

EXHIBIT-1

Summary of 2009 Actual and Potential Results ¹

Approved Programs	Cleveland Electric		Ohio Edison		Toledo Edison		Program Totals	
	MWh	MW	MWh	MW	MWh	MW	MWh	MW
Direct Load Control	744	4.1	667	3.3	239	1.5	1,650	8.9
Community Connections	471	0.05	404	0.04	189	0.02	1,064	0.11
Interruptible Demand Response ²	0	48	0	66	0	144	0	258.0
Home Energy Analyzer ³	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mercantile Self Direct	6,600	0.5	13,300	0.2	0	0	19,900	0.7
Subtotal Actual Results	7,815	52.7	14,371	69.5	428	145.5	22,614	267.7
Pending Programs								
Transmission & Distribution	1,380	0	4,662	0	1,793	0	7,835	0
Mercantile Self Direct	198,600	19.4	83,900	4.0	37,700	4.8	320,200	28.2
Subtotal Potential Results	199,980	19.4	88,562	4.0	39,493	4.8	328,035	28.2
Total Results	207,795	72.1	102,933	73.5	39,921	150.3	350,649	295.9

Note:

¹ Actual results from approved 2009 Programs; potential results from 2009 applications pending before the Commission.

² The PDR capability associated with the Companies' Interruptible Demand Response program is calculated using the Load Modifying Resource MWs claimed at MISO as capacity through the Module E Tariff provisions of the MISO OATT. Customers who are taking service under the Companies' Economic Load Response Rider are the Load Modifying Resources.

³ This program was approved by the Commission in its September 23, 2009 Order in Case No. 09-580-EL-EEC *et seq.* and implemented in December 2009.

EXHIBIT-2

Comparison of 2009 Results to 2009 Benchmarks

Energy Efficiency Benchmarks and Results (MWh)						Peak Demand Benchmarks and Results (MW)			
Utility	Compliance Benchmark Reported in EE&PDR Plans (2010-2012)	Revised Compliance Benchmark	2009 Benchmark Amended by PUCO	Savings from Approved Programs	Savings from Approved and Pending Programs	Compliance Benchmark Reported in EE&PDR Plans (2010-2012)	Revised Compliance Benchmark	Savings from Approved Programs	Savings from Approved and Pending Programs
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)
CEI	58,162	58,155	0	7,815	207,795	41.6	41.6	52.7	72.1
OE	76,796	76,783	0	14,371	102,933	52.8	52.8	69.5	73.5
TE	31,352	31,349	0	428	39,921	20.1	20.1	145.5	150.3
Total	166,310	166,288	0	22,614	350,649	114.5	114.5	267.7	295.9

Notes:

(A): The derivation of the Companies' updated EE benchmarks is set forth in Exhibit 7.

(B): See Case No. 09-1004-EL-EEC, *et al.*, January 7, 2010 Finding and Order, ¶ 10.

(C): The Companies' actual EE savings reflect savings achieved by the 2009 Programs, including the Approved Mercantile Projects.

(D): The Companies' potential EE savings reflect savings achieved by the 2009 Programs, as well as the projected savings from the 2009 T&D and mercantile applications still pending before the Commission.

(E): The revised benchmarks did not change from those reported in the EE&PDR plan because the change in the Mercantile addbacks times the target percent was not large enough to impact them. The derivation of the Companies' updated PDR benchmarks is set forth in Exhibit 8.

(F): The Companies' actual PDR savings reflect capabilities/results achieved by the 2009 Programs, including the Approved Mercantile Projects.

(G): The Companies' potential PDR savings reflect capabilities/results achieved by the 2009 Programs, as well as the projected capabilities/results of the pending mercantile applications.

