with FirstEnergy and its predecessor companies. My work experience is more fully described in my professional biography, which is attached as Appendix A to this testimony.

Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this proceeding?

A. I am testifying on behalf of Penelec.

Q. Please describe the purpose of your testimony.

A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide an overview of and the principal factors driving the distribution base rate increase request that the Company is proposing for approval by the Commission. I will also explain why approval of the proposed distribution rate increase is necessary to provide a fair return to shareholders and to establish the groundwork for enhanced reliability and customer service.

In addition to this Introduction, my testimony is comprised of three substantive sections: Section II reports on the Company's progress in meeting the settlement commitments made in Penelec's last base rate proceeding at Docket No. R-2014-2428743. In Section III, I provide an overview of the current filing and discuss the primary reasons the Company is requesting an increase in its distribution rates. Lastly, in Section IV, I describe the organization of the Company's rate filing, introduce the other witnesses submitting direct testimony on behalf of Penelec and explain the importance of this case to the Company and its customers.

Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits?

A. Yes, I am sponsoring Penelec Exhibits CVF-1 through CVF-6, which consist of the following:[1]

Penelec Exhibit CVF-1 provides a summary of and specific reasons for the proposed rate increase. This exhibit also identifies and quantifies the major components of the Company's revenue request.

Penelec Exhibit CVF-2 identifies the other witnesses submitting direct testimony on behalf of the Company, their corresponding statement numbers and their areas of responsibility.

Penelec Exhibit CVF-3 is a table showing, at present and proposed rates, the Company's revenues, operating expenses, operating income and rate base, as adjusted for ratemaking purposes, and the resulting overall rates of return for the fully projected future test year, the twelve months ending December 31, 2017("FPFTY"). The table also provides references to exhibits sponsored by other witnesses that set forth this information in more detail.

Penelec Exhibit CVF-4 provides a corporate history, including the dates of the Company's original incorporation and subsequent mergers and acquisitions.

---

[1] Exhibits CVF-1 through CVF-4 respond to filing requirements outlined in 52 Pa. Code § 53.53(a)(3). Specifically, these exhibits respond to requirements I-A-1, 2 and 3 and I-B-1 of Exhibit C to Section 53.53.

Penelec Exhibit CVF-5 provides a comparison of residential customer bills at the Company's existing and proposed base rates to residential customer bills, at the same usage levels, of Duquesne Light Company ("Duquesne"), PECO Energy Company ("PECO") and PPL Electric Utilities Corporation ("PPL"), as well as the other FirstEnergy-owned Pennsylvania electric distribuiton companies ("EDCs").

Penelec Exhibit CVF-6 is a copy of the Meter Reading section of the Company's web-site.

II. <u>SETTLEMENT COMMITMENTS</u>

Q. In the Joint Petition for Settlement of Rate Investigation ("Settlement Agreement") which the Commission approved in Penelec's last base rate proceeding at Docket No. R-2014-2428743, the Company, at pages 11- 14, made various commitments in the areas of customer service, meter reading and smart meter operations. Is Penelec in compliance with those provisions?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. Is the Company prepared to meet its commitment to achieve and maintain an annual call answer rate of at least 80% of calls answered within thirty seconds beginning with the twelve-month period ended December 31, 2016?

A. Yes. In fact, the Company satisfied the 80% target in 2014 and 2015, and again during the twelve months ended March 31, 2016.

Q. The Company also agreed to reduce the number of residential disputes that did not receive a response within thirty days to no more than sixty beginning with the twelve-month period ending December 31, 2016. Is Penelec on track to comply with that standard?

A. Yes. The Company has made great strides in this area. For example, in 2014, Penelec had 874 residential disputes that did not receive a response within thirty days. The Company reduced that figure to eleven in 2015 and, as of March 31, 2016, Penelec had no outstanding residential customer disputes that had not received a response within thirty days.

Q. The Company also agreed to take the necessary action to: (i) consistently meet the twelve-month performance standards established by the Commission for SAIFI[2], SAIDI[3] and CAIDI[4] by the end of the first reporting quarter of 2016 (i.e., March 31, 2016); (ii) consistently meet the three-year performance standards established by the Commission for SAIFI, SAIDI, and CAIDI by the end of calendar year 2017; and (iii) strive towards the achievement of reliability performance at or better than the performance benchmarks established by the Commission. How is the Company performing with respect to these reliability commitments?

