

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

IN RE: Application of PPL Electric for : Docket No. R-00072155
Rate Increase :

**COMMISSION ON ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY'S
STATEMENT IN SUPPORT FOR THE
JOINT PETITION OF SETTLEMENT**

SECURITY
2001 FEB 20 11:11:47

The Commission on Economic Opportunity (CEO) supports the Joint Petition for Settlement and agrees to its terms based upon the following:

1. CEO intervened in the above matter to address the Company's universal service programs.

2. CEO supports the Joint Petition for Settlement and believes that it is in the public interest based upon the following:

A. The Company has agreed to significantly increase spending for its low income usage reduction program (LIURP) which will help alleviate the impact of the rate increase on low income residential customers. The increase in LIURP spending will provide additional conservation measures further reducing a low income customer's consumption of energy and therefore his or her energy costs.

B. The Company has reaffirmed its commitment to use community based organizations in its universal service programs.


C. The settlement addresses the numerous and sometimes adverse interests of the many parties involved in this matter and effectively serves the interests of the Company, those parties and the public interest.

D. The willingness of this Company to address the interests of all parties and the willingness of all parties to be willing to accept the positions of other parties will serve as an

example to other parties in other proceedings of an effective compromise serving the public interest.

3. Based upon the above, CEO supports the Joint Petition for Settlement.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Vullo', is written over a horizontal line.

JOSEPH C. VULLO, ESQUIRE
I.D. No. 41279
1460 Wyoming Avenue
Forty Fort, PA 18704
(570) 288-0700
Counsel for Commission On Economic
Opportunity

**Before the
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**Administrative Law Judge
Susan D. Colwell, Presiding**

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, et al.	:	Docket No. R-00072155
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

SEARCHED
SERIALIZED
INDEXED
FILED
MAY 11 2011
FBI - SCRANTON

**STATEMENT OF
THE CITY OF SCRANTON
IN SUPPORT OF
JOINT STIPULATION FOR SETTLEMENT
OF RATE INVESTIGATION**

AND NOW comes the City of Scranton ("City"), by its attorneys, and respectfully submits the following in support of the Joint Stipulation for Settlement of Rate Investigation ("Settlement") presented in the above captioned rate proceeding.

1. City supports the settlement of tariff language concerning the proposed expanded availability of Rate SE - Energy Only Street Lighting Service - to non-municipal users. City takes no position in regard to the settlement of the many other issues as proposed by the other parties to the proceeding.

2. City reviewed the expansion of Rate SE to non-municipal users as proposed by PPL Electric and, in the direct testimony of its witness George Parker, PE, City Statement No. 1, discussed the potential burdens that could be placed on City if the expansion were improved. Initially, City proposed that the Public Utility Commission deny the expansion of Rate SE to non-municipal customers.


3. PPL Electric considered City's testimony and, in the rebuttal testimony of its witness Oliver G. Kasper, proposed certain Rate SE tariff modifications to address City's concerns. City reviewed PPL Electric's rebuttal testimony and, in surrebuttal testimony presented by Mr. Parker, City Statement No. 1-SR, proposed certain additional changes to the language presented by Mr. Kasper to more adequately address City's concerns.

4. Subsequently, City and PPL Electric discussed the matter still further and ultimately agreed to the Rate SE tariff language presented in Appendix A to the Settlement. The Rate SE tariff language proposed in settlement addresses City's concerns and provides assurances that non-municipal Rate SE street lighting will be properly engineered before street lighting facilities are energized. Additional language to the "Identification" paragraph of Rate SE will assure that the public is aware of a non-municipal customer's ownership of street lights and that a telephone number for the customer is published and advertised.

5. It is the policy of the Commission to encourage parties in contested proceedings to enter into settlements. 52 Pa. Code §5.231(a). A settlement mitigates the time and expense of litigating the matter to its ultimate conclusion which benefits all parties concerned. The settlement of language associated with the expansion of Rate SE to non-municipal customers as presented in Appendix A of the Settlement is consistent with the Commission's stated policy.

WHEREFORE, the City of Scranton prays that Administrative Law Judge Susan D. Colwell recommend approval of and the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission approve the settlement of Rate SE tariff language addressing the expansion of the availability of Rate SE to non-municipal users.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas T. Niesen, Esquire
THOMAS, THOMAS, ARMSTRONG & NIESEN
212 Locust Street, Suite 500
P.O. Box 9500
Harrisburg, PA 17108-9500

Attorneys for
City of Scranton

Before the
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Administrative Law Judge
Susan D. Colwell, Presiding

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, *et al.* : Docket No. R-00072155
: :
v. : :
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation : :

STATEMENT OF
THE SUSTAINABLE ENERGY FUND OF
CENTRAL EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA
IN SUPPORT OF
JOINT STIPULATION FOR SETTLEMENT
OF RATE INVESTIGATION

AND NOW comes the Sustainable Energy Fund of Central Eastern Pennsylvania ("SEF"), by its attorneys, and respectfully submits the following in support of the Joint Stipulation for Settlement of Rate Investigation ("Settlement") presented in the above captioned rate proceeding.

1. SEF supports the portion of the settlement related to PPL Electric's proposed Sustainable Development Program that includes participation by PPL Electric in and funding for SEF's Solar Scholars™ Program and a proposed Small Business Guarantee Program. SEF takes no position in regard to the settlement of the many other issues as proposed by the other parties to the proceeding.

Solar Scholars™

2. Solar Scholars™ is a proven solar education program dedicated to universities and promoting awareness and use of solar energy. Solar Scholars™ is a high visibility consumer education program providing students and their schools with

RECEIVED
JUL 10 2013
PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION

funding and incentives for in-depth study, training, and research in photovoltaic technology as part of an overall academic curriculum in renewable energy. Its mission is to prepare the next generation of solar energy leaders to make informed decisions that are science, business, and technology based.

