QUALIFICATIONS OF

DENNIS W. GOINS

PRESENT POSITION

Economic Consultant, Potomac Management Group, Southport, NC

PREVIOUS POSITIONS

- Vice President, Hagler, Bailly & Company, Washington, DC
- Principal, Resource Consulting Group, Inc., Cambridge, MA
- Senior Associate, Resource Planning Associates, Inc., Cambridge, MA
- Economist, North Carolina Utilities Commission, Raleigh, NC

EDUCATION

College	Major	Degree
Wake Forest University	Economics	BA
North Carolina State University	Economics	ME
North Carolina State University	Economics	PhD

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

Dr. Goins specializes in pricing, planning, and market structure issues affecting firms that buy and sell products in electricity and natural gas markets. He has extensive experience in developing product pricing strategies, setting rates for energy-related products and services, negotiating power supply and natural gas contracts for private and public entities, evaluating competitive market conditions, and analyzing power and fuel requirements, prices, market operations, and transactions. He has participated in more than 200 cases as an expert on cost of service, rate design, competitive market issues, utility restructuring, power market planning and operations, utility mergers, and management prudence before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the General Accounting Office (now the Government Accountability Office), the First Judicial District Court of Montana, the Circuit Court of Kanawha County, West Virginia, the Linn County District Court of Iowa, and regulatory commissions in Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming, and the

.

District of Columbia. He has also prepared an expert report on behalf of the United States regarding electricity pricing and contract issues in a case before the United States Court of Federal Claims.

PARTICIPATION IN REGULATORY, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND COURT PROCEEDINGS

1. Washington Gas Light Company, before the Maryland Public Service Commission, Case No. 9704 (2023), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re cost of service and retail rate design.
2. Washington Gas Light Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1169 (2022), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re cost of service and retail rate design.
3. Washington Gas Light Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1162 (2020), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re cost of service and retail rate design.
4. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1156 (2019), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re cost of service, retail rate design, and alternative forms of regulation.
5. AltaGas Ltd., *et al*., before the Maryland Public Service Commission, Case No. 9449 (2018), on behalf of the Department of Defense and all other Federal Executive Agencies, re Settlement Agreement in merger of AltaGas and WGL Holdings, Inc.
6. AltaGas Ltd., *et al*., before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1142 (2017), on behalf of the Department of Defense and all other Federal Executive Agencies, re merger of AltaGas and WGL Holdings, Inc.
7. Kentucky Utilities, Inc., before the Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2016-00370 (2017), on behalf of the Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, re interruptible rates.
8. Louisville Gas and Electric Company, Inc., before the Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2016-00371 (2017), on behalf of the Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, re interruptible rates.
9. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1139 (2016), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re cost of service and retail rate design.
10. Dominion North Carolina Power, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-22, Sub 532 (2016), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Hertford, re cost of service and retail rate design.

11. Washington Gas Light Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1137 (2016), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re cost of service and retail rate design.
12. Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, before the Maryland Public Service Commission, Case No. 9406 (2016), on behalf of the Department of Defense and all other Federal Executive Agencies, re Baltimore City conduit tax and retail rate design.
13. PECO Energy Company, before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2015-2468981 (2015), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re retail distribution standby electric service.
14. Consolidated Edison of New York, Inc., before the New York Public Service Commission, Case No. 15-E-0050 (2015), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re retail delivery service cost recovery.
15. PJM Interconnection, LLC, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. ER15-623-000 (2015), on behalf of the Department of Defense/Federal Executive Agencies, re RPM market design and capacity performance resources.
16. Ohio Edison *et al*., before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO, (2014), on behalf of Nucor Steel Marion, Inc., re standard service offer and demand response.
17. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1121 (2014), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re infrastructure cost allocation and surcharge design.
18. Consolidated Edison of New York, Inc., *et al*., before the New York Public Service Commission, Case No. 14-M-0101 (2014), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re *Reforming the Energy Vision* issues.
19. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1116 (2014), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re infrastructure cost allocation and surcharge design.
20. Potomac Electric Power Company *et al.*, before the Maryland Public Service Commission, Case No. 9361 (2014), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re Exelon-PHI merger issues.
21. Potomac Electric Power Company *et al*., before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1119 (2014), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re Exelon-PHI merger issues.

22. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1114 *et al*. (2014), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re retail dynamic pricing.
23. Entergy Texas, Inc., before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 41791 (2013), on behalf of Texas Cities, re cost of service and retail rate design.
24. Entergy Gulf States Louisiana, before the Louisiana Public Service Commission, Docket No. U-32707 (2013), on behalf of the Department of Energy, re retail cost recovery.
25. Entergy Texas, Inc., before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 40979 (2013), on behalf of Texas Cities, re analysis of JSP PPA termination.
26. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1103 (2013), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re retail delivery service cost recovery.
27. Consolidated Edison of New York, Inc., before the New York Public Service Commission, Case No. 13-E-0030 (2013), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re retail delivery service cost recovery.
28. Ohio Edison *et al*., before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 11-5201-EL-RDR *et al*., (2013), on behalf of the Ohio Energy Group and Nucor Steel Marion, Inc., re alternative energy rider.
29. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the Maryland Public Service Commission, Case No. 9311 (2013), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re retail cost recovery.
30. Ohio Edison *et al*., before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 12-2190-EL-POR *et al*., (2012), on behalf of the Ohio Energy Group and Nucor Steel Marion, Inc., re energy efficiency and peak demand reduction portfolios.
31. Dominion North Carolina Power, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-22, Sub 485 (2012), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Hertford, re fuel rate adjustment.
32. Kentucky Utilities, Inc., before the Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2012-00221 (2012), on behalf of the Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, re interruptible rates.
33. Louisville Gas and Electric Company, Inc., before the Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2012-00222 (2012), on behalf of the Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, re interruptible rates.

34. Dominion North Carolina Power, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-22, Sub 479 (2012), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Hertford, re cost of service and retail rate design.
35. Kansas City Power & Light Company, before the Missouri Public Service Commission, Case No. ER-2012-0174 (2012), on behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy (Federal Executive Agencies), re cost-of-service and rate design issues.
36. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the Maryland Public Service Commission, Case No. 9286 (2012), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re retail cost recovery.
37. Indiana Michigan Power Company, before the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, Cause No. 44075 (2012), on behalf of Steel Dynamics, Inc., re retail cost-of-service and fuel and purchased power cost recovery.
38. Entergy Texas, Inc., before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 39896 (2012), on behalf of Texas Cities, re cost of service and retail rate design.
39. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1087 (2012), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re retail cost recovery.
40. Dominion North Carolina Power, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-22, Sub 474 (2011), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Hertford, re fuel rate adjustments.
41. Mid-Kansas Electric Company, before the Kansas Corporation Commission, Docket No. 11-GIME-597-GIE (2011), on behalf of Kansas Electric Power Cooperative, Inc., re local delivery service and operating agreements.
42. Duke Energy Corporation *et al*., before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. EC11-60-000 (2011), on behalf of the North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation, re merger-related market power issues.
43. Resale Power Group of Iowa *et al*., before the Linn County District Court of Iowa, Case No. LACV 054271 (2011), on behalf of Central Iowa Power Cooperative, re compensation for unauthorized transmission access.
44. Columbus Southern Power Company *et al*., before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO *et al*., (2011), on behalf of the OMA Energy Group., re standard service offer electric security plan rate design issues.

45. Appalachian Power Company and Wheeling Power Company, dba American Electric Power, before the Public Service Commission of West Virginia, Case No. 11-0274-E-GI (2011), on behalf of Steel of West Virginia, Inc., re expanded net energy cost rate issues.
46. Rocky Mountain Power Company, before the Wyoming Public Service Commission, Docket No. 20000-384-ER-10 (2011), on behalf of Cimarex Energy Company, QEP Field Services Company, and Kinder Morgan Interstate Gas Transmission, re utility rates, cost-of-service, and resource acquisition issues.
47. Duke Energy Indiana, Inc., before the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, Cause No. 43955 (2011), on behalf of Nucor Steel and Steel Dynamics, Inc., re utility-sponsored energy efficiency programs.
48. Kansas City Power & Light Company, before the Missouri Public Service Commission, Case No. ER-2010-0355 (2010), on behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy (Federal Executive Agencies), re cost-of-service and rate design issues.
49. Appalachian Power Company and Wheeling Power Company, dba American Electric Power, before the Public Service Commission of West Virginia, Case No. 10-0699-E-42T (2010), on behalf of Steel of West Virginia, Inc., re cost-of-service and rate design issues.
50. Entergy Arkansas, Inc., before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Docket No. 10-010-U (2010), on behalf of Arkansas Electric Energy Consumers, Inc., re industrial opt out of utility-sponsored energy efficiency programs.
51. Indiana Michigan Power Company, before the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, Cause No. 38702 – FAC 62-S1 (2010), on behalf of Steel Dynamics, Inc., re fuel and purchased power cost recovery.
52. Dominion North Carolina Power, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-22, Sub 459 (2010), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Hertford, re cost of service and retail rate design.
53. Dominion North Carolina Power, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-22, Sub 461 (2010), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Hertford, re fuel rate adjustments.
54. Entergy Texas, Inc., before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 37744 (2010), on behalf of Texas Cities, re cost of service and retail rate design.
55. Kentucky Utilities, Inc., before the Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2009-00548 (2010), on behalf of the Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, re interruptible rates.