EXHIBIT-3

The Companies' 2009 Approved Programs			
Program	Program Description	Key Activities	Program Recommendation
Direct Load Control	This program offers residential customers a programmable thermostat, which can be used by the Companies to achieve load reduction. The thermostat installed through this program is operated through a two-way pager communication system, which allows the Companies to initiate set-back curtailment events. The set-back curtailment events consisted of 4-degree increases in household temperatures for periods of up to 4 hours during peak summer days. These curtailment events allow the Companies to reduce residential air conditioning compressor load. Also, the Companies receive confirmation of receipt of curtailment messages as well as feedback on customer behavior, such as customer overrides of curtailments. Participating customers can program the thermostat for their preferred day, night, and seasonal settings in order to achieve electric and gas energy savings throughout the year. In addition, customers can program the thermostat through a secure website.	Installed thermostats Initiated 5 curtailment events Monitored customer behavior during curtailment events Provided services to 11,383 participants	The Companies recommend that this program continue, incorporating slight modifications as set forth in the Companies' three-year EE/PDR Plans.
Community Connections	The Community Connections Program provides weatherization measures, energy efficient solutions, and client education to the Companies' low-income customers. This program is administered by Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy (OPAE) and includes working with subcontractors to perform weatherization measures, energy efficient solutions, and customer education.	Replaced light bulbs Replaced refrigerators and freezers Repaired or replaced roofs Performed electrical upgrades or repairs Provided services to 1,815 participants	The Companies recommend that this program continue, consistent with the ESP Stipulation in Case No. 08-935-EL-SSO and as set forth in the Companies' three-year EE&PDR Plan.
Interruptible Demand Reduction	The objective of the Interruptible Demand Reduction program is load curtailment.	Conducted monthly test of the curtailment notification system to ensure interruptible customers receive required notifications Provided services to 38 participants	The Companies recommend that this program continue, consistent with the ESP Stipulation in Case No. 08-935-EL-SSO through May 2011. The Companies will update the recommendation in their 2010 status report.
Home Energy Analyzer	The Home Energy Analyzer tool is a software program that provides the Company with the necessary tools needed to properly supply customers with the information and education required to lower their energy costs through energy efficiency program participation and other actions.	Purchased the Aclara software program Implemented the Home Energy Analyzer program on December 14, 2009	The Companies recommend that this program continue, as set forth in the Companies' three-year EE&PDR Plans.
Mercantile Self Direct	All customers that meet the definition of "mercantile customer" as defined in R.C. § 4928.01 (A) (19) are eligible for this program. The Companies are currently proactively working with a group of approximately 300 customers across their respective service territories to jointly file applications to commit the customer's EE/PDR programs, pursuant to division R.C. § 4928.66(A)(2)(c). These 300 customers were selected based on highest usage.	Reviewed documentation for 45 mercantile applications to validate the information provided supports the calculation of EE&PDR savings Responded to data requests for applications pending Commission approval Received Commission approval for 6 mercantile applications	The Companies recommend that this program continue, as set forth in the Companies' three-year EE&PDR Plans.

EXHIBIT-4

The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company 2009 Program Performance Assessment										
Program	# of Participants	Type of Participants	Savings				Anticipated Lifetime Savings		Cost Effectiveness (TRC)	Program Expenditures ²
			MWh		MW					
			Forecasted ¹	Actual	Forecasted ¹	Actual	MWh	MW		
Direct Load Control	4,631	Residential	550	744	4.1	4.1	8,118	4.1	3.54 ³	\$2,409,795.18 ⁴
Community Connections	901	Residential Low-Income	898	471	0.3	0.05	4,773	0.05	0.22	\$602,602.00
Interruptible Demand Reduction	5	Mercantile Utility	0	0	34.4	48	0	48	N/A ⁵	\$2,557,007.44
Home Energy Analyzer	0	Residential	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$45,718.00
Mercantile Self Direct ⁶	4	Small Enterprise / Mercantile Utility	22,392	6,600	5.7	0.5	99,000	0.5	1376 ⁷	\$1,474.62
Total	5,541		23,840	7,815	44.5	52.7	111,891	52.7		\$3,206,802.06

Notes:

¹ The savings forecasted for the 2009 Programs was provided as Appendix G to the Companies' Application for approval of their three-year EE&PDR Plans. See Case Nos. 09-1947-EL-POR *et al.*, Application, Appx. G.

² Direct Load Control and Community Connections 2009 charges are recovered under Rider DSM; Interruptible Demand Response 2009 charges are recovered under Rider DSE1; Home Energy Analyzer and Mercantile Self Direct 2009 charges are included in the 2010 rate for Rider DSE2.

