

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA



OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE

555 Walnut Street, 5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101-1923
(717) 783-5048
800-684-6560

 @pa_oca
 /pennoca

FAX (717) 783-7152
consumer@paoca.org

April 10, 2020

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: Petition for Expedited Approval of PGW's
Letter Request to Amend its Universal
Service and Energy Conservation Plan
Pursuant to the 2019 Amendments to the
Policy Statement at Docket No.
M-2019-3012599
Docket No. P-2020-3018867

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed please find the Office of Consumer Advocate's Petition for Reconsideration in the above-referenced proceeding. The OCA has attached the verification of Tanya J. McCloskey, Acting Consumer Advocate, pursuant to the requirements of 52 Pa. Code section 1.36.

Copies have been served as indicated on the enclosed Certificate of Service.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Christy M. Appleby
Christy M. Appleby
Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 85824
E-Mail: CAppleby@paoca.org

Enclosures:

cc: Office of Administrative Law Judge (**email only**)
Office of Special Assistants (**email only**: ra-OSA@pa.gov)
Certificate of Service

*286285

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Re: Petition for Expedited Approval of PGW's :
Letter Request to Amend its Universal : Docket No. P-2020-3018867
Service and Energy Conservation Plan :
Pursuant to the 2019 Amendments to the Policy :
Statement at Docket No. M-2019-3012599 :

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the following document, the Office of Consumer Advocate's Petition for Reconsideration, upon parties of record in this proceeding in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant), in the manner and upon the persons listed below:

Dated this 10th day of April 2020.

SERVICE BY E-MAIL ONLY

Richard A. Kanaskie, Esquire
Bureau of Investigation & Enforcement
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Sharon E. Webb, Esquire
Office of Small Business Advocate
555 Walnut Street
1st Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923

Elizabeth R. Marx, Esquire
Ria M. Pereira, Esquire
Pennsylvania Utility Law Project
118 Locust Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Lauren M. Burge, Esquire
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
600 Grant Street
44th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Deanne M. O'Dell, Esquire
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
213 Market Street, 8th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Graciela Christlieb, Esquire
Philadelphia Gas Works
800 West Montgomery Ave.
Philadelphia, PA 19122

Joline Price, Esquire
Community Legal Services
1424 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102

/s/ Christy M. Appleby
Christy M. Appleby
Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 85824
E-Mail: CApplby@paoca.org

Phillip D. Demanchick
Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 324761
E-Mail: PDemanchick@paoca.org

Counsel for:
Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923
Phone: (717) 783-5048
Fax: (717) 783-7152
Dated: April 10, 2020
*286284

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Petition for Expedited Approval of :
PGW’s Letter Request to Amend its Universal : Docket No. P-2020-3018867
Service and Energy Conservation Plan :
Pursuant to the 2019 Amendments to the Policy :
Statement at Docket No. M-2019-3012599 :

PETITION OF THE
OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE
FOR RECONSIDERATION

The Office of Consumer Advocate (OCA) hereby submits this Petition for Reconsideration pursuant to Sections 5.41 and 5.572 of the Public Utility Commission’s (Commission) regulations. 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.41, 5.572. The OCA requests that the Commission reconsider its Order entered March 26, 2020 in the above-referenced docket and allow for a full consideration of the proposed changes to PGW’s Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan.

I. INTRODUCTION

On November 5, 2019, the Commission entered a Final Opinion and Order at Docket No. M-2019-3012599 (November 5 Order) regarding amendments to the Policy Statement on Customer Assistance Programs. The Final Opinion and Order incorporates issues raised in the proceedings, Energy Affordability for Low-Income Customers, Docket No. M-2017-2587711, and Review of Universal Service and Energy Conservation Programs, Docket No. M-2017-2596907. The Commission’s November 5 Order, among other things, established new energy affordability burdens for customers enrolled in the natural gas and electric distribution companies’ Customer Assistance Programs (CAP). November 5 Order at 28-

34. The Commission's November 5 Order also identified potential costs relating to the proposed energy affordability burden changes. November 5 Order at 24-28.

As a result of the November 5 Order, on January 6, 2020 at Docket No. M-2016-2542418, Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW or Company) filed its addendum to its 2017-2020 universal service plan to identify the areas in which the Company's CRP complied with the CAP Policy Statement (CRP). Addendum to Philadelphia Gas Works Universal Service Plan for 2017-2020, Docket No. M-2016-2542418 (January 6, 2020).¹ Subsequently, on February 21, 2020, PGW filed a Petition to voluntarily modify its Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan. In its Petition, PGW proposed to reduce the energy burdens to 6% for customers with income at or below 51-100% and 101-150% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) and to 4% for customers with income at or below 0-50% of the FPL. Petition at ¶¶ 5, 8, App. H. PGW also proposed to remove the obligation to pay \$5/month towards pre-program arrears and to modify the consumption limits. Petition at ¶¶ 5, 8, App. H. PGW's proposed Amended Plan indicated that the proposed plan costs will increase from \$68,620,083 in 2020 to \$97,104,143 in 2021. PGW Amended USECP 2017-2022 at App. A.