56. Louisville Gas and Electric Company, Inc., before the Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2009-00549 (2010), on behalf of the Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, re interruptible rates.
57. Ohio Edison *et al*., before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 09-1948-EL-POR *et al*., (2010), on behalf of Nucor Steel Marion, Inc., re energy efficiency and peak demand reduction portfolios.
58. Kauai Island Utility Cooperative, before the Hawaii Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 2009-0050 (2010), on behalf of Kauai Marriott Resort & Beach Club, re retail cost allocation and rate design issues.
59. Entergy Arkansas, Inc., before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Docket No. 09-024-U (2009), on behalf of Arkansas Electric Energy Consumers, Inc., re power plant environmental retrofit.
60. Appalachian Power Company, before the Virginia State Corporation Commission, Case No. PUE-2009-00030 (2009), on behalf of Steel Dynamics, Inc., re retail cost allocation and rate design issues.
61. Ohio Edison *et al*., before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 09-906-EL-SSO (2009), on behalf of Nucor Steel Marion, Inc., re market rate offer.
62. Dominion North Carolina Power, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-22, Sub 456 (2009), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Hertford, re fuel cost adjustment.
63. Appalachian Power Company, before the Virginia State Corporation Commission, Case No. PUE-2009-00068 (2009), on behalf of Steel Dynamics, Inc., re demand response programs.
64. Indiana Michigan Power Company, before the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, Cause No. 43750 (2009), on behalf of Steel Dynamics, Inc., re wind power purchased power agreement.
65. Entergy Arkansas, Inc., before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Docket No. 07-085-TF (2009), on behalf of Arkansas Electric Energy Consumers, Inc., re energy efficiency cost recovery.
66. CenterPoint Energy Arkansas Gas, before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Docket No. 07-081-TF (2009), on behalf of Arkansas Gas Consumers, Inc., re energy efficiency cost recovery.
67. South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 2009-261-E (2009), on behalf of CMC Steel-SC, re DSM cost recovery surcharge.

68. Duke Energy Indiana, Inc., before the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, Cause No. 38707 FAC81 (2009), on behalf of Steel Dynamics, Inc., re fuel and purchased power cost recovery.
69. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1076 (2009), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re retail cost allocation and standby rate design issues for distributed generation resources.
70. Appalachian Power Company, before the Virginia State Corporation Commission, Case No. PUE-2009-00039 (2009), on behalf of Steel Dynamics, Inc., re environmental and reliability cost recovery.
71. Indiana Michigan Power Company, before the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, Cause No. 38702 – FAC 63 (2009), on behalf of Steel Dynamics, Inc., re fuel and purchased power cost recovery.
72. Appalachian Power Company, before the Virginia State Corporation Commission, Case No. PUE-2009-302-00038 (2009), on behalf of Steel Dynamics, Inc., re fuel and purchased power cost recovery.
73. South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 2008-302-E (2008), on behalf of CMC Steel-SC, re fuel and purchased power cost recovery.
74. South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 2008-196-E (2008), on behalf of CMC Steel-SC, re base load review order for a nuclear facility.
75. Ohio Edison *et al*., before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 08-935-EL-SSO *et al*. (2008), on behalf of Nucor Steel Marion, Inc., re standard service offer via an electric security plan.
76. Ohio Edison *et al*., before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 08-936-EL-SSO (2008), on behalf of Nucor Steel Marion, Inc., re market rate offer via a competitive bidding process.
77. Alabama Power Company, before the Alabama Public Service Commission, Docket No. 18148 (2008), on behalf of CMC Steel Alabama, Nucor Steel Birmingham, Inc., and Nucor Steel Tuscaloosa, Inc., re energy cost recovery.
78. Entergy Texas, Inc., before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 35269 (2008), on behalf of Texas Cities, re jurisdictional allocation of system agreement payments.
79. Duke Energy Indiana, Inc., before the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, Cause No. 43374 (2008), on behalf of Nucor Steel and Steel Dynamics, Inc., re alternative regulatory plan.

