

## **PETER J. LANZALOTTA**

Peter J. Lanzalotta is a Senior Consultant with Resource Insight. He is a Professional Engineer licensed in the states of Maryland and Connecticut. Mr. Lanzalotta holds a Bachelor of Science in Electric Power Engineering from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and a Master of Business Administration with a concentration in Finance from Loyola College of Baltimore. He is a member of the Institute of Electrical & Electronics Engineers, the National Society of Professional Engineers, the National Fire Protection Association, and the Financial Management Association.

Mr. Lanzalotta has more than twenty-five years experience in electric utility system planning, power pooling operations, distribution operations, electric service reliability, load and price forecasting, and market analysis and development. Mr. Lanzalotta has appeared as an expert witness on utility planning and operation matters in more than 40 proceedings in 13 states, the District of Columbia, and the Provinces of Alberta and Ontario. He has participated in negotiations between utilities and customers or regulators in more than ten states regarding transmission access, the need for facilities, electric rates, electric service reliability, and system operator structure under wholesale competition.

Prior to accepting this position this year, Mr. Lanzalotta was a Partner of Whitfield Russell Associates for 15 years and a Senior Associate of the same firm for 4 years prior to that. Prior to that, he served as System Engineer of the Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative (CMEEC). He provided operational, financial, and rate analyses for CMEEC's budgeting, ratemaking and project evaluations. He managed CMEEC's participation in the New England Power Pool (NEPOOL) operations, and in the Hydro-Quebec/NEPOOL

interconnection project. Also he participated in the development of a data base to support CMEEC's operational and financial data needs.

Formerly, he was Chief Engineer for the South Norwalk (Connecticut) Electric Works. He was responsible for system operation, data processing, engineering, rates and tariffs, generation operation and sales, project management and contractor liaison. He designed and implemented cogeneration and small power production programs, improvements in wholesale purchases and generation resources, and was responsible for retail rate design and service policy design. He also was responsible for distribution design, construction, maintenance, and operations.

Mr. Lanzalotta served as a Utility Engineer for the firm of Van Scoyoc & Wiskup. He was responsible for power pooling analyses and proposals, computer modeling, rate analysis and design, and the preparation of expert testimony on these topics.

Previously, he was a Rates/Service Tariffs Analyst with the Baltimore Gas & Electric Company where he developed cost and revenue studies for a wide range of proposals. Prior to this, Mr. Lanzalotta was an Associate Engineer with the System Operations Department of Baltimore Gas & Electric Company for about 3 years.

## **Peter Lanzalotta's Testimony Filed**

1. In re: Public Service Company of New Mexico, Docket Nos. ER78-337 and ER78-338 before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, concerning the need for access to calculation methodology underlying filing.
2. In re: Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Case No. 7238-V before the Maryland Public Service Commission, concerning outage replacement power costs.
3. In re: Houston Lighting & Power Company, Texas Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 4712, concerning modeling methods to determine rates to be paid to cogenerators and small power producers.
4. In re: Nevada Power Company, Nevada Public Service Commission, Docket No. 83-707 concerning rate case fuel inventories, rate base items, and O&M expense.
5. In re: Virginia Electric & Power Company, Virginia State Corporation Commission, concerning the operating and reliability-based need for additional transmission facilities.
6. In re: Public Service Electric & Gas Company, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. 831-25, concerning outage replacement power costs.
7. In re: Philadelphia Electric Company, Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. P-830453, concerning outage replacement power costs.
8. In re: Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 83-33-EL-EFC, concerning the results of an operations/fuel-use audit conducted by Mr. Lanzalotta.
9. In re: Kansas City Power and Light Company, before the State Corporation Commission of the state of Kansas, Docket Nos. 142,099-U and 120,924-U, concerning the determination of the capacity, from a new base-load generating facility, needed for reliable system operation, and the capacity available from existing generating units.