A. The Company has made positive strides towards meeting, all of its reliability obligations as shown in Table 1 below:

---

[2] System Average Interruption Frequency Index, or "SAIFI," represents the average frequency of sustained interruptions per customer during an analysis period.

[3] System Average Interruption Duration Index, or "SAIDI," represents the average duration of sustained interruptions per customer during an analysis period.

[4] Customer Average Interruption Duration Index, or "CAIDI," represents the average interruption duration of sustained interruptions for those customers who experience interruptions during an analysis period.

Table 1
Penelec Reliability Performance as of March 31, 2016

Metric	Benchmark	12-Month Standard	12-Month Actual	3-Year Standard	3-Year Actual
SAIFI	1.26	1.52	1.34	1.39	1.42
CAIDI	117	141	143.2	129	134
SAIDI	148	213	191.8	179	189

As indicated above, the Company has bettered the 12-month Standard for SAIFI and SAIDI while falling only slightly below standard on CAIDI. The Company approached benchmark performance for SAIFI over the 12 months ended March 2016, and has also improved its performance toward meeting the 3-Year Standard in all three metrics by the end of calendar 2017. .

Q. As part of the Settlement Agreement, the Company also agreed to ensure that its policies and procedures were designed such that customer meters are read at least every other month and to document the specific reasons when it is unable to do so. Has the Company complied with this commitment?

A. Yes. The Company continues to focus on its meter reading operations to ensure that its performance is consistent with all regulatory requirements. In furtherance of the commitment it made in its last base rate case, the Company created a new report that summarizes its meter-reading performance and identifies the causes for any missed reads. The Company provided such a report, covering the period from June 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015, to the statutory advocates on April 8, 2016.

Q. Penelec further agreed to revise its website and customer education materials to explicitly inform its customers, in plain language, of the Company's policy to issue

bills based on actual meter readings no less frequently than every other month and to explain the procedures for customers to submit self-readings if they elect to do so. Has Penelec complied with this settlement provision?

A. Yes. The Company modified its website on July 1, 2015 to provide the information requested by the settling parties. Exhibit CVF- 6 provides a copy of the relevant Meter Reading page, shown on the website, of Penelec's current tariff.

Q. The Settlement Agreement also required that Penelec provide the statutory advocates with certain information regarding the operation of its modified estimated billing algorithm, including its performance over the first full year of its use. Is the Company on track to supply the necessary information?

A. Yes. Company representatives met with the statutory advocates on September 10, 2015 in Harrisburg to review its modified estimated billing algorithm and to answer any questions regarding its operation. Due to final upgrades taking place through the end of 2015, it was agreed that the Company will use the twelve-month period–ending December 31, 2016 to study the accuracy and performance of the new algorithm and will provide a report to the statutory advocates in March of 2017.

Q. Turning to a different area, did the Company add certain reporting metrics to its Annual Progress Report under its Smart Meter Technology Deployment Plan approved by the Commission at Docket No. M-2013-2341991 ("Smart Meter Plan"), as it agreed to do in its Settlement Agreement?

A. Yes. Beginning with the August 1, 2015 Annual Progress Report submitted pursuant to its Smart Meter Plan, the Company provided information concerning the following metrics:

Home area network ("HAN") devices. Number of utility AMI meters with consumer devices registered to operate with the HAN chip.

AMI meter installs. Number of smart meters installed and registered.

Customer complaints. Number of formal and informal PUC complaints related to AMI meter deployment, broken down by type of complaint and resolution. AMI meter deployment includes installation, functioning or accuracy of the AMI meter, and HAN device registration.

Reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Reduced emissions attributable to reduced truck rolls due to automatic meter readings and increased efficiencies. This reporting will commence once the realization of this benefit has been determined and reflected in the smart meter baseline savings as of April 30, 2016.

Voltage and VAR controls. Number and percentage of distribution lines using sensing from an AMI meter as part of the Company's voltage regulation scheme.

Q. Did the Company also host an informational meeting with respect to the Company's smart meter and smart grid deployment efforts as committed to in the Settlement Agreement?

