

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission	:	
Office of Consumer Advocate	:	
Office of Small Business Advocate	:	R-2025-3059428
CAUSE-PA	:	C-2026-3060292
	:	C-2026-3060354
v.	:	C-2026-3060437
	:	
National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation	:	

FIRST POST HEARING ORDER

Objection of National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation
to Two Hearing Exhibits of
the Office of Consumer Advocate

Background

On January 28, 2026, National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation (NFGDC) filed Supplement No. 294 to Tariff Gas Pa. P.U.C. No. 9 (Supplement No. 294) at Docket No. R-2025-3059428, with an effective date of March 29, 2026. NFGDC proposed to increase overall rates by approximately \$19.7 million per year, or 7.4%, over present revenues. NFGDC's proposal, if approved, would increase the average residential customer's bill using 80 ccf per month from \$83.49 to \$88.44, or by approximately 5.9%. NFGDC also proposed to reinstate a tariff rider that would provide a refund of Other-Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) funds of approximately \$6.2 million to all customers and provide a one-time bill credit of \$30, totaling approximately \$1.025 million, to confirmed Level 1 and Level 2 customers and Customer Assistance Program (CAP) customers.

Supplement No. 294 includes a request seeking approval of two alternative rate mechanisms: permanent approval of the Weather Normalization Adjustment and approval of the Energy Efficiency pilot program.

On February 19, 2026, the Commission suspended the implementation of Supplement No. 294 by operation of law, pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 1308(d), until October 29, 2026, unless permitted by Commission Order to become effective at an earlier date, and instituted an investigation into the lawfulness, justness, and reasonableness of the rates, rules, and regulations proposed in Supplement No. 294.

Also, on February 19, 2026, the Office of Administrative Law Judge (OALJ) scheduled a prehearing conference to be conducted telephonically on February 26, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. Also, on February 26, 2026, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ or presiding officer) issued the Prehearing Conference Order which provided procedural information for the prehearing conference.

On February 26, 2026, the presiding officer conducted a call-in telephonic prehearing conference with the following parties present and represented by counsel: National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation (NFGDC), the Commission's Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (BIE), the Office of Small Business Advocate (OSBA), the Office of Consumer Advocate (OCA), Pennsylvania Weatherization Providers Task Force (Providers Task Force) and the Coalition for Affordable Utility Services and Energy Efficiency in Pennsylvania (CAUSE-PA). The parties addressed various matters including the litigation schedule and identifying the location, method, dates and times for in-person and telephonic public input hearings.

On February 27, 2026, the presiding officer issued the Prehearing Order which memorialized discussions with the parties at the Prehearing Conference, including establishing the litigation schedule, specifying procedural rules to include discovery, motions, resolving disputes, response times, and the scheduling of public input hearings.

On March 11, 2026, the OALJ issued the In-Person Public Input Hearing Notice, which outlined the date, time and location for two (2) in-person public input hearings to be conducted by the presiding officer in Erie, Pennsylvania, at 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on March 31, 2026. Also, on March 11, 2026, the OALJ scheduled telephonic public input hearings to be conducted at 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on April 2, 2026.

On March 16, 2026, OALJ issued the In-Person Evidentiary Hearings Notice which scheduled three days of in-person hearings on June 2, 2026, through June 4, 2026, in the Keystone Building, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

On March 17, 2026, the presiding officer issued the First Interim Order which provided the parties with requirements and guidance concerning the conduct of the public input hearings.

On March 30, 2026, the Company submitted a Motion for Protective Order, pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 5.423(a), which was granted on April 23, 2026.

On March 31, 2026, at 1:00 p.m., the presiding officer conducted an in-person public input hearing at the Bayfront Convention Center, Erie, Pennsylvania, at which two witnesses testified. The presiding officer conducted a second in-person public input hearing at 6:00 p.m. on March 31, 2026, at which no individual appeared to testify.

On April 2, 2026, the Company filed proof of the publications concerning the public input hearings.

Also, on April 2, 2026, at 1:00 p.m., the presiding officer conducted a telephonic public input hearing at which two witnesses testified. The presiding officer conducted a second telephonic public input hearing at 6:00 p.m. on April 2, 2026, at which no individuals appeared to testify.

On May 22, 2026, the OALJ issued a Corrected In-Person Evidentiary Hearing Notice which indicated the start time on June 1, 2026, was 1:30 p.m. instead of 9:00 a.m.