³ Includes natural gas avoided costs pursuant to Case No. 09-512-GE-UNC, Appendix C, provisional recommendation #18A.

⁴ Program expenditures include costs incurred from 2006-2009.

⁵ Approved as a result of the Commission's findings in Case No. 08-935-EL-SSO. Accordingly, no TRC test is required.

⁶ This chart only reflects information applicable to the Approved Mercantile Projects with the exception of forecasted savings.

⁷ The TRC test calculations for the Approved Mercantile Projects does not include mercantile customer costs, making the number equal to a Utility Cost Test ("UCT").

EXHIBIT-4

Ohio Edison Company 2009 Program Performance Assessment										
Program	# of Participants	Type of Participants	Savings				Anticipated Lifetime Savings		Cost Effectiveness (TRC)	Program Expenditures ²
			MWh		MW		MWh	MW		
			Forecasted ¹	Actual	Forecasted ¹	Actual				
Direct Load Control	5,126	Residential	465	667	3.7	3.3	7,277	3.3	3.38 ³	\$2,302,753.76 ⁴
Community Connections	630	Residential Low-Income	1,338	404	0.4	0.04	4,096	0.04	0.21	\$548,120.00
Interruptible Demand Reduction	28	Mercantile Utility	0	0	32.6	66	0	66	N/A ⁵	\$2,315,277.05
Home Energy Analyzer	0	Residential	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$45,718.00
Mercantile Self Direct ⁶	2	Small Enterprise / Mercantile Utility	51,869	13,300	13.2	0.2	199,500	0.2	4946 ⁷	\$831.94
Total	5,786		53,672	14,371	49.9	69.5	210,873	69.5		\$2,909,946.99

Notes:

¹ The savings forecasted for the 2009 Programs was provided as Appendix G to the Companies' Application for approval of their three-year EE&PDR Plans. See Case Nos. 09-1947-EL-POR *et al.*, Application, Appx. G.

² Direct Load Control and Community Connections 2009 charges are recovered under Rider DSM; Interruptible Demand Response 2009 charges are recovered under Rider DSE1; Home Energy Analyzer and Mercantile Self Direct 2009 charges are included in the 2010 rate for Rider DSE2.

³ Includes natural gas avoided costs pursuant to Case No. 09-512-GE-UNC, Appendix C, provisional recommendation #18A.

⁴ Program expenditures include costs incurred from 2006-2009.

⁵ Approved as a result of the Commission's findings in Case No. 08-935-EL-SSO. Accordingly, no TRC test is required.

⁶ This chart only reflects information applicable to the Approved Mercantile Projects with the exception of forecasted savings.

⁷ The TRC test calculations for the Approved Mercantile Projects does not include mercantile customer costs, making the number equal to a Utility Cost Test ("UCT").

EXHIBIT-4

The Toledo Edison Company 2009 Program Performance Assessment										
Program	# of Participants	Type of Participants	Savings				Anticipated Lifetime Savings		Cost Effectiveness (TRC)	Program Expenditures ²
			MWh		MW					
			Forecasted ¹	Actual	Forecasted ¹	Actual	MWh	MW		
Direct Load Control	1,626	Residential	219	239	1.3	1.5	2,605	1.5	3.70 ³	\$777,359.24 ⁴
Community Connections	284	Residential Low-Income	456	189	0.1	0.02	1,915	0.02	0.19	\$283,315.00
Interruptible Demand Reduction	5	Mercantile Utility	0	0	84.4	144	0	144	N/A ⁵	\$2,659,097.68
Home Energy Analyzer	0	Residential	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$45,718.00
Mercantile Self Direct ⁶	0	Small Enterprise / Mercantile Utility	24,864	0	6.3	0	0	0	0	\$0.00
Total	1,915		25,539	428	92.1	145.5	4,520	145.5		\$2,988,130.68

Notes:

¹ The savings forecasted for the 2009 Programs was provided as Appendix G to the Companies' Application for approval of their three-year EE&PDR Plans. See Case Nos. 09-1947-EL-POR *et al.*, Application, Appx. G.