10. In re: Philadelphia Electric Company, Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. R-850152, concerning the determination of the capacity, from a new base-load generating facility, needed for reliable system operation, and the capacity available from existing generating units.
11. In re: ABC Method Proposed for Application to Public Service Company of Colorado, before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado, on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies ("FEA"), concerning a production cost allocation methodology proposed for use in Colorado.
12. In re: Duquesne Light Company, Docket No. R-870651, before the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission, on behalf of the Office of Consumer Advocate, concerning the system reserve margin needed for reliable service.
13. In re: Pennsylvania Power Company, Docket No. I-7970318 before the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission, on behalf of the Office of Consumer Advocate, concerning outage replacement power costs.
14. In re: Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. 87-0427 before the Illinois Commerce Commission, on behalf of the Citizen's Utility Board of Illinois, concerning the determination of the capacity, from new base-load generating facilities, needed for reliable system operation.
15. In re: Central Illinois Public Service Company, Docket No. 88-0031 before the Illinois Commerce Commission, on behalf of the Citizen's Utility Board of Illinois, concerning the degree to which existing generating capacity is needed for reliable and/or economic system operation.
16. In re: Illinois Power Company, Docket No. 87-0695 before the State of Illinois Commerce Commission, on behalf of Citizens Utility Board of Illinois, Governors Office of Consumer Services, Office of Public Counsel and Small Business Utility Advocate, concerning the determination of the capacity, from a new base-load generating facility, needed for reliable system operation, and the capacity available from existing generating units.

17. In re: Florida Power Corporation, Docket No. 860001-EI-G (Phase II), before the Florida Public Service Commission, on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies of the United States, concerning an investigation into fuel supply relationships of Florida Power Corporation.
18. In re: Potomac Electric Power Company, before the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia, Docket No. 877, on behalf of the Public Service Commission Staff, concerning the need for and availability of new generating facilities.
19. In re: South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 88-681-E, On Behalf of the State of Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs, concerning the capacity needed for reliable system operation, the capacity available from existing generating units, relative jurisdictional rate of return, reconnection charges, and the provision of supplementary, backup, and maintenance services for QFs.
20. In re: Commonwealth Edison Company, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 87-0169, 87-0427, 88-0189, 88-0219, and 88-0253, on behalf of the Citizen's Utility Board of Illinois, concerning the determination of the capacity, from a new base-load generating facility, needed for reliable system operation.
21. In re: Illinois Power Company, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 89-0276, on behalf of the Citizen's Utility Board of Illinois, concerning the determination of capacity available from existing generating units.
22. In re: Jersey Central Power & Light Company, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. EE88-121293, on behalf of the State of New Jersey Department of the Public Advocate, concerning evaluation of transmission planning.
23. In re: Canal Electric Company, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. ER90-245-000, on behalf of the Municipal Light Department of the Town of Belmont, Massachusetts, concerning the reasonableness of Seabrook Unit No. 1 Operating and Maintenance expense.
24. In re: New Hampshire Electric Cooperative Rate Plan Proposal, before the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission, Docket No.

- DR90-078, on behalf of the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, concerning contract valuation.
25. In re: Connecticut Light & Power Company, before the Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control, Docket No. 90-04-14, on behalf of a group of Qualifying Facilities concerning O&M expenses payable by the QFs.
  26. In re: Duke Power Company, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, Docket No. 91-216-E, on behalf of the State of South Carolina Department of Consumer Advocate, concerning System Planning, Rate Design and Nuclear Decommissioning Fund issues.
  27. In re: Jersey Central Power & Light Company, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket No. ER91-480-000, on behalf of the Boroughs of Butler, Madison, Lavallette, Pemberton and Seaside Heights, concerning the appropriateness of a separate rate class for a large wholesale customer.
  28. In re: Potomac Electric Power Company, before the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia, Formal Case No. 912, on behalf of the Staff of the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia, concerning the Application of PEPCO for an increase in retail rates for the sale of electric energy.
  29. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, House of Representatives, General Assembly House Bill No. 2273. Oral testimony before the Committee on Conservation, concerning proposed Electromagnetic Field Exposure Avoidance Act.
  30. In re: Hearings on the 1990 Ontario Hydro Demand\Supply Plan, before the Ontario Environmental Assessment Board, concerning Ontario Hydro's System Reliability Planning and Transmission Planning.
  31. In re: Maui Electric Company, Docket No. 7000, before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Hawaii, on behalf of the Division of Consumer Advocacy, concerning MECO's generation system, fuel and purchased power expense, depreciation, plant additions and retirements, contributions and advances.