On June 2, 2026, the presiding officer conducted the in-person evidentiary hearing in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, at which the following parties appeared: NFG, BIE, OCA, OSBA, CAUSE-PA and the Providers Task Force.

On June 3, 2026, NFG filed the Objections of National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation to the Admission of the Office of Consumer Advocate's Exhibits MWD-10 and MWD-11 (NFG Objections).

On June 10, 2026, OCA filed the Answer of the Office of Consumer Advocate to the Objections of National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation to the Admission of the Office of Consumer Advocate's Exhibits MWD-10 and MWD-11 (OCA Answer to Objections).

NFG Objections

In the NFG Objections, NFG argued there were four reasons why the two exhibits should be excluded from the hearing record. First, NFG contended the two OCA exhibits were hearsay. Second, NFG contended the two OCA exhibits were irrelevant. Third, NFG argued that OCA Exhibit MWD-10 should be excluded because any probative value the exhibit might have was outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion of the issues. Fourth, NFG argued portions of OCA St. 1-SR (Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael Deupree) should be stricken because the testimony therein relied on OCA Exhibits MWD-10 and MWD-11. Lastly, NFG requested the presiding officer exercise discretion and make a determination that these exhibits and testimony be provided little weight in consideration of the objections raised by NFG, if the presiding officer decided not to exclude and/or strike the exhibits and related testimony.

NFG asserts OCA Exhibits MWD-10 and MWD-11 consist of statements Mr. Deupree did not write or create. NFG points out OCA did not call the authors of these exhibits to testify at the hearing and authenticate the statements contained therein. As a result, NFG argues these exhibits are out of court statements being offered for the truth of the matters asserted, i.e., hearsay, and the exhibits do not qualify for any exception to the hearsay rule.¹ In addition, NFG contends OCA Exhibit MWD-11 contains "hearsay within hearsay", because the exhibit, a press release, contains quotes from and/or characterizes the views of additional third parties.

¹ Hearsay is an out-of-court statement offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted. Pa.R.E. 801; *Bonegre v. Workers' Compensation Appeal Board (Bertolini's)*, 863 A.2d 68, 72 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2004). Ordinarily, hearsay evidence is inadmissible unless some exception applies. Pa.R.E. 802. The hearsay rule is somewhat relaxed in proceedings before administrative agencies. *Rox Coal Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeal Bd. (Snizaski)*, 570 Pa. 60, 807 A.2d 906 (2002).

NFG acknowledges that there is an exception to the hearsay rule applicable when an expert may express an opinion based on material not in evidence, including other expert opinions, where such material is of a type customarily relied on by experts in his or her profession. *See Lower Makefield Twp. v. Lands of Dalgewicz*, 4 A.3d 1114, 1122 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2010), *affirmed*, 67 A.3d 772 (Pa. 2013); *Collins v. Cooper*, 746 A.2d 615, 618 (Pa. Super. 2000); *Primavera v. Celotex Corp.*, 608 A.2d 515, 520-21 (Pa. Super. 1992); Pa.R.E. 703.

NFG points out, however, that Mr. Deupree acknowledged he did not rely on either exhibit to form his opinion but introduced these exhibits to corroborate his opinions, as presented in his Direct Testimony.² NFG argues the introduction of these exhibits violates the “anti-conduit” rule, which prohibits using expert testimony as a conduit for the opinions of others who are not available for cross-examination.³ NFG points out that, while Mr. Deupree was made available for cross-examination, the authors of Exhibits MWD-10 and MWD-11 were not made available.

As to relevance, NFG argues the exhibits are irrelevant because: the exhibits make no mention of NFG or the instant proceeding; the exhibits were made/issued three months after the instant proceeding was filed; OCA Exhibit MWD-10 is a statement of policy benchmarks for future rate cases which have not been adopted; OCA Exhibit MWD-11 is another’s utility’s managerial decision to withdraw a requested rate increase; and the two exhibits are unrelated opinions and facts offered by non-parties which do not prove or disprove whether National Fuel’s proposed rates are just and reasonable.

As concerns OCA Exhibit MWD-10, NFG argues OCA Exhibit MWD-10 should be excluded because any probative value the exhibit has is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion of the issues in this case. NFG notes that, pursuant to Section 5.401(b)(2), evidence “will be excluded” if its probative value is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice or confusion of the issues. 52 Pa. Code § 5.401(b)(2)(i) and (ii). NFG argues OCA Exhibit MWD-10 is a letter, not a

² See OCA St. No. 1SR at 2-3 (stating that Exhibits MWD-10 and MWD-11 demonstrate that “prominent figures” appear to agree with the affordability concerns raised in his direct testimony).