80. Entergy Gulf States Inc., before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 34800 (2008), on behalf of Texas Cities, re affiliate transactions.

81. Commonwealth Edison Company, before the Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 07-0566 (2008), on behalf of Nucor Steel Kankakee, Inc., re cost-of-service and rate design issues.

82. Ohio Edison *et al*., before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 07-0551-EL-AIR *et al*. (2008), on behalf of Nucor Steel Marion, Inc., re cost-of-service and rate design issues.

83. Appalachian Power Company dba American Electric Power, before the Public Service Commission of West Virginia, Case No. 06-0033-E-CN (2007), on behalf of Steel of West Virginia, Inc., re power plant cost recovery mechanism.

84. Oncor Electric Delivery Company and Texas Energy Future Holdings Limited Partnership, before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 34077 (2007), on behalf of Nucor Steel - Texas, re acquisition of TXU Corp. by Texas Energy Future Holdings Limited Partnership.

85. Arkansas Oklahoma Gas Company, before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Docket No. 07-026-U (2007), on behalf of West Central Arkansas Gas Consumers, re gas cost-of-service and rate design issues.

86. Idaho Power Company, before the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, Case No. IPC-E-07-08 (2007), on behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy (Federal Executive Agencies), re cost-of-service and rate design issues.

87. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1056 (2007), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re demand-side management and advanced metering programs.

88. South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 2007-229-E (2007), on behalf of CMC Steel-SC, re cost-of-service and rate design issues.

89. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the Maryland Public Service Commission, Case No. 9092 (2007), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re retail cost allocation and standby rate design issues for distributed generation resources.

90. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1053 (2007), on behalf of the General Services Administration, re retail cost allocation and standby rate design issues for distributed generation resources.

91. Entergy Gulf States Inc., before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 32907 (2006), on behalf of Texas Cities, re hurricane cost recovery.
92. Entergy Gulf States Inc., before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 32710/ SOAH Docket No. 473-06-2307 (2006), on behalf of Texas Cities, re reconciliation of fuel and purchased power costs.
93. Florida Power & Light Company, before the Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 060001-EI (2006), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force (Federal Executive Agencies), re fuel and purchased power cost recovery.
94. Arizona Public Service Company, before the Arizona Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01345A-05-0816 (2006), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force (Federal Executive Agencies), re retail cost allocation and rate design issues.
95. PacifiCorp (dba Rocky Mountain Power), before the Utah Public Service Commission, Docket No. 06-035-21 (2006), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force (Federal Executive Agencies), re rate design issues.
96. South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 2006-2-E (2006), on behalf of CMC Steel-SC, re fuel and purchased power cost recovery.
97. Entergy Gulf States Inc., before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 31544/ SOAH Docket No. 473-06-0092 (2006), on behalf of Texas Cities, re transition to competition rider.
98. Idaho Power Company, before the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, Case No. IPC-E-05-28 (2006), on behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy (Federal Executive Agencies), re cost-of-service and rate design issues.
99. Alabama Power Company, before the Alabama Public Service Commission, Docket No. 18148 (2005), on behalf of SMI Steel-Alabama, re energy cost recovery.
100. Florida Power & Light Company, before the Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 050001-EI (2005), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force (Federal Executive Agencies), re fuel and capacity cost recovery.
101. Entergy Gulf States Inc., before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 31315/ SOAH Docket No. 473-05-8446 (2005), on behalf of Texas Cities, re incremental purchased capacity cost rider.
102. Florida Power & Light Company, before the Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 050045-EI (2005), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force (Federal Executive Agencies), re cost-of-service and interruptible rate issues.

103. Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation, before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Docket No. 05-042-U (2005), on behalf of Nucor Steel and Nucor-Yamato Steel, re power plant purchase.

104. Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation, before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Docket No. 04-141-U (2005), on behalf of Nucor Steel and Nucor-Yamato Steel, re cost-of-service and rate design issues.

105. Dominion North Carolina Power, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-22, Sub 412 (2005), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Hertford, re cost-of-service and interruptible rate issues.

106. Public Service Company of Colorado, before the Colorado Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 04S-164E (2004), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force (Federal Executive Agencies), re cost-of-service and interruptible rate issues.

107. CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC, *et al*., before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 29526 (2004), on behalf of the Coalition of Commercial Ratepayers, re stranded cost true-up balances.