² Direct Load Control and Community Connections 2009 charges are recovered under Rider DSM; Interruptible Demand Response 2009 charges are recovered under Rider DSE1; Home Energy Analyzer and Mercantile Self Direct 2009 charges are included in the 2010 rate for Rider DSE2.

³ Includes natural gas avoided costs pursuant to Case No. 09-512-GE-UNC, Appendix C, provisional recommendation #18A.

⁴ Program expenditures include costs incurred from 2006-2009.

⁵ Approved as a result of the Commission's findings in Case No. 08-935-EL-SSO. Accordingly, no TRC test is required.

⁶ This chart only reflects information applicable to the Approved Mercantile Projects with the exception of forecasted savings.

EXHIBIT-5

Potential Results ¹ 2009 Mercantile Self Direct Program Summary										
Utility	# of Participants	Type of Participants	MWh Savings		MW Savings		Anticipated Lifetime Savings		Cost Effectiveness (TRC) ³	Program Expenditures
			Forecasted ²	Potential	Forecasted ²	Potential	MWh	MW		
CEI	12	Small Enterprise / Mercantile Utility	22,392	205,200	5.7	19.9	3,078,000	19.9	16487.74	\$3,834.00
OE	19	Small Enterprise / Mercantile Utility	51,869	97,200	13.2	4.2	1,458,000	4.2	3790.10	\$7,903.43
TE	14	Small Enterprise / Mercantile Utility	24,864	37,700	6.3	4.8	565,500	4.8	4365.99	\$2,701.72
Total	45		99,125	340,100	25.2	28.9	5,101,500	28.9		\$14,439.15

Notes:

¹ This chart includes data associated with the Approved Mercantile Projects and the applications for approval of additional mercantile self-directed projects that remain pending before the Commission as of December 31, 2009.

² See Case Nos. 09-1947-EL-POR *et al.*, Application, Appx. G.

³ The TRC calculation does not include mercantile customer costs, making the number equal to a utility cost test.

EXHIBIT-5

The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company Mercantile Applications Filed as of: Dec 31, 2009				
Customer Name	Docket Number	MWh	MW	Date Filed
Progressive Casualty Insurance Company	09-0595	3,300	0	07/15/2009
The Lubrizol Corporation	09-1100	1,500	0.3	07/28/2009
Automated Packaging Systems	09-1101	800	0.1	10/29/2009
PolyChem Corporation	09-1102	1,000	0.1	11/04/2009
Subtotal		6,600	0.5	
Parma General Community Hospital	09-1103	2,200	0	11/04/2009
Charter Steel	09-1117	26,000	5.2	12/23/2009
Metro Health Systems	09-1109	2,400	0.4	12/30/2009
Energizer Battery Company	09-1116	300	0.1	12/30/2009
ArcelorMittal USA Inc.	09-1120	166,000	13.2	12/30/2009
4 Cs	09-1105	300	0.1	12/31/2009
The Sherwin Williams Company	09-1107	1,200	0.3	12/31/2009
Cantanzarite Inv Co	09-1118	200	0.1	12/31/2009
Total		205,200	19.9	

The Toledo Edison Company Mercantile Applications Filed as of: Dec 31, 2009				
Customer Name	Docket Number	MWh	MW	Date Filed
Worthington Industries	09-1301	2,700	0.4	10/28/2009
Sauder Woodworking	09-1300	1,900	0.3	11/04/2009
Comfort Line LTD	09-1302	600	0.2	11/04/2009
Kelsey-Hayes Company	09-1306	2,800	0.5	12/06/2009
Atlas Industries Incorporated	09-1307	1,000	0	12/09/2009
Toledo Correctional Institute (TCI)	09-1315	1,500	0.2	12/23/2009
Marsulex	09-1317	3,600	0.4	12/29/2009
Calphalon	09-1303	1,600	0	12/31/2009
Kamco Industries Inc.	09-1305	1,200	0.2	12/31/2009
North Star Bluescope Steel	09-1309	12,100	1.5	12/31/2009
Johns Manville Waterville	09-1318	2,200	0.2	12/31/2009
Rexam Beverage Can Company	09-1320	4,200	0.5	12/31/2009
Walgreens Distribution Center	09-1321	1,000	0.2	12/31/2009
Johnson Controls - Holland	09-1326	1,300	0.2	12/31/2009
Total		37,700	4.8	