³ See *Primavera v. Celotex*, 608 A.2d 515, 521 (Pa. Super. 1992) (“An ‘expert’ should not be permitted simply to repeat another’s opinion or data without bringing to bear on it his own expertise and judgment. Obviously in such a situation, the non-testifying expert is not on the witness stand and truly is unavailable for cross-examination.”).

statement of law, that NFG contends is offered to bind or constrain the independent authority of the Commission to carry out its duties under the Public Utility Code to review and decide National Fuel's proposed rate increase. NFG argues the policy statements laid out in this letter have not been adopted by the Public Utility Commission or the General Assembly or evaluated by any party in the record for this case, including OCA.

NFG contends the exhibit is a letter that introduces new benchmarks for review of three of the litigated issues in this case: the appropriate cost of capital, capital structure, and return on equity. NFG contends that OCA's introduction of these benchmarks into the record now only serves to muddy the water on the appropriate standard of review for these contested issues. NFG concludes OCA Exhibit MWD-10 should be excluded pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.401(b)(2)(i) and (ii) because it introduces new standards of review for litigated issues in this case that have not been adopted by the Public Utility Commission or the General Assembly.

As concerns NFG's assertion that portions of the testimony in Mr. Deupree's Surrebuttal statement that relate to both exhibits should be stricken, NFG argues the following portions of OCA Statement No. 1-SR be stricken: page 2, lines 17-20; page 3, lines 1-14; and page 4, lines 1-3. NFG contends these provisions quote or paraphrase statements made by individuals who are not available for cross-examination. As a result, NFG contends these provisions are inadmissible hearsay (*See, e.g.*, OCA St. No. 1SR, p. 2, lines 17-20 through p. 3, line 1; p. 3, lines 5-13), and are included in the Surrebuttal testimony to corroborate Mr. Deupree's previously formed opinions in violation of the "anti-conduit" rule explained in Paragraph 14, above (*See, e.g.*, OCA St. No. 1SR, p. 3, lines 1-4; p. 4, lines 1-3).

OCA Answer to Objections

OCA argues the presiding officer properly admitted the two exhibits into the record during the hearing because: (1) NFG disregarded directives regarding written testimony as laid out in the Prehearing Order; (2) the two exhibits are not hearsay; (3) the exhibits are relevant; and (4) the probative value of the exhibits is not outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion of the issues. In addition, OCA argues the portions of OCA witness Deupree's Surrebuttal Testimony referencing these

exhibits should not be stricken from the record because the exhibits were properly admitted into the record.

OCA explains the two exhibits NFG now seeks to omit consist of an open letter from Pennsylvania Governor Josh Shapiro, dated April 29, 2026 (marked as OCA Exhibit MWD-10), and a press release by PECO Electric Company, dated April 16, 2026 (marked as OCA Exhibit MWD-11). OCA notes both exhibits discuss affordability of utility service. OCA notes the open letter from Governor Shapiro refers to rising utility bills as drivers of inflation and opines Pennsylvania is at a tipping point where customers must be put first. The open letter tells utilities that the utilities “must seek to procure capital in more affordable ways, conscious of the utility burdens facing many consumers across our Commonwealth.” OCA notes the PECO press release highlights, in a similar manner, the need to “prioritize customer affordability while continuing to deliver safe and reliable service,” noting the sustained financial strain driven by rising costs and the broader economic backdrop. OCA points out that PECO’s press release further discusses customer affordability and the need to focus efforts on driving down energy supply costs.

OCA argues NFG’s objections should be overruled, and the two exhibits (OCA Exhibits MWD-10 and MWD-11) should remain within the hearing record. OCA asserts the objections should be overruled because NFG disregarded the Prehearing Order wherein the presiding officer specified that any motion concerning written testimony must be presented in writing to the presiding officer no later than 24 hours prior to the day a witness is scheduled to testify. OCA notes NFG failed to abide by the ALJ’s pre-hearing directives and that lapse constitutes sufficient reason in and of itself to deny NFG’s objections. OCA points out that NFG received both exhibits nearly one week prior to the evidentiary hearing, which OCA provided to NFG in accordance with the litigation deadlines established in the Prehearing Order dated February 27, 2026.

OCA points out that up until 3:20 p.m. on June 1, 2026, Mr. Deupree was scheduled to testify on June 2, 2026, as the first non-Company witness. However, OCA contends NFG contacted OCA at 3:20 p.m. on June 1, 2026, and informed OCA via a phone call that NFG no longer had cross-examination questions for Mr. Deupree. OCA asserts NFG advised on June 1, 2026 that OCA could seek to admit Mr. Deupree’s testimony into the record via stipulation with cross examination waived.