108. PacifiCorp, before the Utah Public Service Commission, Docket No. 04-035-11 (2004), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force (United States Executive Agencies), re time-of-day rate design issues.

109. Arizona Public Service Company, before the Arizona Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01345A-03-0347 (2004), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force (Federal Executive Agencies), re retail cost allocation and rate design issues.

110. Idaho Power Company, before the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, Case No. IPC-E-03-13 (2004), on behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy (Federal Executive Agencies), re retail cost allocation and rate design issues.

111. PacifiCorp, before the Utah Public Service Commission, Docket No. 03-2035-02 (2004), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force (United States Executive Agencies), re retail cost allocation and rate design issues.

112. Dominion Virginia Power, before the Virginia State Corporation Commission, Case No. PUE-2000-00285 (2003), on behalf of Chaparral (Virginia) Inc., re recovery of fuel costs.

113. Jersey Central Power & Light Company, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, BPU Docket No. ER02080506, OAL Docket No. PUC-7894-02 (2002-2003), on behalf of New Jersey Commercial Users, re retail cost allocation and rate design issues.

114. Public Service Electric and Gas Company, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, BPU Docket No. ER02050303, OAL Docket No. PUC-5744-02 (2002-2003), on behalf of New Jersey Commercial Users, re retail cost allocation and rate design issues.

115. South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 2002-223-E (2002), on behalf of SMI Steel-SC, re retail cost allocation and rate design issues.

116. Montana Power Company, before the First Judicial District Court of Montana, *Great Falls Tribune et al. v. the Montana Public Service Commission*, Cause No. CDV2001-208 (2002), on behalf of a media consortium (*Great Falls Tribun*e, *Billings Gazett*e, *Montana Standar*d, *Helena Independent Recor*d, *Missoulia*n, Big Sky Publishing, Inc. dba *Bozeman Daily Chronicl*e, the Montana Newspaper Association, *Miles City Sta*r, *Livingston Enterpris*e, Yellowstone Public Radio, the Associated Press, Inc., and the Montana Broadcasters Association), re public disclosure of allegedly proprietary contract information.

117. Louisville Gas & Electric *et al*., before the Kentucky Public Service Commission, Administrative Case No. 387 (2001), on behalf of Gallatin Steel Company, re adequacy of generation and transmission capacity in Kentucky.

118. PacifiCorp, before the Utah Public Service Commission, Docket No. 01-035-01 (2001), on behalf of Nucor Steel, re retail cost allocation and rate design issues.

119. TXU Electric Company, before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 23640/ SOAH Docket No. 473-01-1922 (2001), on behalf of Nucor Steel, re fuel cost recovery.

120. FPL Group *et al*., before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. EC01-33-000 (2001), on behalf of Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation, Inc., re merger-related market power issues.

121. Entergy Mississippi, Inc., *et al*., before the Mississippi Public Service Commission, Docket No. 2000-UA-925 (2001), on behalf of Birmingham Steel-Mississippi, re appropriate regulatory conditions for merger approval.

122. TXU Electric Company, before the Public Utilities Commission of Texas, PUC Docket No. 22350/ SOAH Docket No. 473-00-1015 (2000), on behalf of Nucor Steel, re unbundled cost of service and rates.

123. PacifiCorp, before the Utah Public Service Commission, Docket No. 99-035-10 (2000), on behalf of Nucor Steel, re using system benefit charges to fund demand-side resource investments.

124. Entergy Arkansas, Inc. *et al*., before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Docket No. 00-190-U (2000), on behalf of Nucor-Yamato Steel and Nucor Steel-Arkansas, re the development of competitive electric power markets in Arkansas.

125. Entergy Arkansas, Inc. *et al*., before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Docket No. 00-048-R (2000), on behalf of Nucor-Yamato Steel and Nucor Steel-Arkansas, re generic filing requirements and guidelines for market power analyses.

126. ScottishPower and PacifiCorp, before the Utah Public Service Commission, Docket No. 98-2035-04 (1999), on behalf of Nucor Steel, re merger conditions to protect the public interest.

127. Dominion Resources, Inc. and Consolidated Natural Gas Company, before the Virginia State Corporation Commission, Case No. PUA990020 (1999), on behalf of the City of Richmond, re market power and merger conditions to protect the public interest.

128. Houston Lighting & Power Company, before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket No. 18465 (1998) on behalf of the Texas Commercial Customers, re excess earnings and stranded-cost recovery and mitigation.