3. SEF has funded Solar Scholars™ at six Pennsylvania universities: Penn State University, Clarion University, Bucknell University, Mercyhurst College, Messiah College, and Villanova University. With the additional funding to be provided as part of the Settlement, Solar Scholars™ will be expanded to an additional 12-15 universities within the PPL Electric service territory.

Small Business Guarantee Program

4. Continuing their collaborative efforts, SEF and PPL Electric will work with participating financial institutions to develop and administer a one-year pilot small business guarantee program. SEF believes that many small businesses are already aware of desired improvements in their business operations that would foster energy efficiency. Creating a guarantee program can assist small businesses with funding for improvements and help prepare small businesses for increased electricity costs projected by 2010.

5. Although PPL Electric's funding is contingent on its review of the final details of the program, SEF has reviewed similar, already existing programs in Pennsylvania and Delaware. Based on that review, SEF believes that through a collaborative effort a cost effective program can be designed and implemented in the PPL Electric service territory.

Conclusion


6. It is the policy of the Commission to encourage parties in contested proceedings to enter into settlements. 52 Pa. Code §5.231(a). A settlement mitigates

the time and expense of litigating the matter to its ultimate conclusion which benefits all parties concerned. In settlement, funding for Solar Scholars™ and a pilot small business guarantee program will be provided and SEF and PPL Electric will work in collaborative fashion to further the worthwhile objectives of these consumer education and energy efficiency programs. SEF submits that the proposed settlement funding and anticipated collaborative effort is in the public interest and consistent with the Commission's stated policy encouraging settlements.

WHEREFORE, the Sustainable Energy Fund of Central Eastern Pennsylvania prays that Administrative Law Judge Susan D. Colwell recommend approval of and the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission approve those settlement terms providing for funding of SEF's Solar Scholars™ Program and a proposed Small Business Guarantee Program.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Thomas T. Niesen, Esquire
THOMAS, THOMAS, ARMSTRONG & NIESEN
212 Locust Street, Suite 500
P.O. Box 9500
Harrisburg, PA 17108-9500

Attorneys for
The Sustainable Energy Fund
of Central Eastern Pennsylvania

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission :
 :
 : **Docket No. R-00072155, et al.**
 v. :
 :
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation :

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY
MAY 11 2007

**PP&L INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMER ALLIANCE STATEMENT
IN SUPPORT OF JOINT PETITION FOR SETTLEMENT**

PPL Electric Utilities Corporation ("PPL" or "Company"), The Office of Trial Staff ("OTS") of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission ("PUC" or "Commission"), Office of Consumer Advocate ("OCA"), Office of Small Business Advocate ("OSBA"), PP&L Industrial Customer Alliance ("PPLICA"), Department of Defense and Federal Executive Agencies ("DOD"), Richards Energy Group, Inc. ("REG"), Sustainable Energy Fund ("SEF"), City of Scranton ("Scranton"), Commission on Economic Opportunity ("CEO"), and Eric Epstein (collectively, "Joint Petitioners") are filing with the Commission a Joint Stipulation for Settlement of Rate Investigation ("Settlement") to resolve all issues in the above-captioned proceeding. This Statement in Support sets forth the reasons PPLICA supports the Settlement as a reasonably balanced resolution that serves the public interest.

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

On March 29, 2007, PPL filed with the Commission Supplement No. 54, proposed to become effective on June 1, 2007. By this filing, PPL requested a distribution rate increase of approximately \$83.6 million, or 13% over the Company's present annual distribution revenues, and a proposed return on equity of 11.5%. In support of Supplement No. 54, PPL filed and

served testimony purportedly validating the Company's claim for an \$83.6 million distribution rate increase and the other elements of the Company's proposal.

On April 23, 2007, PPLICA filed a Complaint in the above-captioned proceeding. PPLICA is an ad hoc association of energy-intensive industrial customers receiving electric service in PPL's service territory. PPLICA members purchase service from PPL primarily under Rate Schedules LP-4, LP-5, LP-6, IS-P, and IS-T, as well as available riders. These Rate Schedules and Rate Schedules LPEP, IS-M and Standby make up the Large Commercial and Industrial ("C&I") Class for purposes of PPL's distribution base rate filing. PPLICA was an active party in PPL's Restructuring Proceeding pursuant to the Competition Act, during which the Company's initial unbundled distribution and transmission rates were established, as well as PPL's 2004 Distribution Base Rate proceeding.

On May 30, 2007, the Commission suspended Supplement No. 54 for investigation and assigned the matter to the Office of Administrative Law Judge for hearing. Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") Susan D. Colwell was designated as the Presiding Judge.

PPLICA actively participated in all phases of this proceeding by attending the prehearing conference on May 31, 2007; propounding discovery; submitting the prepared Direct, Supplemental Direct, Rebuttal, and Surrebuttal Testimony and accompanying exhibits of Stephen J. Baron on July 6, 19, 27, and August 8, 2007, respectively; and attending evidentiary hearings on August 13 and 16, 2007. PPLICA also participated in numerous settlement discussions, which culminated in the resolution of all issues at stake in this proceeding, as memorialized in this Settlement.

II. REASONS FOR SUPPORT OF SETTLEMENT

In its Complaint, PPLICCA identified a number of issues presented by PPL's Supplement No. 54. These issues related to the appropriate level of the requested distribution revenue requirement increase, the proper allocation of the proposed increase, and the justness and reasonableness of the proposed tariff rule changes. For the reasons discussed below, PPLICCA supports the Settlement.

A. The Settlement Is Consistent With PUC Policy Favoring Settlements.

As a threshold matter, Commission policy favors settlement as a means of resolving disputes between parties. The Commission generally views the results of a settlement as benefits to the public that are "often preferable to those achieved at the conclusion of a fully litigated proceeding." 52 Pa. Code § 69.401. Moreover, "[t]he Commission encourages parties to seek negotiated settlements of contested proceedings in lieu of incurring the time, expense and uncertainty of litigation." 52 Pa. Code § 69.391; see also 52 Pa. Code § 5.231. The Settlement conserves the PUC's and parties' resources, eliminates the uncertainty of litigation, and expedites resolution of this proceeding. Thus, approval of the Settlement is consistent with Commission policy.