OCA also asserts NFG did not communicate any oral objection to either the testimony or the attachments to the testimony or Mr. Deupree. Lastly, OCA points out NFG communicated this change to the presiding officer via email on June 1, 2026, at 4:11 pm. While OCA asserts it does not understand why NFG changed its plans regarding Mr. Deupree's testimony and exhibits less than 24 hours prior to the start of the evidentiary hearing, OCA argues that permitting NFG to engage in these actions would be contrary to long-standing Commission practice and would undermine the orderly conduct of Commission proceedings.

OCA also points out NFG's objections should be denied because a cornerstone of evidentiary practice in all administrative agencies in Pennsylvania – Section 505 of the Pennsylvania Rules of Evidence – provides that Commonwealth agencies are not bound by technical rules of evidence at agency hearings, and all relevant evidence of reasonably probative value may be received. 2 Pa. C.S. § 505. Because evidentiary rules are relaxed in administrative proceedings, OCA contends the Commonwealth agencies conducting administrative hearings are not bound by technical rules of evidence and may consider all probative evidence, including hearsay that is not otherwise admissible. *In re: E.A.*, 82 A.3d 370 (Pa. 2013) (*In re: E.A.*).

OCA also contends OCA Exhibits MWD-10 and MWD-11 do not qualify as hearsay statements because they are not offered for the truth of the matter asserted, and the two exhibits are relevant to the instant proceeding because the contents of the exhibits speak to broader affordability concerns which concerns are at issue in the instant proceeding.

In total, OCA asserts the presiding officer should reject NFG's hyper-technical evidentiary arguments made in its written objections that are rarely, if ever, seen in practice before the Commission. OCA contends the presiding officer should deny NFG's objections as untimely and erroneous and should allow for the admission of the Governor's open letter as OCA Exhibit MWD-10 and the PECO press release as OCA Exhibit MWD-11. OCA requests the presiding officer grant both documents the proper weight in determining National Fuel's rate increase request.

Discussion

Overview

On June 2, 2026, the presiding officer conducted the in-person evidentiary hearing in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. On June 1, 2026, the parties informed the presiding officer there would be no cross-examination questions for any witness except for two witnesses - NFG's witness Joshua Nowak and BIE's witness Drew Breuning. Those two witnesses were required to be made available for cross-examination questions. All other witnesses, who pre-served verified written statements and exhibits, were excused from attendance at the in-person evidentiary hearing in reliance on the information received from the parties. One such excused witness was OCA's witness, Michael Deupree (Mr. Deupree). No party indicated to the presiding officer that there would be an objection to the admission of any written statement or exhibit of an excused witness.

Prior to the evidentiary hearing, OCA timely pre-served three written statements of Mr. Deupree and eleven exhibits attached to Mr. Deupree's written statements, including Exhibits 10 and 11. Mr. Deupree was not present to testify on June 2, 2026, having been excused from attendance by the presiding officer because no party indicated an intention to ask Mr. Deupree questions on cross-examination. During the proceeding, OCA listed the pre-served evidence that it sought to admit into the hearing record, including Mr. Deupree's written statements on direct, rebuttal and surrebuttal (OCA St. 1, OCA St. 1-R, OCA St. 1-SR) and Mr. Deupree's exhibits attached to his written statements (MWD Exhibits 1 through 11).

After OCA's recitation of its sponsored evidence, NFG objected to the admission of OCA's Exhibits MWD-10 and MWD-11. (See Transcript of June 2, 2026 Evidentiary Hearing, pp 237 – 242.) NFG objected on the grounds both exhibits were inadmissible hearsay, and the out-of-court declarants were not available to be cross-examined about the statements. In response, OCA asserted NFG had waived the right to object to the admission of the exhibits when NFG waived the opportunity for cross-examination. NFG asserted that it is not fair to assume it stipulated to the admission of the two exhibits when NFG waived cross-examination of Mr. Deupree. OCA requested the presiding officer order NFG to render its objections into writing in the form of a motion.

The presiding officer granted the request of OCA and admitted the two exhibits into the hearing record, along with the remainder of OCA's evidence, but ordered NFG to file a motion within two business days if NFG wanted to pursue the objections. The presiding officer granted OCA time to respond if NFG filed a motion.