129. PJM Interconnection, LLC, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. ER98-1384 (1998) on behalf of Wellsboro Electric Company, re pricing low-voltage distribution services.

130. DQE, Inc. and Allegheny Power System, Inc., before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket Nos. ER97-4050-000, ER97-4051-000, and EC97-46-000 (1997) on behalf of the Borough of Chambersburg, re market power in relevant markets.

131. GPU Energy, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. EO97070458 (1997) on behalf of the New Jersey Commercial Users Group, re unbundled retail rates.

132. GPU Energy, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. EO97070459 (1997) on behalf of the New Jersey Commercial Users Group, re stranded costs.

133. Public Service Electric and Gas Company, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. EO97070461 (1997) on behalf of the New Jersey Commercial Users Group, re unbundled retail rates.

134. Public Service Electric and Gas Company, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. EO97070462 (1997) on behalf of the New Jersey Commercial Users Group, re stranded costs.

135. DQE, Inc. and Allegheny Power System, Inc., before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket Nos. ER97-4050-000, ER97-4051-000, and EC97-46-000 (1997) on behalf of the Borough of Chambersburg, Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc., and Selected Municipalities, re market power in relevant markets.

136. CSW Power Marketing, Inc., before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No.ER97-1238-000 (1997) on behalf of the Transmission Dependent Utility Systems, re market power in relevant markets.

137. Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation *et al*., before the New York Public Service Commission, Case Nos. 96-E-0891, 96-E-0897, 96-E-0898, 96-E-0900, 96-E-0909 (1997), on behalf of the Retail Council of New York, re stranded-cost recovery.

138. Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation, supplemental testimony, before the New York Public Service Commission, Case No. 96-E-0909 (1997) on behalf of the Retail Council of New York, re stranded-cost recovery.

139. Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., supplemental testimony, before the New York Public Service Commission, Case No. 96-E-0897 (1997) on behalf of the Retail Council of New York, re stranded-cost recovery.

140. New York State Electric & Gas Corporation, supplemental testimony, before the New York Public Service Commission, Case No. 96-E-0891 (1997) on behalf of the Retail Council of New York, re stranded-cost recovery.

141. Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation, supplemental testimony, before the New York Public Service Commission, Case No. 96-E-0898 (1997) on behalf of the Retail Council of New York, re stranded-cost recovery.

142. Texas Utilities Electric Company, before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket No. 15015 (1996), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Texas, re real-time electricity pricing.

143. Central Power and Light Company, before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket No. 14965 (1996), on behalf of the Texas Retailers Association, re cost of service and rate design.

144. Carolina Power & Light Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 95-1076-E (1996), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Darlington, re integrated resource planning.

145. Texas Utilities Electric Company, before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket No. 13575 (1995), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Texas, re integrated resource planning, DSM options, and real-time pricing.

146. Arkansas Power & Light Company, *et al*., Notice of Inquiry to Consider Section 111 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Docket No. 94-342-U (1995), Initial Comments on behalf of Nucor-Yamato Steel Company, re integrated resource planning standards.

147. Arkansas Power & Light Company, *et al*., Notice of Inquiry to Consider Section 111 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Docket No. 94-342-U (1995), Reply Comments on behalf of Nucor-Yamato Steel Company, re integrated resource planning standards.

148. Arkansas Power & Light Company, *et al*., Notice of Inquiry to Consider Section 111 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Docket No. 94-342-U (1995), Final Comments on behalf of Nucor-Yamato Steel Company, re integrated resource planning standards.

149. South Carolina Pipeline Corporation, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 94-202-G (1995), on behalf of Nucor Steel, re integrated resource planning and rate caps.

150. Gulf States Utilities Company, before the United States Court of Federal Claims, *Gulf States Utilities Company v. the United States*, Docket No. 91-1118C (1994, 1995), on behalf of the United States, re electricity rate and contract dispute litigation.

151. American Electric Power Corporation, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. ER93-540-000 (1994), on behalf of DC Tie, Inc., re costing and pricing electricity transmission services.

152. Texas Utilities Electric Company, before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket No. 13100 (1994), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Texas, re real-time electricity pricing.

153. Carolina Power & Light Company, *et al*., Proposed Regulation Governing the Recovery of Fuel Costs by Electric Utilities, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 93-238-E (1994), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Darlington, re fuel-cost recovery.

154. Southern Natural Gas Company, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. RP93-15-000 (1993-1995), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Darlington, re costing and pricing natural gas transportation services.