Ohio Edison Company Mercantile Applications Filed as of: Dec 31, 2009				
Customer Name	Docket Number	MWh	MW	Date Filed
PCC Airfoils LLC	09-1200	1,800	0.2	07/28/2009
Heinz Frozen Foods Company a division of H.J. Heinz Company L.P.	09-1201	11,500	0	07/29/2009
Subtotal		13,300	0.2	
PPG Industries Incorporated	09-1224	8,200	0.9	07/22/2009
Automated Packaging Systems	09-1202	600	0.1	10/15/2009
Cardington Yutaka Technologies Incorporated	09-1203	1,900	0	10/15/2009
U S Foodservice - Cleveland Division	09-1204	1,400	0.1	10/23/2009
Elyria Foundry	09-1205	9,300	0	10/28/2009
Plastipak Packaging	09-1206	8,600	0	10/28/2009
Sterling Jewelers Incorporated	09-1209	1,300	0.2	11/04/2009
The McGraw-Hill Companies	09-1207	2,300	0.4	11/12/2009
Whirlpool Corporation - Marion Division	09-1210	7,400	0.8	11/25/2009
Republic Engineered Products Incorporated - Massillon	09-1212	2,100	0.3	11/25/2009
Johnny Appleseed Broadcasting	09-1226	200	0	12/08/2009
Coastal Pet Products Incorporated	09-1208	1,200	0.2	12/09/2009
Ellwood Engineered Castings	09-1216	500	0.2	12/23/2009
Quaker City - Korff Holdings	09-1214	500	0	12/23/2009
Ohio Star Forge	09-1217	900	0.5	12/28/2009
McMaster Carr	09-1228	1,200	0.3	12/31/2009
AK Steel	09-1231	36,300	0	12/31/2009
Total		97,200	4.2	

Note:

Data associated with the Approved Mercantile Projects are highlighted in the tables above.

Projected Results 2009 Transmission and Distribution Projects						
Company	Project	Project Description	Actual In Service Date	MW Loss Reduction	Partial Year MWh Loss Reduction ¹	Annualized MWh Loss Reduction
ATSI ²	Cardington-Tangy 69kV line - Phase 3 - 2009 R/C	This is the third step of a 3-step plan (2009 portion is final) of the Cardington - Tangy 69kV R/C project. The entire Cardington-Tangy 69kV line will be 336.4 ACSR conductor and remain built to operate at 69 kV. Reconductor 3/0 ACSR and 1/0 ACSR from Hartford Tap to Marengo Tap with 336.4 ACSR. Total length = 8.87 mi.	12/31/2009	0.701	0	2,598
ATSI	Avon 92-AV-T New Transformer	This project is the addition of a new autotransformer, 92-AV-T, operating in parallel with existing unit (91-AV-T). This will involve the addition of new circuit breakers on both the 138 and 345 kV sides of the existing transmission substation.	6/1/2009	2,499	5,402	9,260
ATSI	Babb (50 MVAR) (6/09)	Install a 50 MVAR, 138 kV capacitor bank at Babb Substation	6/1/2009	0.73	1,578	2,705
ATSI	Hubbard Sub - Add 23 kV, 7.2 Mvar capacitor bank	Add 23 kV, 7.2 MVAR capacitor bank with reactor at Hubbard Substation. The project will require the substation fence as well as the 23kV bus be expanded. Substation expansion should include enough space for a future additional cap bank with reactor in future. An additional bus sectionalizing switch was also required.	10/1/2009	0.098	91	363
OE	OE-Southington exit reconductor	The exit conductors on the 843E circuit are 3/0 ACSR. The summer rating of these conductors is 360 amps. Changing to 336.4 ACSR will raise the rating to 625 amps. This will be an additional 265 amps or 5.7 MVA on the exit conductors.	8/7/2009	0.073	80	200
TE	Levis Park - Install 2nd Mod Sub	A standard Mod Sub 138-12.47 kV, 11.2/14 MVA was added to the Levis Park Substation to relieve the #1 Levis Park and #1 Five Point Transformers which were projected to exceed their top planning rating. Two new feeders, 1082 and 1083 Levis Park were extended and absorbed some of the existing load from 1080 and 1081 Levis Park as well as 1358 and 1359 Five Point.	5/29/2009	0.040	64	109
TE	Lime City - Install 2nd Mod Sub	A standard Mod Sub, 69 kV-12 kV, 11.2/14 MVA was added to the Lime City Substation to relieve the #1 Penta County Transformer which was projected to exceed its top planning rating. Two new feeders 1185 and 1186 Lime City were extended and absorbed some of the existing load from 1183 Lime City, 1129 Tracy and 1342 Penta County.	5/22/2009	0.321	534	877
CEI	Crestwood Transformer Replacement- Replace failed 138kV to 13.8kV 30 MVA	Replace failed 138kV to 13.8kV, 20.2/26.9/33.6 MVA transformer supplied from Q-3-AV-FW with 138kV to 13.2kV, 33.4 MVA transformer supplied from Q-3-AV-FW.	6/5/2009	0.055	86	150
Total				4.5	7,835	16,262