B. The Settlement Proposes a Reduction in the Company's Requested Revenue Requirement Based on a Thorough Vetting of the Information Made Available During the Discovery Process and in Prepared Testimony.

The Settlement also establishes a just and reasonable distribution revenue requirement. The parties in this proceeding engaged in extensive discovery, during which they examined issues related to the Company's expenses, rate of return, and rate base. The parties also addressed these issues in multiple rounds of prepared testimony. As a result of this thorough vetting process, the Settlement contemplates a distribution revenue requirement of \$55 million. See Settlement, Paragraph 24(a). The Settlement represents a reduction in the Company's

initially proposed increase of \$83.6 million (which was subsequently revised to \$76.996 million). Thus, the distribution revenue requirement set forth in the Settlement is in the public interest.

C. The Settlement's Revenue Allocation Proposal Is Consistent With the Commonwealth Court's decision in Lloyd.

Consistent with the Commonwealth Court's decision Lloyd v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n, 904 A.2d 1010 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2006), the Settlement moves PPL's distribution rates another step closer to cost of service and, consequently, further reduces the substantial subsidies embedded in the Company's distribution rates for Large C&I customers. This Settlement is premised upon a three-step approach described by the Company in its filing with the Commission in this proceeding. See PPL Statement No. 7, pp. 10-11. This approach provides a blueprint for eliminating interclass subsidies embedded in the Company's distribution rates in a gradual, but systematic manner that addresses concerns regarding potential rate shock. As indicated by the Company, this proceeding represents the second step in realizing full cost of service distribution rates. Id.

In light of the substantial levels of subsidies, particularly with respect to certain Large C&I rate schedules (e.g., Rate Schedules IS-T and IS-P), that remain in PPL's distribution rates, concerted movement toward cost of service is necessary. See PPLICA Statement No. 1, pp. 17-23. To that end, the Settlement proposes revenue decreases for Rate Schedules LP-4, IS-P, LP-5, and IS-T, and a slight revenue increase for Rate Schedule LP-6.¹ See Settlement, Paragraphs 27(a)-(b). As a result, the monthly bills for an average industrial customer using 150,000 kWh of electricity with a maximum demand of 500 kW supplied by PPL would decrease by \$41.48. See id. at Paragraph 28(a). Notably, the proposed revenue allocation reflects additional adjustments that respond to the arguments raised in PPLICA's testimony. See, e.g., PPLICA

¹ The revenue increase is a function of the expiration of the DOE/SEF rate credits applicable during 2007. See PPLICA Statement No. 2, pp. 5-6.

Statement No. 3, pp. 21-23. Accordingly, the Settlement provides relief to rate schedules that are presently yielding disproportionately high returns.

Thus, PPLICA supports the Settlement as advancing the ultimate goal of eliminating interclass subsidies to arrive at distribution rates that are fully reflective of cost of service. Distribution rates that are free of interclass subsidies are just and reasonable and in the public interest.

D. The Settlement Addresses PPLICA's Concerns Pertaining to the Company's Proposed Tariff Rule Changes.

The Settlement addresses PPLICA's concerns regarding the Company's proposed tariff rule changes as follows:

Rule 4A(2). This provision sets forth the Company's interconnection obligation to its retail distribution customers. PPL proposed to limit the applicability of this provision to customers taking service at voltages "less than the nominal 69,000 volts and excluding service extensions and lines energized at voltages of nominal 69,000 volts or higher," such as distribution customers on Rate Schedules LP-5, IS-T, and LP-6. The Settlement proposes additional language that confirms PPL's continued obligation to provide full service and non-discriminatory, just and reasonable distribution rates to high voltage customers. The specific language provides: "However, this definition does not affect the Company's obligations under the Federal Power Act and/or Public Utility Code, as applicable: (1) to provide safe, reliable and adequate retail electric service to customers taking service at voltages of 69 kV and above, and (2) to provide just and reasonable and non-discriminatory distribution and transmission rates, terms and conditions of service to such customers." See Settlement, Paragraph 29(c).

Rule 4A(7). The Company proposed to add language that refers to an "Institutional Complex." In response to PPLICA's concern that PPL's proposed definition could be construed as eliminating a large customer's ability to secure two points of service to a single building, the

Company will withdraw its proposed language and replace it with the following: "For application of this rule, services to more than one building or facility located on the same property and owned by the same entity will be considered service to a single premise; each individual building or facility will not be considered a separate premise." See Settlement, Paragraph 29(a) (incorporating revisions agreed to by PPL in its rebuttal testimony); see also PPL Statement No. 7-R, p. 12.

Rule 4C. PPL proposed changes to Rule 4C that appeared to eliminate the Company's current obligation to use the distribution supply lines closest to a customer's property line when installing a service extension and shift to the customer the cost of all mechanical facilities necessary to install the service extension. Based on PPLICA's concerns regarding these changes, PPL has agreed to withdraw the proposed changes. See Settlement, Paragraph 29(a) (incorporating revisions agreed to by PPL in its rebuttal testimony); see also PPL Statement No. 7-R, p. 13.

Accordingly, the Settlement adequately addresses PPLICA's concerns regarding the Company's proposed tariff rule changes. The clarification of the Company's tariff rules, particularly with respect to its continuing obligation to provide full service and non-discriminatory, just and reasonable distribution rates to high voltage customers, is in the public interest.