A. Yes. The meeting was held on July 20, 2015 at the FirstEnergy General Offices in Akron. Representatives of the Environmental Defense Fund attended in person and representatives of the Office of Consumer Advocate participated via teleconference.

III. <u>OVERVIEW OF RATE REQUEST AND REASONS FOR PROPOSED INCREASE</u>

Q. Please describe the increases and changes in rates for distribution service that the Company is proposing.

A. The Company is proposing a general rate increase to its distribution rates and is also requesting increases in rates charged under its Default Service Support ("DSS") Rider and Hourly Pricing Default Service ("HPS") Rider in order to fully collect the uncollectible expense associated with the provision of default service, as well as the Purchase of Receivables Program offered to electric generation suppliers. Finally, the Company is proposing to roll smart meter and Distribution System Improvement Charge ("DSIC") investment costs into base rates.

Q. Please identify the principal changes to existing and pending rate riders that affect distribution base rate revenue in this case.

A. The Company currently has a Smart Meter Technologies Charge ("SMT-C") Rider through which it recovers the costs of implementing its Smart Meter Plan. Absent the filing of this base rate request, the Company's SMT-C Rider, which is currently set at zero, would be reinstated beginning in 2017 to collect a budgeted $3,871,000 of smart meter costs during 2017. Because of this filing, the Company will instead include its 2017 smart meter costs in base rates and will maintain its SMT-C Rider rate at zero. The SMT-C Rider will remain in the Company's tariff and will be utilized to recover the costs of its Smart Meter Plan in excess of the level of such costs included in base rates, net of applicable savings.

Likewise, the Company has sought the Commission's approval to implement a DSIC Rider for service rendered beginning July 1, 2016 at Docket No. P-2015-2508936. The Company proposes to roll the projected DSIC Rider charges and costs into base distribution rates, and to reset the DSIC Rider to zero as of the effective date of the base rates determined in this case. The DSIC Rider will remain at zero until Penelec has added plant through its Commission-approved Long Term Infrastructure Improvement Plan ("LTIIP") in excess of the claimed amount included in its estimated December 31, 2017 rate base in the present case.

Q. What effect will the proposed increases and changes in distribution rates and riders have on the Company's pro forma revenues at current rates ?

A. The effect of the proposed increases and changes in distribution rates and riders on the Company's pro forma revenues at current rates for the FPFTY is summarized in Penelec Exhibit CVF-3 and highlighted in Table 2 below:

Table 2

Requested Revenue Change	
Penelec	($ Thousands)
Distribution Base Rate	$152,935
DSS & HPS Riders	$ 5,835
Total Request	$158,770
Percentage Increase in Total Revenue	11.42 %
Smart Meter Roll In	$ 3,871
DSIC Roll In	$ 2,082
Net Increase in Revenue	$152,817
Percentage Increase in Total Revenue	10.94%
Smart Meter – 2017 Rider revenue in the absence of the rate case	
DSIC Roll in – 2017 Rider revenue in the absence of the rate case	

The percentage increases shown are based on total Company revenue, assuming all customers are taking default service from the Company.

Q. What overall rate of return and return on common equity does the Company propose be used for purposes of calculating its revenue requirement in this case?

A. Penelec's proposed distribution rates are designed to recover the Company's costs to furnish safe and reliable distribution service and to provide it an opportunity to earn a fair return on its investment in distribution assets. More specifically, as summarized in Penlec Exhibit CVF-3 and explained in more detail in the direct testimony of Pauline M. Ahern (Penelec St. No. 8), the requested increase proposed by the Company would provide it an opportunity to earn an overall rate of return of 8.58% and a 11.30% return on common equity.

Q. How will the proposed rate increase impact the total bill of a typical residential customer using 1,000 kWh per month and how will the resulting bill compare to the current average residential bills of other Pennsylvania EDCs?

A. The Table 3 below shows: (1) a current monthly bill for a residential default service customer using 1,000 kWh; (2) the requested increase in that bill; and (3) the new bill under proposed base rates.

Table 3

	Current Monthly Bill*	Increase	Total Bill After Increase
Penelec	$137.89	$23.61	$161.50

*Based upon Current default service rates as of the date of this filing.