In the Company's February 21, 2020 Petition, PGW requested expedited approval of the pilot by March 31, 2020 in order to implement the program prior to the filing of its next USECP due on November 1, 2021 for PGW's 2023-2027 Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan. Petition at 2. PGW requested expedited treatment in order to implement the pilot as a part of its planned customer information system (CIS) replacement project. Petition at 2. PGW anticipated

¹ In the Commission's Energy Association of Pennsylvania (EAP) Reconsideration Order on February 6, 2020, the Commission identified that if Companies wanted to voluntarily amend their current Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plans, the Company should file a Petition to Amend its Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan. Petition of Energy Association of Pennsylvania for Reconsideration/Clarification of the November 5, 2019 Final CAP Policy Statement and Order at Docket No. M-2019-3012599, Docket No. P-2020-3016889, Order on Reconsideration/Clarification at 10-12 (Feb. 6, 2020) (EAP Petition for Reconsideration).

that changes to the existing CIS will need to cease as of September 2020. Petition at 2. PGW stated that a secondary reason for expedited treatment is to “enable PGW to begin to analyze how the Pilot Program energy burden changes impact PGW and its ratepayers, and will likely provide PGW with the ability to provide more informed input into the Commission’s upcoming Universal Service Rulemaking.” Petition at 2. PGW requested that the pilot program proposal be deemed withdrawn if the Commission does not approve the program by March 31, 2020 and states that in that event, PGW would continue under the terms of its currently approved USECP, as amended to include the 2021 and 2022 program budgets. Petition at ¶¶ 10, 11.

On March 2, 2020, the OCA filed an Answer and a Notice of Intervention and Public Statement to PGW’s February 21 Petition.² In its Answer, the OCA identified concerns with the Company’s proposal for expedited approval including questions as to the cost of the program, the increased costs related to the proposed amendments, the impact of the amendments on the overall plan, and the continued cost-effectiveness of the Plan, among others. The OCA argued that further analysis of the impact of the changes on returned LIHEAP dollars is required. With significantly lower energy burdens, it is possible that LIHEAP dollars will not be able to be fully utilized, resulting in a waste of scarce resources. The OCA requested that the Commission provide an adequate forum to evaluate the proposed program changes and sufficient time for the collection of necessary information and an analysis of the data.

On March 26, 2020, the Commission issued its Order approving PGW’s expedited Petition and proposed changes to its USECP. Petition to Amend the Philadelphia Gas Works Universal

² The OCA notes that the Office of Small Business Advocate (OSBA) filed a Notice of Intervention and Public Statement in the proceeding. The Tenant Union Representative Network (TURN), Action Alliance of Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia (Action Alliance) and the Coalition for Affordable Utility Services and Energy Efficiency in Pennsylvania (CAUSE-PA) (collectively, Low Income Advocates) also filed a Letter in support of PGW’s proposed amended USECP.

Service and Energy Conservation Plan for 2017-2022, Docket No. P-2020-3018867, Order (Mar. 26, 2020) (March 26 Order). In the dissenting Joint Statement of Commissioner John F. Coleman, Jr. and Commissioner Ralph V. Yanora, the Commissioners raised concerns regarding the level of the costs for the proposed changes and also due process concerns regarding the Commission's expedited approval of PGW's Petition. Petition to Amend the Philadelphia Gas Works Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan for 2017-2022, Docket No. P-2020-3018867, Joint Statement of Commissioner John F. Coleman, Jr. and Commissioner Ralph V. Yanora (Mar. 26, 2020) (Joint Statement of Commissioners Coleman and Yanora).

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

As set forth in Duick v. Pennsylvania Gas and Water Co., 56 Pa. P.U.C. 553 (1985), the standards for granting a petition for reconsideration are as follows:

A petition for reconsideration, under the provisions of 66 Pa. C.S. 703(g), may properly raise any matters designed to convince the Commission that it should exercise its discretion under this code section to rescind or amend a prior order in whole or in part. In this regard we agree with the Court in the Pennsylvania Railroad case, wherein it stated that “[p]arties...cannot be permitted by a second motion to review and reconsider, to raise the same questions which were specifically considered and decided against them...” What we expect to see raised in such petitions are new and novel arguments, not previously heard, or considerations which appear to have been overlooked or not addressed by the Commission. Absent such matters being presented, we consider it unlikely that a party will succeed in persuading us that our initial decision on a matter or issues was either unwise or in error.