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the PP&L Industrial Customer Alliance respectfully requests that the Commission approve the Joint Petition for Settlement without modification submitted in the above-captioned proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

McNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC

By *Vasiliki Karandrikas*
David M. Kleppinger (I.D. No. 32091)
Pamela C. Polacek (I.D. No. 78276)
Vasiliki Karandrikas (I.D. No. 89711)
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
100 Pine Street
P.O. Box 1166
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166
(717) 232-8000
(717) 237-5300 (fax)

Counsel to the PP&L Industrial Customer Alliance

Dated: August 29, 2007

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

2017 JUN 30 10:11:47
SECRET

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, <i>et al.</i>	:	
	:	
v.	:	Commission Docket Nos.
	:	R-00072155, <i>etc.</i>
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

STATEMENT OF RICHARDS ENERGY GROUP, INC.
IN SUPPORT OF THE JOINT STIPULATION
FOR SETTLEMENT OF RATE INVESTIGATION

TO THE HONORABLE SUSAN D. COLWELL, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

Richards Energy Group, Inc. (“REG”), an intervener in the above-captioned proceeding, files this Statement in Support, respectfully requesting that Your Honor recommend that the Commission approve the Joint Stipulation for Settlement of Rate Investigation (“Joint Petition”) filed on behalf of the signatory parties.

Within its Petition to Intervene and in the testimony of Mr. Frank Richards, REG raised several issues relating to: the apparent elimination of time of day pricing for each rate classification¹; the redefinition of GS-1 and GS-3 service that would prohibit customers from choosing between the two services; the open ended nature of the Energy Efficiency Rider proposed by PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (“PPL”); and other minor tariff changes. The Joint Petition contains a negotiated compromise of all of these issues.

¹ Mr. Richards refers to time of day (TOD) provisions while the Joint Petition utilizes the phrase time of use (TOU).

Time of Use Pricing

While REG had originally advocated maintaining the status quo with respect to TOU provisions, REG recognizes that TOU offerings have become a part of a broader discussion of the energy plan proposed by various companies, individuals, and governmental officials. As such, REG believes that the collaborative process as outlined in the Joint Petition is the most appropriate forum to address all issues related to TOU rates. Such an effort will enable all interested parties to address such issues as whether TOU rates should follow the PPL peak or that of PJM, whether “smart meters” that permit power reductions on a remote basis are an option and at what cost, as well as the actual pricing to be utilized in any TOU rate offered by PPL. In REG’s opinion, these are important issues that must be addressed prior to the expiration of the rate caps in 2010.

Definition of GS-1 and GS-3 service

REG raised the issue of revisions to the eligibility requirements for a customer taking service under PPL’s GS-1 or GS-3 tariff provisions. As pointed out by Mr. Richards, current customers have available to them both rates and could switch between whichever rate is most advantageous, a process that could aid them in shopping for generation supply. The Joint Petition strikes a balance between the position taken by PPL and REG. Pursuant to the Paragraph 29(c) of the Joint Petition, PPL will permit existing customers to switch rate classifications until the year 2010. Thus, the current options will remain available to exiting customers until the expiration of the PPL rate caps to enable these customers to take advantage of the most advantageous rate and potential generation shopping opportunities, while simultaneously providing a transition to the separation of rate classifications based upon the type of service received.

Energy Efficiency Rider

REG generally supported the concept of the Energy Efficiency Rider proposed by PPL, but was concerned about the apparent open-ended nature of the program. Statement REG-1, p. 8. While we are disappointed that PPL has withdrawn this proposal in the context of this Joint Petition, we appreciate the fact that the concept remains viable. REG looks forward to the continuation of discussions regarding this program.

Other tariff issues

REG raised additional questions regarding the need to clarify several of its tariff provisions. PPL had agreed to retain the portability of TOD rates under its GS and GH rate schedules;² eliminate the annual maintenance charges for non-standard equipment which would enable customers to receive data via KYZ pulses;³ agreed to provide information to customers on rate schedule GH-1 who qualify for Rate GS-3 in order for them to determine whether to change rate schedules;⁴ and agreed to make various language changes to its Tariff Rule 4.

Public Interest

While REG has not taken any position with regard to the other issues addressed by the Joint Petition, REG believes that the adoption of those paragraphs specifically supported by REG is in the public interest. These paragraphs provide protections for existing customers while at the


² Joint Petition, ¶ 29(d).

³ Joint Petition, ¶ 29(g).

⁴ Joint Petition, ¶ 29(f).

same time address issues critical to the transitioning to the expiration of rate caps in 2010 and providing customers with the tools to make intelligent choices. REG respectfully requests that Your Honor recommend to the Commission adoption of the Joint Petition.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Craig A. Doll". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name and contact information.

Craig A. Doll, Esquire
25 West Second Street
P.O. Box 403
Hummelstown, PA 17036-0403
(717) 566-9000
cdoll76342@aol.com

Attorney I.D. # 22814

Attorney for Richards Energy Group, Inc.

DATED: August 28, 2007

STANDARD TIME
2007 OCT 30 11:11 AM


**DOD/FEA Statement in Support of
Joint Stipulation for Settlement
Of Rate Investigation**

DOD/FEA agreed to the settlement because the rates for our largest military customers, which take service under Rate LP-5 (Army) and Rate LP-6 (Navy) fell within an acceptable proximity of DOD/FEA Witness Kincl's recommendations for these two rate classes. DOD/FEA Witness Kincl, within both direct and surrebuttal testimony recommended that the relative rate of return (RROR) for any class of customer should not be set higher than 1.25 times the system average percentage return in order to redress the most inequitable cross-subsidies that are now embedded within class rates. At the stipulation of a \$55 million total revenue increase, the 2007 test year revenues for the LP-5 class would have to be reduced by \$138k if present revenues were defined as PPL does, or by \$282k if defined with expiring DOE credits netted out of present revenues, as Witness Kincl does within his surrebuttal testimony. (PPL's litigated and settlement position is that the expiring DOE credits are a valid component of "present" revenues in 2007.) These revenue reductions are based on running Exhibit KLK-7 Revised and Exhibit KLK-7 Revised DOE Refund Adjusted as presented with in Witness Kincl's surrebuttal testimony at the scaleback level of \$55 million. DOD/FEA agreed to settle the revenues for the LP-5 class at a reduction of \$140k, which brings the RROR for that class roughly to 1.25 given the PPL definition of present revenues. (All other parties apparently support PPL's definition of present revenues because no other party requested the DOE credit adjustment in their surrebuttal testimony.)