Under the corresponding rates in effect as of May 1, 2016, customers of the other three non-affiliated major Pennsylvania EDCs (i.e., Duquesne, PECO and PPL) would pay a monthly bill of between $136.37 and $156.21. **Penelec Exhibit CVF-5** graphically depicts the billing comparison I just described.

Q. What are the principal factors driving the Company's need for rate relief?

A. The principal factors driving the Company's need to increase its distribution base rates are as follows:

1. **Growth in the Company's distribution rate base**. One of the factors driving Penelec's need for rate relief is the 11% growth in the Company's rate base attributable to its ongoing investment in distribution plant (including smart meter and DSIC-eligible investment). As shown in Table 4 below, the Company's estimated rate base at December 31, 2017, as summarized in Penelec Exhibit

CVF-3 and developed in Mr. D'Angelo's Penelec Exhibit RAD-1, is expected to be approximately $165 million greater than the level reflected in current rates:

Table 4

	$ (thousands)
Rate Base Docket No. R-2014-2428743	$ 1,465,918
Rate Base RAD-1 pg. 1 line 19	$ 1,631,037
Increase	$ 165,120
Percentage Change	11%

2. **Reduction in sales**. Penelec's projected 2017 revenue at current rates is twenty-three million dollars less than the revenue requirement agreed to in the Settlement Agreement approved by the Commission at Docket No. R-2014-2428743. Sales to the residential class as a whole are expected to decrease by 2.14% annually, driven by a decline in the average usage per customer of approximately 2.10% annually over the next four years, offset only slightly by increases in the number of residential customers. The decline in the average residential usage in the Company's service area is primarily due to implementation of Pennsylvania's state-mandated energy efficiency programs underAct 129, as well as federally mandated energy efficiency lighting standards.

3. **Deferred taxes**. Penelec's deferred tax expense for the FPFTY is higher than the amount reflected in its last base rate proceeding.

4. **Depreciation expense associated with increased investment in plant in service**. The Company has included with this filing a new service life study reflecting application adoption of the Equal Life Group Method. The updated

accrual rates, along with the new distribution plant, result in corresponding increases in depreciation expense.

5. **Increase in operation and maintenance ("O&M") expense**. Implementation of the Company's LTIIP, will drive higher O&M expenses as work included in the LTIIP has an on-going O&M component in addition to the capital component. In addition, the Company has budgeted increases in expenses associated with vegetation management, facility repairs and substation maintenance as part of its on-going efforts to enhance reliability. Finally, the Company continues to experience increased uncollectible accounts expense.

IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE FILING, OTHER WITNESSES AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CASE TO THE COMPANY AND ITS CUSTOMERS

Q. Please identify the other witnesses presenting direct testimony on behalf of the Company and the principal subjects they address.

A. The Company is submitting the direct testimony of nine witnesses including myself. The other witnesses submitting direct testimony and the principal subjects they address are identified in Penelec Exhibit CVF-2 and can be summarized as follows:

Richard A. D'Angelo	Statement No. 2	Development of the Company's revenue requirement, including sponsoring and explaining the Company's principal accounting exhibits.
Kevin M. Siedt	Statement No. 3	Development of normalized sales and revenues; development of the Company's proposed rate design; proposed changes to tariff rules and regulations, rate schedules and riders.

Thomas J. Dolezal	Statement No. 4	Development of the Company's cost of service studies; separation studies; and cost of service at existing rates.
Jeffrey L. Adams	Statement No. 5	Development of the Company's claim for cash working capital.
Laura W. Gifford	Statement No. 6	Updating uncollectible accounts expense to be recovered in Penelec's DSS and HPS Riders. Updating the baselines for the measurement of smart meter savings.
John J. Spanos	Statement No. 7	Annual and accrued depreciation rates and service lives.
Pauline M. Ahern	Statement No. 8	Cost of common equity.
Joseph Dipre	Statement No. 9	Capitalization ratios; cost rates of long-term debt and common equity; and overall cost of capital.

Q. Please explain the importance of the proposed rate increase to the Company.

A. In order to continue enhancing reliability and customer service, the Company must continue to make very substantial investments in new and replacement distribution plant, including the investments set forth in its Commission-approved LTIIP. Moreover, it must do so during a period of declining sales and ever increasing O&M expenses. Due to these factors, Penelec's projected overall rate of return for the FPFTY, at present rates, is only 3.42%. More importantly, its indicated return on common equity during that same period is anticipated to be but 1.93%, which is obviously grossly inadequate by any reasonable standard. Returns at these levels will simply not support the level of investment required to ensure that customers continue to receive safe and reliable electric service. Accordingly, it is critically important that the Company be granted the rate relief it is requesting in this case.