Notes:¹ See Exhibit 6, pg. 2 for partial-year energy savings (MWh) calculations for each Company.² See Exhibit 6, pg. 2 for loss allocation percentages applied to individual ATSI projects.

EXHIBIT-6

2009 T&D Project Partial Year Energy Savings By Company

	CEI	OE	TE	Total
	MWh			
Transmission System Partial Year Energy Savings ¹	1,294	4,582	1,195	7,071
Distribution System Partial Year Energy Savings	86	80	598	764
Total Energy Savings	1,380	4,662	1,793	7,835

Notes:

¹ Energy savings realized through ATSI projects was allocated to each Company based on the number of transmission line miles within each Company's territory as a percentage of the total transmission line miles contained within all of the Companies' service territories. The resulting allocation factors are as follows: CEI = 18.30%; OE = 64.80%; and TE = 16.90%

Energy Efficiency Compliance Baselines and Benchmarks (MWh) ¹													
Electric Utility	Year	Sales	Weather Adjustment	Weather Adjusted Retail Sales	Mercantile Addbacks as Filed in Initial Benchmark	Fully Adjusted Sales as Filed in Initial Benchmark	Planning Baseline	Remove Mercantile Addbacks as Filed in Initial Benchmark	Approved Mercantile Addbacks	Fully Adjusted Sales	Compliance Baseline	% Target of Cumulative Annual Savings	Compliance Benchmark
		(A)	(B)	(C)=(A)+(B)	(D)	(E)	(F)=(C) through (E)	(G)	(H)	(I)=(F) through (H)	(J) = Average of (I)	(K)	(L)=(J)*(K)
CEI	2006	19,292,000	141,550	19,433,550	1,208	19,434,758		(1,208)	37	19,433,587			
	2007	19,718,000	(189,341)	19,528,659	3,217	19,531,876		(3,217)	438	19,529,097			
	2008	19,302,000	(111,932)	19,190,068	5,455	19,195,523		(5,455)	2,459	19,192,527			
	2009						19,387,386				19,385,070	0.30%	58,155
OE	2006	25,432,000	252,142	25,684,142	1,386	25,685,528		(1,386)	1,320	25,685,462			
	2007	26,052,000	(184,134)	25,867,866	2,682	25,870,548		(2,682)	1,320	25,869,186			
	2008	25,279,000	(61,319)	25,217,681	21,965	25,239,646		(21,965)	10,932	25,228,613			
	2009						25,598,574				25,594,420	0.30%	76,783
TE	2006	10,448,000	37,646	10,485,646	2,668	10,488,314		(2,668)	-	10,485,646			
	2007	10,690,000	(81,149)	10,608,851	807	10,609,658		(807)	-	10,608,851			
	2008	10,281,000	(26,163)	10,254,837	1,861	10,256,698		(1,861)	-	10,254,837			
	2009						10,451,556				10,449,778	0.30%	31,349
Ohio	2006	55,172,000	431,338	55,603,338	5,262	55,608,600		(5,262)	1,357	55,604,695			
	2007	56,460,000	(454,624)	56,005,376	6,707	56,012,083		(6,707)	1,758	56,007,134			
	2008	54,862,000	(199,414)	54,662,586	29,280	54,691,866		(29,280)	13,390	54,675,976			
	2009						55,437,516				55,429,268	0.30%	166,288

Notes:

¹ The Companies' Compliance EE Baseline and Benchmarks were updated to include only those mercantile customer self-directed projects that were approved by the Commission in 2009 because the initial benchmarks included all such project applications that were filed through December 1, 2009.