155. West Penn Power Company, *et al*., v. State Tax Department of West Virginia, *et al*., Civil Action No. 89-C-3056 (1993), before the Circuit Court of Kanawha County, West Virginia, on behalf of the West Virginia Department of Tax and Revenue, re electricity generation tax.

156. Carolina Power & Light Company, *et al*., Proceeding Regarding Consideration of Certain Standards Pertaining to Wholesale Power Purchases Pursuant to Section 712 of the 1992 Energy Policy Act, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 92-231-E (1993), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Darlington, re Section 712 regulations.

157. Mountain Fuel Supply Company, before the Public Service Commission of Utah, Docket No. 93-057-01 (1993), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Utah, re costing and pricing retail natural gas firm, interruptible, and transportation services.

158. Texas Utilities Electric Company, before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket No. 11735 (1993), on behalf of the Texas Retailers Association, re retail cost-of-service and rate design.

159. Virginia Electric and Power Company, before the Virginia State Corporation Commission, Case No. PUE920041 (1993), on behalf of Philip Morris USA, re cost of service and retail rate design.

160. Carolina Power & Light Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 92-209-E (1992), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Darlington.

161. Gulf States Utilities Company, before the Louisiana Public Service Commission, Docket No. U-17282, Rate Design (1992), on behalf of the Department of Energy, Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

162. Georgia Power Company, before the Georgia Public Service Commission, Docket Nos. 4091-U and 4146-U (1992), on behalf of Amicalola Electric Membership Corporation.

163. PacifiCorp, Inc., before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. EC88-2-007 (1992), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Utah.

164. South Carolina Pipeline Corporation, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 90-452-G (1991), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Darlington.

165. Carolina Power & Light Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 91-4-E, 1991 Fall Hearing, on behalf of Nucor Steel-Darlington.

166. Sonat, Inc., and North Carolina Natural Gas Corporation, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. G-21, Sub 291 (1991), on behalf of Nucor Corporation, Inc.

167. Northern States Power Company, before the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. E002/GR-91-001 (1991), on behalf of North Star Steel-Minnesota.

168. Gulf States Utilities Company, before the Louisiana Public Service Commission, Docket No. U-17282, Phase IV-Rate Design (1991), on behalf of the Department of Energy, Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

169. Houston Lighting & Power Company, before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket No. 9850 (1990), on behalf of the Department of Energy, Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

170. General Services Administration, before the United States General Accounting Office, Contract Award Protest (1990), Solicitation No. GS-00P-AC87-91, Contract No. GS-00D-89-B5D-0032, on behalf of Satilla Rural Electric Membership Corporation, re cost of service and rate design.

171. Carolina Power & Light Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 90-4-E (1990 Fall Hearing), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Darlington, re fuel-cost recovery.

172. Gulf States Utilities Company, before the Louisiana Public Service Commission, Docket No. U-17282, Phase III-Rate Design (1990), on behalf of the Department of Energy, Strategic Petroleum Reserve, re cost of service and rate design.

173. Atlanta Gas Light Company, before the Georgia Public Service Commission, Docket No. 3923-U (1990), on behalf of Herbert G. Burris and Oglethorpe Power Corporation, re anticompetitive pricing schemes.

174. Ohio Edison Company, before the Ohio Public Utilities Commission, Case No. 89-1001-EL-AIR (1990), on behalf of North Star Steel-Ohio, re cost of service and rate design.

175. Gulf States Utilities Company, before the Louisiana Public Service Commission, Docket No. U-17282, Phase III-Cost of Service/Revenue Spread (1989), on behalf of the Department of Energy, Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

176. Northern States Power Company, before the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. E002/GR-89-865 (1989), on behalf of North Star Steel-Minnesota.

177. Gulf States Utilities Company, before the Louisiana Public Service Commission, Docket No. U-17282, Phase III-Rate Design (1989), on behalf of the Department of Energy, Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

178. Utah Power & Light Company, before the Utah Public Service Commission, Case No. 89-039-10 (1989), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Utah and Vulcraft, a division of Nucor Steel.

179. Soyland Power Cooperative, Inc. v. Central Illinois Public Service Company, Docket No. EL89-30-000 (1989), before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, on behalf of Soyland Power Cooperative, Inc., re wholesale contract pricing provisions

180. Gulf States Utilities Company, before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket No. 8702 (1989), on behalf of the Department of Energy, Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

181. Houston Lighting and Power Company, before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket No. 8425 (1989), on behalf of the Department of Energy, Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

182. Northern Illinois Gas Company, before the Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 88-0277 (1989), on behalf of the Coalition for Fair and Equitable Transportation, re retail gas transportation rates.