Q. In view of the foregoing, do you have a recommendation regarding the rate of return on common equity that should be approved for the Company?

A. Yes, I do. I strongly encourage the Commission to adopt the 11. 3% equity return developed by Ms. Ahern.

Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?

A. Yes, it concludes my direct testimony at this time. However, I would like to reserve the right to supplement my direct testimony should it become necessary to do so.

APPENDIX A

Biography
Charles V. Fullem
Director – Rates & Regulatory Affairs/Pennsylvania

Charles V. Fullem is Director- Rates & Regulatory Affairs/Pennsylvania, a position he was appointed to on January 22, 2006. In that capacity, he is responsible for developing the default service plans of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Power Company and West Penn Power Company, as well as all retail tariff filings and financial reports to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission ("PaPUC") and the New York State Public Service Commission. He has over 30 years of experience in the energy industry, with a background in rates and regulation, marketing, unregulated retail pricing and regulated tariffs, contract development and negotiations of both wholesale and retail electric service contracts.

From December 2000 through January 2006, he served in various positions, including Director of Energy Consulting Operations for The E Group, the energy consulting subsidiary of FirstEnergy Corporation ("FirstEnergy"). As Director, he managed technical staff teams and was responsible for delivering all aspects of The E Group's client services for an over one billion dollar client energy spend, including energy management, bill and rate analysis, development of energy procurement strategies, preparation of requests for proposal, evaluation of bids, contract development and implementation, open market analysis, and negotiations with suppliers and utilities and utility bill payment.

From November 1999 through December 2000, Mr. Fullem was Director, Pricing and Regulatory Affairs, in FirstEnergy's rate department, where he was responsible for tariff administration and pricing programs serving over 2.2 million customers in Ohio and Pennsylvania. In this capacity, Mr. Fullem developed and implemented the unbundled tariffs designed to implement Customer Choice in Ohio, coordinated the development of FirstEnergy's Supplier Tariff and Net Metering Rider, and participated in the Operational Support Plan (OSP) workgroups. The OSP workgroups were collaborative working groups charged with establishing the various rules and policies of retail choice in Ohio.

From December 1994 through November 1999, Mr. Fullem served in various roles in FirstEnergy's marketing department, including Director, Planning and Strategy, and Director of Centerior Energy's Competitive Analysis Department, where he developed and implemented successful marketing programs targeted to commercial and industrial customers and mass market customers in both competitive generation markets and traditional areas of competition between fully integrated electric utility providers.

From 1982 through December 1994, Mr. Fullem served in various roles in rates and regulation at Centerior Energy and Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, including the roles of Director, Planning & Strategy, and Director of Rates & Contracts. In these roles, Mr. Fullem managed and performed cost of service studies, load research, customer requirements analyses, designed rates and tariffs, participated in the development of revenue requirements, and performed financial analyses.

Mr. Fullem holds his Bachelor of Science degree in Mineral Economics from the Pennsylvania State University. Mr. Fullem is a Certified Energy Procurement Professional by the Association of Energy Engineers. He has provided expert testimony before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO"), the PaPUC, The New York State Public Service Commission and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC").

Mr. Fullem has prepared and presented testimony in the following rate-related cases:

PUCO Cases:

Docket Nos.	***Case Name***
85-521-EL-COI	(In the Matter of the Investigation into the Perry Nuclear Power Station)
88-170-EL-AIR	(In the Matter of the Application of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company for Authority to Amend and to Increase Certain of its Filed Schedules Fixing Rates and Charges for Electric Service)
88-171-El-AIR	(In the Matter of the Application of the Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Amend and to Increase Certain of its Filed Schedules Fixing Rates and Charges for Electric Service)
91-1528-EL-CSS	(In the Matter of the Complaint of Toledo Premium Yogurt, Inc., dba Freshens Yogurt, Complainant, v. Toledo Edison Company, Respondent)
91-2308-EL-CSS	(Board of Education, Cleveland City Schools v. Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company)
92-504-EL-CSS	(Board of Education, Cleveland City Schools v. Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company)
95-02-EL-ABN	(In the Matter of the Application of the City of Clyde Requesting Removal of Certain Electric Distribution Facilities of the Toledo Edison Company from Within Clyde's Corporate Limits)
01-174-EL-CSS	(In the Matter of the Complaint of the City of Cleveland and WPS Energy Services, Inc., Complaints, v. The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and FirstEnergy Corp., Respondents)