(A) and (B): These numbers are explained in further detail in Exhibit 1 to the Direct Testimony of Katherine M. Kettlewell, which was submitted in support of the Companies' EE&PDR Plans, Case Nos. 09-1947-EL-POR *et al.* (the "Kettlewell Testimony").

(H): Includes only the Approved Mercantile Projects.

EXHIBIT-8

Peak Demand Compliance Baselines and Benchmarks (MW) ¹													
Electric Utility	Year	Sales	Weather Adjustment	Weather Adjusted Retail Peaks	Mercantile Addbacks as Filed in Initial Benchmark	Fully Adjusted Peaks as Filed in Initial Benchmark	Planning Baseline	Remove Mercantile Addbacks as Filed in Initial Benchmark	Approved Mercantile Addbacks	Fully Adjusted Sales	Compliance Baseline	% Target of Cumulative Annual Savings	Compliance Benchmark 2
		(A) ³	(B) ³	(C)=(A)+(B)	(D)	(E)	(F)=(C) through (E) ⁴	(G)	(H)	(I)=(F) through (H)	(J) = Average of (I)	(K)	(L)=(J)*(K)
CEI	2006	4,341.2	-	4,341.2	-	4,341.2		-	-	4,341.2			
	2007	4,154.6	-	4,154.6	1.0	4,155.6		(1.0)	0.1	4,154.7			
	2008	3,982.1	-	3,982.1	1.0	3,983.1		(1.0)	0.4	3,982.5			
							4,160				4,159.5	1.00%	41.6
OE	2006	5,491.8	-	5,491.8	-	5,491.8		-	-	5,491.8			
	2007	5,344.7	-	5,344.7	1.0	5,345.7		(1.0)	-	5,344.7			
	2008	4,996.6	-	4,996.6	6.0	5,002.6		(6.0)	-	4,996.6			
							5,280				5,277.7	1.00%	52.8
TE	2006	2,119.2	-	2,119.2	-	2,119.2		-	-	2,119.2			
	2007	2,002.5	-	2,002.5	-	2,002.5		-	-	2,002.5			
	2008	1,898.8	-	1,898.8	-	1,898.8		-	-	1,898.8			
							2,007				2,006.8	1.00%	20.1
Ohio	2006	11,952.2	-	11,952.2	-	11,952.2		-	-	11,952.2			
	2007	11,501.7	-	11,501.7	2.0	11,503.7		(2.0)	0.1	11,501.8			
	2008	10,877.5	-	10,877.5	7.0	10,884.5		(7.0)	0.4	10,878.0			
							11,447				11,444.0	1.00%	114.5

Notes:

¹ The Companies' Peak Demand Compliance Baseline and Benchmarks are updated to include only the Approved Mercantile Projects because the initial benchmarks included all mercantile project applications that that were filed through December 1, 2009. *See Kettlewell Testimony*, Ex. 3.

² The updated benchmarks do not reflect any change from those reported in the Companies' EE&PDR Plans because the change in the mercantile addbacks multiplied by the target percent was not large enough to impact the benchmarks.

³ (A) and (B): These numbers are explained in further detail in Exhibit 3 to the Kettlewell Testimony.

⁴ (F): Includes only the Approved Mercantile Projects.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

3/8/2010 2:50:45 PM

in

Case No(s). 10-0227-EL-EEC, 10-0228-EL-EEC, 10-0229-EL-EEC

Summary: Exhibit 1-8 to the Annual Status Report electronically filed by Ms. Kathy J Kolich on behalf of Ohio Edison Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and The Toledo Edison Company