DOD/FEA witness Kincl also called for a cap on the rate increase to any class of customer at 26%. The LP-6 class is producing returns which result in a slightly negative RROR under either of the two definitions of present revenues. DOD/FEA's proposed 26% rate cap would result in an increase of \$9k under the PPL definition of present revenues and an increase of \$14k with DOE credits netted out of PPL's present revenues. DOD/FEA agreed to an increase of only \$6k, which was proposed by both OCA and PPL at the \$55 million scaleback level.

DOD/FEA finds this settlement producing reasonable and equitable rates for Rate classes LP-5 and LP-6 at this time. DOD/FEA intends to promote rates for all classes of customer that are at or near to parity with the system average percentage return in the next general rate proceeding of PPL.

Respectfully Submitted,



Peter Q. Nyce Jr.
(DC Bar No. 923011)
General Attorney
Regulatory Law Office
U. S. Army Legal Services Agency

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served upon the following persons, in the manner indicated, in accordance with the requirements of § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant).

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Honorable Susan D. Colwell
Administrative Law Judge
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor West
PO Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105

VIA E-MAIL and FIRST CLASS MAIL

Tanya J. McCloskey
Aron J. Beatty
Jennedy C. Santolla
Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
Forum Place, 5th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923

Steven C. Gray
Office of Small Business Advocate
Commerce Building
300 North Second Street, Suite 1102
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Kenneth Mickens
Charles Daniel Shields
Office of Trial Staff
PO Box 3265
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor West
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Pamela C. Polacek
Vasiliki Karandrikas
McNees, Wallace & Nurick
PO Box 1166
100 Pine Street
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166

Joseph L. Vullo
Burke Vullo Reilly Roberts
1460 Wyoming Avenue
Forty Fort, PA 18702

Thomas T. Niesen
Thomas, Thomas, Armstrong & Niesen
212 Locust Street, Suite 500
P.O. Box 9500
Harrisburg, PA 17108-9500

Peter Q. Nyce, Jr.
US Army Legal Services Agency (JALS-
RL)
901 North Stuart Street, Room 713
Arlington, VA 22203-1837

Ken Kincel
President
Decision Analysis Corporation of Virginia
8009 Snowpine Way
Suite 100
McLean, VA 22102-2420

Anthony E. Gay
Exelon Business Services Company
2301 Market Street/S23-1
Philadelphia, PA 19103

2017 JUN 30 11:11:45

Eric Joseph Epstein
4100 Hillsdale Road
Harrisburg, PA 17112

Craig A. Doll
25 West Second Street
P.O. Box 403
Hummelstown, PA 17036-0403

Mr. Frank Richards
Richards Energy Group
3901 Nolt Road, Building # 1
Landisville, PA 17538

Date: August 30, 2007



David B. MacGregor

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
P.O. BOX 3265, HARRISBURG, PA 17105-3265

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE

August 31, 2007

RE: **R-00072155, et al.**

Your Complaint in PPL Rate Case;
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation

TO: Andrew T. Bosak, Daniel D. Graham, Stephanie Crayton,
Judith A. Lewis-Walton, Margaret Gay, Deb Eastman,
Frank Tokarz, Gregory B. Clemens, William J. Vigilante Jr.,
Richard and Eleanor Cobb, Denise M. Sater, James Hronich,
Fred Charles, Joseph McAndrew, Lillian Falcone,
Joseph Nabogis, and Michael Ochs

Dear Sir or Ms.:

Attached please find a copy of the Joint Petition for Settlement which was entered into by the litigating parties to the above-captioned case. Those parties include the Commission's Office of Trial Staff, Office of Consumer Advocate, Office of Small Business Advocate, PP&L Industrial Customer Alliance, Richards Energy Group, Inc., Department of Defense and Federal Executive Agencies, Sustainable Energy Fund, City of Scranton, Commission on Economic Opportunity, Eric Epstein, and PPL.

Because you filed a Formal Complaint or Protest in this case, you now have the following options:

- If you agree with the proposed Settlement, you may join in the Settlement. Please sign and return the Signature Page (enclosed with this letter) on or before September 11, 2007. Signing the Signature Page means that you agree to have your Formal Complaint or Protest discontinued if this Settlement is approved.
- If you decide not to join in the Settlement, and would like to submit a comment, you may submit written comments on or before September 11, 2007.
- If you decide not to join in the Settlement and have no comment, you may do nothing.

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

1 of 3

KJR

DOCKETED
SEP 7 2007

- If you want to object to the Settlement, you may submit written objections by September 11, 2007.


If you have any comments, objections or wish to join the Settlement, you must submit your response to me on or before September 11, 2007: Administrative Law Judge Susan D. Colwell, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, P.O. Box 3265, Harrisburg PA 17105-3265.

I will review the Joint Petition for Settlement and any comments that I receive and will prepare and issue a Recommended Decision which will recommend to the Commission one of the following: (1) approval, (2) disapproval, or (3) amendment of the Joint Petition for Settlement to the Commission.

After the Recommended Decision is issued, you may file exceptions to the Recommended Decision, if you disagree with it and you submitted objections to the Joint Petition for Settlement. You may not file exceptions if you have signed the Signature Page indicating your agreement with the Settlement, and the Recommended Decision recommends approval of the Settlement without modification. You are advised that failure to file timely objections to the Joint Petition for Settlement will result in waiver of your right to have your exceptions considered by the Commission.