PaPUC Cases:

Docket No.	*Case Name*
R – 850267	(Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, et al. v. Pennsylvania Power Company)
R – 860378	(Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, et al. v. Duquesne Light Company)
87-1160	(Duquesne Light Company and Pennsylvania Power Company, Appellants v. David M. Barasch, etc., et al.)
P-00072305	(Petition of Pennsylvania Power Company for Approval of Interim Default Service Supply Plan)
P-2008-2066692	(Voluntary Prepayment Plan)
P-2009-2093053	(Metropolitan Edison Company Default Service Programs)
P-2009-2093054	(Pennsylvania Electric Company Default Service Programs)
I-2009-2099881	(Compliance of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with Section 410(a) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act 2009)
M-2009-2092222	(Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, and Pennsylvania Power Company for approval of its Energy Efficiency and Conservation Plans)
M-2009-2112952	(Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, and Pennsylvania Power Company for approval of its Energy Efficiency and Conservation Plans)
M-2009-2112956	(Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, & Pennsylvania Power Company for approval of its Energy Efficiency and Conservation Plans)
A-2010-2176520	(Joint Application of West Penn Power Company, Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company & FirstEnergy Corp.)
A-2010-2176732	(Joint Application of West Penn Power Company, Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company & FirstEnergy Corp.)

P-2011-2273650	(Metropolitan Edison Company Default Service Programs)
P-2011-2273668	(Pennsylvania Electric Company Default Service Programs)
P-2011-2273669	(Pennsylvania Power Company Default Service Programs)
P-2011-2273670	(West Penn Power Company Default Service Programs)
M-2012-2334387	Joint Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Power Company and West Penn Power Company for Approval of its Act 129 Phase II EE&C Plans
M-2012-2334392	Joint Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Power Company and West Penn Power Company for Approval of its Act 129 Phase II EE&C Plans
M-2012-2334395	Joint Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Power Company and West Penn Power Company for Approval of its Act 129 Phase II EE&C Plans
M-2012-2334398	Joint Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Power Company and West Penn Power Company for Approval of its Act 129 Phase II EE&C Plans
R-2014-2428745	Metropolitan Edison Company – General Base Rate Filing
R-2014-2428743	Pennsylvania Electric Company – General Base Rate Filing
R-2014-2428744	Pennsylvania Power Company – General Base Rate Filing
R-2014-2428742	West Penn Power Company – General Base Rate Filing
A-2015-2488903	Joint Application of Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC ("MAIT"); Metropolitan Edison Company and Pennsylvania Electric Company
A-2015-2488904	Joint Application of Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC ("MAIT"); Metropolitan Edison Company and Pennsylvania Electric Company
A-2015-2488905	Joint Application of Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC ("MAIT"); Metropolitan Edison Company and Pennsylvania Electric Company

G-2015-2488906	Joint Application of Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC ("MAIT"); Metropolitan Edison Company and Pennsylvania Electric Company
G-2015-2488907	Joint Application of Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC ("MAIT"); Metropolitan Edison Company and Pennsylvania Electric Company
P-2015-2511333	Joint Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Power Company and West Penn Power Company for Approval of their Default Service Programs
P-2015-2511351	Joint Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Power Company and West Penn Power Company for Approval of their Default Service Programs
P-2015-2511355	Joint Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Power Company and West Penn Power Company for Approval of their Default Service Programs
P-2015-2511356	Joint Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Power Company and West Penn Power Company for Approval of their Default Service Programs

NY PSC Cases:

Docket No.	***Case Name***
Case 11-E-0594	(Pennsylvania Electric Company Waverly District – moving POLR rates to market supply)

FERC Cases:

Docket No.	***Case Name***
ER93-471-000	(COS – FERC Rate Case: Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company v. Cleveland Public Power)