32. In re: Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc., Docket No. 7256, before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Hawaii, on behalf of the Division of Consumer Advocacy, concerning need for, design of, and routing of proposed transmission facilities.
33. In re: Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. 94-0065, before the Illinois Commerce Commission, on behalf of the City of Chicago, concerning proposed general increase in rates.
34. In re: Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. 92-0221, before the Illinois Commerce Commission, on behalf of the Friends of Illinois Prairie Path, concerning application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity ("CPCN") for a new transmission line and substation.
35. In re: Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. 92-0216, before the Illinois Commerce Commission, on behalf of Citizens for Responsible Electric Power, concerning application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity ("CPCN") for a new transmission line and substation.
36. In re: Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. 94-0179, before the Illinois Commerce Commission, on behalf of the Friends of Sugar Ridge, concerning the need for proposed 138 kV transmission and substation facilities.
37. In re: Public Service Company of Colorado, Docket Nos. 95A-531EG and 95I-464E, before the Colorado Public Utilities Commission, on behalf of the Office of Consumer Counsel, concerning a proposed merger with Southwestern Public Service Company and a proposed performance-based rate-making plan.
38. In re: South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, Duke Power Company, and Carolina Power & Light Company, Docket No. 95-1192-E, before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, on behalf of the South Carolina Department of Consumer Advocate, concerning avoided cost rates payable to qualifying facilities.
39. In re: Lawrence A. Baker v. Truckee Donner Public Utility District, Case No. 55899, before the Superior Court of the State of California, on behalf of Truckee Donner Public Utility District, concerning the reasonableness of electric rates.

40. In re: Black Hills Power & Light Company, Docket No. OA96-75-000, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on behalf of the City of Gillette, Wyoming, concerning the Black Hills' proposed open access transmission tariff.
41. In re: Metropolitan Edison Company and Pennsylvania Electric Company for Approvals of the Restructuring Plan Under Section 2806, Docket Nos. R-00974008 and R-00974009 before the Pennsylvania PUC on behalf of Operating NUG Group, concerning miscellaneous restructuring issues.
42. In re: New Jersey State Restructuring Proceeding for consideration of proposals for retail competition under BPU Docket Nos. EX94120585U; E097070457; E097070460; E097070463; E097070466 before the New Jersey BPU on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate, concerning load balancing, third party settlements, and market power.
43. In re: Arbitration Proceeding In City of Chicago v. Commonwealth Edison for consideration of claims that franchise agreement has been breached, Proceeding No. 51Y-114-350-96 before arbitration panel board on behalf of the City of Chicago concerning electric system reliability.
44. In re: Transalta Utilities Corporation, Application No. RE 95081 on behalf of the ACD companies, before the Alberta Energy And Utilities Board in reference to the use and value of interruptible capacity.
45. In re: Consolidated Edison Company, Docket No. EL99-58-000 on behalf of The Village of Freeport, New York, before FERC in reference to remedies for the breach of contract to provide firm service on a non-discriminatory basis and failure to operate and maintain facilities in a prudent fashion.
46. In re: ESBI Alberta Ltd., Application No. 990005 on behalf of The Firm Customer Group, before the Alberta Energy And Utilities Board in reference to the reasonable cost of service plus management fee to be charged by the Transmission Administrator for the province.

47. In re: South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, Docket No. 2000-0170-E on behalf of the South Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina concerning an application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Convenience and Necessity for new and repowered generating units at the Urquhart generating station.
48. In re: Baltimore Gas & Electric Company, Case No. 8837 on behalf of the Maryland Office of People's Counsel before the Maryland Public Service Commission concerning the electric line extension costs payable by commercial and industrial customers.
49. In re: PEPCO, Case No. 8844 on behalf of the Maryland Office of People's Counsel before the Maryland Public Service Commission concerning proposed electric line extension charges.