Please carefully review the enclosed materials. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the attorneys for the Office of Consumer Advocate, Aron J. Beatty and Darlene R. Wong at (717) 783-5048 or toll-free at (800) 684-6560. Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Very truly yours,



Susan D. Colwell
Administrative Law Judge

Enclosure

cc: Letter to all parties of Record
Joint Petition and letter to:
Andrew T. Bosak, Daniel D. Graham, Stephanie Crayton,
Judith A. Lewis-Walton, Margaret Gay, Deb Eastman
Frank Tokarz, Gregory B. Clemens, William J. Vigilante Jr.
Richard and Eleanor Cobb, Denise M. Sater, James Hronich
Fred Charles, Joseph McAndrew, Lillian Falcone
Joseph Nabogis, and Michael Ochs

SIGNATURE PAGE

Please sign this sheet if you would like to join in the Joint Petition for Settlement signed by all active parties including PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, the Commission's Office of Trial Staff, and the Office of Consumer Advocate in the case of Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, Docket Nos. R-00072155, et al.

By adding my signature below, I am indicating that I have read the terms of the Settlement Agreement and wish to join in it. I am willing to allow the terms of the Settlement to resolve my Formal Complaint or Protest in this matter if the Public Utility Commission approves the Settlement without modification.

Please Print Your Full Name

Please Sign Your Full Name

Date: _____

Please Write Your Address Here:

**Docket Number of Your Complaint
If Known (e.g., C-0001):**

September 6, 2007

Administrative Law Judge Susan D. Colwell,
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

RE: R-00072155

Dear Judge Colwell,

I disagree with the Proposed Settlement.

I don't feel that PPL Corporation is run and managed in a cost effective and prudent manner. It is becoming a habit for utility companies to submit one appeal after another for increases, at the expense of customers, to cover bad business practices, company profits, and stock increases.

Basic life necessities should not be provided by private corporations.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns.

Respectfully,

Lillian Falcone

Lillian Falcone
1367 Kodiak Terrace
Tobyhanna, PA 18466

RECEIVED

SEP 11 2007

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

**DOCUMENT
FOLDER**

DOCKETED
NOV 06 2007

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF C.A.L.L.J.
07 SEP 10 AM 9:37
PA PUC

3A

JOSEPH E. MCANDREW M.ED
CUSTOMER

Joseph E. McAndrew
85 W. Chestnut St.
Macungie, Pa 18062
Phone 610 966-4537
Jems2@enter.net

Administrative Law Office
Susan D. Colwell
Puc
PO Box 3265
Harrisburg, Pa 17105-3265

RECEIVED

SEP 11 2007

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

RE: PA Public Utility Commission V.PPL Electric Utilities Corporation Docket No. R- 00072155

Dear Judge Colwell,

I disagree with the proposed settlement. The Joint Petitioners have won, they have their rates decreased.
The residential customers have lost, they have their rates increased.

My docket No. R 00073155

Thank You,

Joseph Mc Andrew
Joseph Mc Andrew

September 4, 2007

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

DOCKETED
NOV 06 2007

BA

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF CALL J.
PA PUC
07 SEP 10 AM 9:37



ORIGINAL

McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
attorneys at law

VASILIKI KARANDRIKAS
DIRECT DIAL: (717) 237-5274
DIRECT FAX: (717) 260-1707
E-MAIL ADDRESS: VKARANDRIKAS@MWN.COM

September 12, 2007

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

VIA HAND DELIVERY

James J. McNulty, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

**RE: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation;
Docket No. R-00072155, et al.**

Dear Secretary McNulty:

Enclosed please find an original and three (3) copies of an updated Appendix "A" to the Complaint of PP&L Industrial Customer Alliance ("PPLICA") in the above-referenced proceeding. As indicated in Paragraph 1 of PPLICA's Complaint, PPLICA reserved the right to update its membership during the course of the above-referenced proceeding. Accordingly, Appendix "A" contains an updated list of PPLICA member companies for this proceeding, as follows:

- Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.
- Alcoa Inc.
- Binkley & Ober, Inc.
- Cinram Manufacturing, Inc.
- Hercules Cement (BUU)
- High Industries
- Lafarge North America
- Praxair, Inc.
- Rieter Automotive North America, Carpet
- Sanofi Pasteur, Inc.
- The Linde Group, Inc. (BOC Gases)
- Timet, Inc.

SEP 12 2007
10:00 AM
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

As reflected on the attached Certificate of Service, all parties to this proceeding are being duly served with copies of this filing. Please date stamp the extra copy of this transmittal letter and kindly return it to our messenger for our filing purposes. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

McNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC

By 
David M. Kleppinger (I.D. No. 32091)
Pamela C. Polacek (I.D. No. 78276)
Vasiliki Karandrikas (I.D. No. 89711)

Counsel to the PP&L Industrial Customer
Alliance

VK/sds

Enclosure

c: Administrative Law Judge, Susan D. Colwell (via e-mail and hand delivery)
Certificate of Service

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am this day serving a true copy of the foregoing document upon the participants listed below in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code Section 1.54 (relating to service by a participant).

VIA E-MAIL AND FIRST CLASS MAIL

Aron J. Beatty, Esquire
Jennedy E. Santolla, Esquire
Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
Forum Place, 5th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923
abeatty@paoca.org
jsantolla@paoca.org

Kenneth L. Mickens, Esquire
Charles Daniel Shields, Esquire
Office of Trial Staff
PA Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor West
Harrisburg, PA 17120
kmickens@state.pa.us
chshields@state.pa.us

Paul E. Russell, Esquire
PPL Services Corporation
Two North Ninth Street
Allentown, PA 18101-1179
perussell@pplweb.com

Eric Joseph Epstein
4100 Hillsdale Road
Harrisburg, PA 17112
ericepstein@comcast.net

Steven C. Gray, Esquire
Office of Small Business Advocate
Commerce Building
Suite 1102, 300 North 2nd Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
sgray@state.pa.us

David B. MacGregor, Esquire
Post & Schell, P.C.
Four Penn Center
1600 John F. Kennedy Boulevard
Philadelphia, PA 19103
dmacgregor@postschell.com

Michael W. Gang, Esquire
Michael W. Hassell, Esquire
John H. Isom, Esquire
Post & Schell, P.C.
17 North Second Street, 12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601
mgang@postschell.com
mhassell@postschell.com
jisom@postschell.com