When NFG filed its motion on June 3, 2026, NFG contended the basis of its objections included more than the hearsay objection which NFG noted on the record during the evidentiary hearing. For the first time, NFG contended: the two exhibits were irrelevant; any probative value OCA Exhibit MWD-10 (open letter by Governor Shapiro) might have was outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion of the issues;⁴ and portions of OCA St. 1-SR Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael Deupree) should be stricken where the testimony appears to have relied on OCA Exhibits MWD-10 and MWD-11.

Hearsay is defined in Pennsylvania as "an out-of-court statement offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted." *Commonwealth v. Cassidy*, 315 Pa. Super 429, 462 A.2d 270 (1983). Concomitant with this definition has been the assumption that the declarant of the out-of-court statement must have been unavailable to testify. It has long been held in Pennsylvania that statements made by an unavailable declarant. *DelVitto v. Schiavo*, 370 Pa. 299, 87 A.2d 913 (1952); *Rudisill v. Cordes*, 333 Pa. 544, 549 5 A.2d 217, 219 (1939); *Heddings v. Steele*, 514 Pa. 569; 526 A.2d 349 (1987).

Pennsylvania courts do not regard the hearsay rule as a technical rule of evidence, but a basic, vital and fundamental rule of law, which ought to be followed by administrative agencies at those points in their hearings, when facts crucial to an issue are sought to be placed upon the record. *Bleilevens v. Pa. State Civil Service Commission*, 11 Pa. Commonwealth Ct. 1, 312 A.2d 109 (1973).

By statute, administrative agencies which are part of the executive branch of the government are not bound by the hearsay rule. *See* 2 Pa. C.S. §§ 505, 554. However, the PUC follows the *Walker* rule, which provides that hearsay evidence, properly objected to, is not competent evidence

⁴ The presiding officer notes NFG did not express concern about unfair prejudice and confusion of issues outweighing any probative value of OCA Exhibit MWD-11.

to support a finding of the agency. Hearsay evidence admitted without objection, will be given its natural probative effect and may support a finding of the agency if it is corroborated by any competent evidence in the record. A finding of fact based solely on hearsay will not stand. *Walker v. Unemployment Compensation Board of Review*, 367 A.2d 366, 370 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1976); *Anderson v. Pa. Department of Public Welfare*, 468 A.2d 1167 (1983).

The Prehearing Order, issued in this proceeding on February 27, 2026, contains the following direction under “Witness Lists” on page 5: “Motions with respect to written testimony must be presented in writing no later than 24 hours prior to the day the witness is scheduled to testify.”

This evidentiary matter is now ready for disposition, and that disposition can be rendered simply: the objections of OCA to the admission of OCA MWD-10 and MWD-11 are overruled.

Conclusion

NFG’s actions – waiting until June 1, 2026, during an evidentiary hearing, before notifying the presiding officer about an objection to a witness’ testimony – were untimely, pursuant to the Prehearing Order, and will be overruled and dismissed.

Base rate proceedings function under shortened timelines but built into the expedited process are provisions that – if NFG had complied with the Prehearing Order – would have resolved this dispute before the evidentiary hearing began. The Prehearing Order makes clear that any motion relating to a witness must be provided at least 24 hours prior to when that witness is set to testify. Mr. Deupree was set to testify as the first non-Company witness until NFG contacted OCA on June 1, 2026, and notified OCA that NFG had no questions for their witness. It now appears that either NFG was not forthcoming with its concerns on June 1, 2026, or NFG realized at some point in time – between the call to OCA at 3:20 p.m. on June 1, 2026, until halfway through the evidentiary hearing on the afternoon of June 2, 2026, – that it had objections to the two exhibits.

All NFG had to do was to file a written *motion in limine* or other appropriate motion on the morning of June 1, 2026, through which NFG could have informed the presiding officer timely, as

well as timely informing OCA, that NFG had objections to the two exhibits. If NFG had taken that action in response to its concerns – concerns that the Prehearing Order anticipated could arise in a litigious proceeding – then OCA would have been on notice that it had to either make its witness available at the hearing, or it had to pull the two exhibits from off its list of statements and exhibits to be admitted into the hearing record.

NFG's actions at the evidentiary hearing, in addition to its claims in the written objections, were disingenuous, at best. NFG did not notify OCA of its concerns when it discussed evidence and the presence of witnesses with OCA on the afternoon of June 1, 2026. NFG did not notify the presiding officer by written motion prior to the evidentiary hearing or by an oral motion at the start of the hearing. The first communication from NFG that potential problems with the two exhibits might exist was after two other witnesses had been subject to cross-examination questions and after NFG had moved for admission of its own evidence into the record. NFG's actions appeared to be calculated to surprise OCA and the presiding officer with evidentiary objections in such a way as would leave OCA with no option but to withdraw evidence.