183. Carolina Power & Light Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 79-7-E, 1988 Fall Hearing, on behalf of Nucor Steel-Darlington, re fuel-cost recovery.

184. Potomac Electric Power Company, before the District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 869 (1988), on behalf of Peoples Drug Stores, Inc., re cost of service and rate design.

185. Carolina Power & Light Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 88-11-E (1988), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Darlington.

186. Northern States Power Company, before the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-002/GR-87-670 (1988), on behalf of the Metalcasters of Minnesota.

187. Ohio Edison Company, before the Ohio Public Utilities Commission, Case No. 87-689-EL-AIR (1987), on behalf of North Star Steel-Ohio.

188. Carolina Power & Light Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 87-7-E (1987), on behalf of Nucor Steel-Darlington.

189. Gulf States Utilities Company, before the Louisiana Public Service Commission, Docket No. U-17282, Phase I (1987), on behalf of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

190. Gulf States Utilities Company, before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket No. 7195 (1987), on behalf of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

191. Gulf States Utilities Company, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. ER86-558-006 (1987), on behalf of Sam Rayburn G&T Cooperative.

192. Utah Power & Light Company, before the Utah Public Service Commission, Case No. 85-035-06 (1986), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force.

193. Houston Lighting & Power Company, before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket No. 6765 (1986), on behalf of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

194. Central Maine Power Company, before the Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 85-212 (1986), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force.

195. Gulf States Utilities Company, before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket Nos. 6477 and 6525 (1985), on behalf of North Star Steel-Texas.

196. Ohio Edison Company, before the Ohio Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 84-1359-EL-AIR (1985), on behalf of North Star Steel-Ohio.

197. Utah Power & Light Company, before the Utah Public Service Commission, Case No. 84-035-01 (1985), on behalf of the U.S. Air Force.

198. Central Vermont Public Service Corporation, before the Vermont Public Service Board, Docket No. 4782 (1984), on behalf of Central Vermont Public Service Corporation.

199. Gulf States Utilities Company, before the Louisiana Public Service Commission, Docket No. U-15641 (1983), on behalf of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

200. Southwestern Power Administration, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Rate Order SWPA-9 (1982), on behalf of the Department of Defense.

201. Public Service Company of Oklahoma, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket Nos. ER82-80-000 and ER82-389-000 (1982), on behalf of the Department of Defense.

202. Central Maine Power Company, before the Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 80-66 (1981), on behalf of the Commission Staff.

203. Bangor Hydro-Electric Company, before the Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 80-108 (1981), on behalf of the Commission Staff.

204. Oklahoma Gas & Electric, before the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Docket No. 27275 (1981), on behalf of the Commission Staff.

205. Green Mountain Power, before the Vermont Public Service Board, Docket No. 4418 (1980), on behalf of the PSB Staff.

206. Williams Pipe Line, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. OR79-1 (1979), on behalf of Mapco, Inc.

207. Boston Edison Company, before the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities, Docket No. 19494 (1978), on behalf of Boston Edison Company.

208. Duke Power Company, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-7, Sub 173, on behalf of the Commission Staff.

209. Duke Power Company, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-100, Sub 32, on behalf of the Commission Staff.

210. Virginia Electric & Power Company, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-22, Sub 203, on behalf of the Commission Staff.

211. Virginia Electric & Power Company, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-22, Sub 170, on behalf of the Commission Staff.

212. Southern Bell Telephone Company, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. P-5, Sub 48, on behalf of the Commission Staff.

213. Western Carolina Telephone Company, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. P-58, Sub 93, on behalf of the Commission Staff.

214. Natural Gas Ratemaking, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. G-100, Sub 29, on behalf of the Commission Staff.

215. General Telephone Company of the Southeast, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. P-19, Sub 163, on behalf of the Commission Staff.

216. Carolina Power and Light Company, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-2, Sub 264, on behalf of the Commission Staff.

217. Carolina Power and Light Company, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-2, Sub 297, on behalf of the Commission Staff.

218. Duke Power Company, *et al*., Investigation of Peak-Load Pricing, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. E-100, Sub 21, on behalf of the Commission Staff.

219. Investigation of Intrastate Long Distance Rates, before the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. P-100, Sub 45, on behalf of the Commission Staff.