Craig A. Doll, Esquire
25 West Second Street
P.O. Box 403
Hummelstown, PA 17036-0403
Cdoll76342@aol.com

Thomas T. Niesen, Esquire
Thomas, Thomas, Armstrong & Niesen
212 Locust Street, Suite 500
P.O. Box 9500
Harrisburg, PA 17108-9500
tniesen@ttanlaw.com

Mr. Frank Richards
Richards Energy Group
3901 Nolt Road, Bldg. #1
Landisville, PA 17538
frichards@richardsenergy.com

2011
SEP 11 11 11 AM '11

Joseph L. Vullo, Esquire
1460 Wyoming Avenue
Forty Fort, PA 18704
jlvullo@bvrrlaw.com

Peter Q. Nyce, General Attorney
The Department of Defense and Federal
Executive Agencies
Regulatory Law Office
U.S. Army Legal Services Agency
Department of the Army (JALS-RL)
901 North Stuart Street, Room 713
Arlington, VA 22203-1837
Peter.nyce@us.army.mil

Anthony E. Gay, Esquire
Exelon Business Services Company
2301 Market Street/S23-1
P.O. Box 8699
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699
Anthony.E.Gay@exeloncorp.com

Mr. Joseph McAndrew
85 W. Chestnut Street
Macungie PA 18062

Mr. Joseph Nabogis
1883 Bald Mountain Rod
Wilkes-Barre, PA 18702

Mr. Michael Ochs
1633 Scott Street
Williamsport, PA 17701-4458

Richard Galligan
Exeter Associates, Inc.
Suite 310
5565 Sterrett Place
Columbia, MD 21044
rgalligan@exeterassociates.com

Stephen J. Baron
J. Kennedy and Associates, Inc.
570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305
Roswell, GA 30075
sbaron@jkenn.com

Mr. Robert D. Knecht
Industrial Economics Incorporated
2067 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02140
rdk@indecon.com

Mr. Kenneth L. Kincl
Decision Analysis Corporation of Virginia
8009 Snowpine Way, Suite 100
McLean, Virginia 22102
kenkincl@aol.com



Vasiliki Karandrikas

Counsel to the PP&L Industrial Customer Alliance

Dated this 12th day of September, 2007, at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

PP&L INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMER ALLIANCE
2007 Distribution Base Rate Proceeding

Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.
Alcoa Inc.
Binkley & Ober, Inc.
Cinram Manufacturing, Inc.
Hercules Cement (BUU)
High Industries
Lafarge North America
Praxair, Inc.
Rieter Automotive North America, Carpet
Sanofi Pasteur, Inc.
The Linde Group, Inc. (BOC Gases)
Timet, Inc.

2007
12/11/06

APPENDIX "A"



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
P.O. BOX 3265, HARRISBURG, PA 17105-3265

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE
**DOCUMENT
FOLDER**

September 12, 2007

TO: All Parties of Record

RE: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation
R-00072155, R-00072155C0001 through C0023

Dear Sir or Ms.:

On August 31, 2007, a copy of the Joint Stipulation for Settlement Of Rate Investigation filed in the above-captioned case was served upon the customer complainants who were not signatories to the Settlement, along with a letter which directed that any objections to the Settlement be submitted on or before September 11, 2007.

Four objections were received. Since there was no indication that these were sent to all parties, enclosed please find a copy of the objections submitted by Lillian Falcone (C0021), Joseph McAndrew (C0019), Stephanie Crayton (C0006), and Michael Ochs (C0023).

This mailing neither requires a response nor confers the right to one. **No further objections or responses to the objections shall be admitted to the record.** However, Joint Petitioners may, if they choose, provide references to discussions of each objection which exist in the record. Such references, if provided, shall be without further advocacy, and shall be filed and served on or before Tuesday, September 18, 2007.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Susan D. Colwell
Administrative Law Judge

Cc: Secretary's Bureau, official file
All parties of record by first-class mail
Counsel for PPL by fax



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Office of Administrative Law Judge
P.O. BOX 3265, HARRISBURG, PA 17105-3265
September 14, 2007

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE

In Re: R-00072155,
R-00072155C0001 thru
R-00072155C0023

(SEE LETTER OF 8-17-07)

DOCUMENT FOLDER

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation

PPL Electric Utilities Corporation filed Supplement No. 54
To Tariff - Electric PA PUC No. 201 proposing a Distribution Only Rate Increase in the
amount of \$83,521,261. or 2.67%.
Number of Customers: 1,382,796. Area Served: Portions of Berks, Bucks, Carbon,
Chester, Clinton, Columbia, Cumberland, Dauphin, Juniata, Lackawanna, Lancaster,
Lebanon, Lehigh, Luzerne, Lycoming, Monroe, Montgomery, Montour, Northampton,
Northumberland, Perry, Pike, Schuylkill, Snyder, Susquehanna, Union, Wayne,
Wyoming & York Counties. Address of Utility:
2 N. Ninth Street, Allentown, PA 18101.

Hearing Notice

This is to inform you that a hearing on the above-captioned case will
be held as follows:

Type: Further Evidentiary Hearing - IN-PERSON

Date: Monday, September 24, 2007

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Location: Hearing Room 2
Plaza Level
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

DOCKETED
SEP 18 2007

RJP

Presiding: Administrative Law Judge Susan D. Colwell
 PO Box 3265
 Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
 Phone: 717.783.5452
 Fax: 717.787.0481

This hearing is for the purpose of providing individual complainants an opportunity to testify and to provide written evidence regarding the Joint Stipulation for Settlement of Rate Investigation which was filed by the Joint Petitioners on August 30, 2007 and sent to the individual complainants on August 31, 2007. No further hearings will be scheduled, and no further comments will be accepted by the Administrative Law Judge regarding the Joint Stipulation for Settlement.

This is a formal hearing, and the participating parties will have the right to cross-examine and to provide rebuttal evidence.