In addition, it should be noted NFG chose an unnecessary course of action with two exhibits which have limited evidentiary value. The two exhibits do not speak to any action, decision, proposal or adjustment made by NFG in this proceeding. Both exhibits reference issues common to every current base rate proceeding as well as reflecting some of the difficult dynamics facing all utility companies, utility consumers, governments and regulatory bodies. NFG's objections herein might have appeared to be reasonable if these exhibits had not been received until the afternoon of June 1, 2026, referenced some malfeasance or misappropriation by NFG, or placed NFG in a bad light before the Commission.

In fact, the exhibits have probative value, albeit limited. The exhibits speak to the current regulatory environment and issues present in all current base rate proceedings. Some of the same issues were referenced by the Commissioners in this proceeding when the initial filing was suspended for investigation on February 19, 2026. (See Statement of Vice Chair Kim Barrow, Public Meeting, February 19, 2026).

Accordingly, the two exhibits are admissible and can be considered in the final adjudication of this base rate proceeding. The weight to be accorded the two exhibits is within the purviews of the presiding officer and the Commission. Therefore, having considered the evidentiary record, the applicable law, the arguments of both NFG and OCA, and a full perusal of both exhibits in dispute, the objections of NFG will be overruled and dismissed in the Ordering Paragraphs below.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Objections of National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation to the Admission of the Office of Consumer Advocate's Exhibits MWD-10 and MWD-11 are overruled and dismissed.
2. That OCA Exhibit MWD-10 and OCA Exhibit MWD-11, having been admitted into the hearing during the evidentiary hearing on June 2, 2026, will remain a part of the evidentiary record in this proceeding.

Date: July 15, 2026

/s/
Katrina L. Dunderdale
Administrative Law Judge

**R-2025-3059428 - PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION v. NATIONAL FUEL GAS
DISTRIBUTION CORPORATION**

ANTHONY D. KANAGY ESQUIRE
MEGAN E RULLI ESQUIRE
17 NORTH 2ND STREET, 12TH FLOOR
HARRISBURG PA 17101-1601
717.612.6034
717.612.6012
717.731.1985
717.472.0466

akanagy@postschell.com
mrulli@postschell.com

Served via eService July 15, 2026

SCOTT B. GRANGER ESQUIRE
PA PUC BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION &
ENFORCEMENT
400 NORTH STREET, 2ND FLOOR WEST
HARRISBURG PA 17120
717.425.7593
717.884.1440

sgranger@pa.gov

Served via eService July 15, 2026

REBECCA LYTTLE
NAZAARAH SABREE
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS
ADVOCATE
555 WALNUT STREET, 1ST FLOOR
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.783.2525
717.783.2831

relyttle@pa.gov

ra-sba@pa.gov

Served via Email July 15, 2026

JOSEPH L. VULLO ESQUIRE
BURKE VULLO REILLY ROBERTS
1460 WYOMING AVENUE
FORTY FORT PA 18704
570.288.6441

jlvullo@bvrrlaw.com

Served via eService July 15, 2026

JOEL H. CHESKIS ESQUIRE
RYAN MORDEN ESQUIRE
OLIVIA M. SPERGEL ESQUIRE
HARRISON W. BREITMAN ESQUIRE
JANNA E. WILLIAMS ESQUIRE
CRYSTAL M. ZOOK ESQUIRE
OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE
FORUM PLACE
555 WALNUT STREET, 5TH FLOOR
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.783.5048
717.780.4536

jcheskis@paoca.org

rmorden@paoca.org

ospergel@paoca.org

hbreitman@paoca.org

jwilliams@paoca.org

czook@paoca.org

Served via eService July 15, 2026

JOHN SWEET ESQUIRE
LEVI PHILLIPS ESQUIRE
RIA PEREIRA ESQUIRE
ELIZABETH R. MARX ESQUIRE
LAUREN BERMAN ESQUIRE
PA UTILITY LAW PROJECT
118 LOCUST STREET
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.701.3837
717.710.3825
717.236.9486
jsweet@pautilitylawproject.org
lphillips@pautilitylawproject.org
rpereira@pautilitylawproject.org
emarx@pautilitylawproject.org
lberman@pautilitylawproject.org
Served via eService July 15, 2026