Attention: You may lose the case if you do not come to this hearing and present facts on the issues raised.

If you intend to file exhibits, 2 copies of all hearing exhibits to be presented into evidence must be submitted to the reporter. An additional copy must be furnished to the Presiding Officer. A copy must also be provided to each party of record.

Individuals representing themselves do not need to be represented by an attorney. All others (corporation, partnership, association, trust or governmental agency or subdivision) must be represented by an attorney. An attorney representing you should file a Notice of Appearance before the scheduled hearing date.

If you are a person with a disability, and you wish to attend the hearing, we may be able to make arrangements for your special needs. Please call the scheduling office at the Public Utility Commission at least (2) two business days prior to your hearing:

- Scheduling Office: 717.787.1399
- AT&T Relay Service number for persons who are deaf or hearing-impaired: 1.800.654.5988

pc: Judge Colwell
Ona Lester
Beth Plantz
Docket Section
Calendar File

R-00072155 PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION v. PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION

REVISED ON 8-8-07

KENNETH MICKENS ESQ
CHARLES DANIEL SHIELDS ESQ
PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF TRIAL STAFF
PO BOX 3265
HARRISBURG PA 17101-3265
717.787.4886

DAVID B MACGREGOR ESQUIRE
POST & SCHELL PC
FOUR PENN CENTER
1600 JOHN F KENNEDY BOULEVARD
PHILADELPHIA PA 19103

MICHAEL W GANG ESQUIRE
MICHAEL W HASSELL ESQUIRE
JOHN H ISOM ESQUIRE
POST & SCHELL PC
17 NORTH SECOND ST 12TH FL
HARRISBURG PA 17101-1601

PAUL E RUSSELL ESQUIRE
PPL SERVICES CORPORATION
TWO NORTH NINTH STREET
ALLENTOWN PA 18101-1179

TANYA J MCCLOSKEY ESQ
ARON J BEATTY ESQ
JENNEDY C SANTOLLA ESQ
OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE
555 WALNUT STREET
5TH FLOOR FORUM PLACE
HARRISBURG PA 17101-1923
717.783.5048
C0001

PAMELA C POLACEK ESQUIRE
VASILIKE KARANDRIKAS ESQ
MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK
PO BOX 1166
100 PINE STREET
HARRISBURG PA 17108-1166
(FOR PP&L INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMER ALLIANCE)
C0002

STEVEN C GRAY ESQUIRE
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS ADV
SUITE 1102 COMMERCE BUILDING
300 NORTH SECOND STREET
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.783.2525
C0003

JOSEPH L VULLO ESQUIRE
BURKE VULLO REILLY ROBERTS
1460 WYOMING AVENUE
FORTY FORT PA 18704

CRAIG A DOLL ESQUIRE
25 WEST SECOND STREET
PO BOX 403
HUMMELSTOWN PA 17036-0403
(FOR RICHARDS ENERGY GROUP)

THOMAS T NIESEN ESQUIRE
THOMAS THOMAS ARMSTRONG &
NIESEN
212 LOCUST STREET SUITE 500
PO BOX 9500
HARRISBURG PA 17108-9500
*(FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY FUND
CENTRAL/EAST PA)
*(AND FOR CITY COMPLAINANTS,
INCLUDING CITY OF SCRANTON
C0018)

ANDREW T BOSAK
343 S SECOND STREET
STEELTON PA 17113
C0004

DANIEL D GRAHAM
217 N SECOND STREET
APT B (2RR)
HARRISBURG PA 17113
C0005

STEPHANIE CRAYTON
460 E CENTRAL AVENUE
SOUTH WILLIAMSPORT PA 17702
C0006

JUDITH A LEWIS-WALTON
777 WALNUT STREET
POTTSVILLE PA 17901
C0007

MARGARET GAY
23 W BERGH STREET
PLAINS PA 18705
C0008

ERIC JOSEPH EPSTEIN
4100 HILLSDALE ROAD
HARRISBURG PA 17112
C0009

DEB EASTMAN
418 BLOOM STREET
DANVILLE PA 17821
C0010

FRANK TOKARZ
R D 2
BOX 117
OLYPHANT PA 18447
C0011

GREGORY B CLEMENS
126 EAST 6TH STREET
BERWICK PA 18603
C0012

WILLIAM J VIGILANTE JR
422 W CHARLOTTE STREET
MILLERSVILLE PA 17551
C0013

RICHARD AND ELEANOR COBB
2300 RICKERT ROAD
PERKASIE PA 18944
C0014

DENISE M SATER
16 STRAWBERRY LANE
LITITZ PA 17543
C0015

JAMES HRONICH
305 UNION STREET
TAYLOR PA 18517
C0016

FRED CHARLES
7220 HUNTINGDON STREET
HARRISBURG PA 17111
C0017

JOSEPH MCANDREW
85 W CHESTNUT STREET
MACUNGIE PA 18062
C0019

ANTHONY E GAY ESQUIRE
EXELON BUSINESS SERVICES CO
2301 MARKET STREET/ S23-1
PO BOX 8699
PHILADELPHIA PA 19101-8699
(FOR PECO ENERGY COMPANY)
215.841.4635

PETER Q NYCE JR ESQUIRE
DEPT OF THE ARMY
US ARMY LEGAL SERVICE AGENCY
901 NORTH STUART STREET
ARLINGTON VA 22202-1837
C0020

KENNETH L KINCEL
DECISION ANALYSIS CORP OF VA
8009 SNOWPINE WAY SUITE 100
MCLEAN VA 22102
(DEPT OF DEFENSE CONSULTANT)

LILLIAN FALCONE
1367 KODIAK TERRACE LOT K329
TOBYHANNA PA 18466
C0021

JOSEPH NABOGIS
1883 BALD MOUNTAIN RD
WILKES-BARRE PA 18702
C0022

MICHAEL OCHS
1633 SCOTT STREET
WILLIAMSPORT PA 17701-4458
C0023