Duick v. Pennsylvania Gas and Water Co., 56 Pa. P.U.C. at 599, (quoting Pennsylvania R.R. Co. v. Pa. P.U.C., 118 Pa. Super. 180 (1935)).

In this Petition, the OCA raises points not previously heard or fully considered and which the Commission may have overlooked. The OCA submits that the Commission did not fully consider the due process rights of the parties to this proceeding, particularly in light of the significant increase in costs of at least \$27 million on an annual basis. The Commission also

appears to have overlooked its determination in the OCA's Petition for Reconsideration in the CAP Policy Statement proceeding wherein the Commission stated that the parties would be able to examine the specific proposals of the utilities in each Universal Service and Energy Efficiency proceeding. The Commission stated that "issues related to a specific utility's energy burdens are still subject to the scrutiny in that utility's USECP proceedings." Petition of Office of Consumer Advocate for Reconsideration/Clarification of the November 5, 2019 Final CAP Policy Statement and Order at Docket No. M-2019-3012599, Docket No. P-2020-3016885, Order on Reconsideration/Clarification at 10-11 (Feb. 6, 2020) (OCA Petition for Reconsideration). The OCA submits that the Commission also overlooked, or failed to consider the import of, its prior procedures for reviewing changes to its Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan. Finally, the OCA presents new issues regarding the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on this proceeding as the impacts of the pandemic have continued to unfold.

III RECONSIDERATION

A. The Commission Has Not Adequately Considered The OCA's Due Process Rights In This Proceeding.

Pursuant to the Duick standard, the OCA submits that the Commission has not adequately considered the OCA's due process rights in this proceeding in light of the significant increase in rates that will result. PGW has proposed significant changes to its USECP in this proceeding with significant cost and rate consequences, and the Commission has failed to provide the OCA an opportunity to be heard as required to fully comply with due process. The OCA has not had the opportunity to evaluate or comment on the costs of the proposal for those changes, as the OCA requested in its Answer in this proceeding. The OCA has also not been given the opportunity to review the proposed changes as a part of the Company's overall USECP. Instead, the Commission has accepted the Company's request for expedited review without any opportunity for fact-finding,

further comment, or investigation of the significant changes to PGW's Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan.

In the dissenting Joint Statement of Commissioner John F. Coleman, Jr. and Commission Ralph V. Yanora, the Commissioners correctly pointed out that due process should have been provided here. Specifically, the Commissioners stated:

A petition to amend a universal service plan requires due process. Due process is satisfied by providing notice and opportunity to be heard. Upon review, we have not provided the OCA and the other interested parties with adequate notice and opportunity to be heard with respect to PGW's January 6, 2020 Cover Letter and its proposed USECP changes. First the Cover Letter was converted to a petition to amend without formal notice to the parties. Second, we are essentially deciding the merits of the case based on the pleadings, even though the OCA has raised material fact sensitive issues. Such an outcome is inconsistent with due process, even under the more informal handling of universal service plans.

Joint Statement of Commissioners Coleman and Yanora at 3 (internal citations omitted).

As further support for their position that the requirements of due process have not been satisfied here, the Commissioners noted that PGW forecasts that its Pilot Program will result in increased CAP costs of approximately \$27 million in 2021 and approximately \$29 million in 2022. Id., at 4. Accordingly, the Commissioners assert that this is the type of modification that lends itself to a more robust review period with opportunity for input from numerous interested parties. Id. The Commissioners concluded that allowing for a meaningful process with stakeholder input is necessary to fully understand the cost implications of the Pilot Program upon all PGW ratepayers and will facilitate the development of important and critical reporting requirements and limitations that will guide the success of the Pilot Program. Id., at 4-5.

The Commission's Order, however, proceeds to approve the Company's proposal without resolving the issues raised or conducting any fact-finding on a proposal that will increase rates by \$27 million. The Courts have long recognized consumers' right to due process when rates are

being affected by a Commission action. As stated by the Commonwealth Court, “[t]he essential elements of due process required are notice of government action and an opportunity to be heard to challenge that action.” Barasch v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n, 546 A.2d 1296, 1305 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Aug. 22, 1988) (Milesburg); see also, Luzzi v. State Horse Racing Commission, 548 A.2d 659, 662 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Oct. 5, 1988). Furthermore, while due process is flexible and calls for such procedural protection as the particular situation demands, consideration of what procedures due process may require under any given set of circumstances must begin with a determination of the precise nature of the government function involved as well as of the private interest that has been affected by governmental action. Milesburg, 546 A.2d at 1303. Generally, due process for proceedings regarding implementation of Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plans is met using tentative orders and comments from stakeholders. See e.g. Philadelphia Gas Works Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan for 2017-2020 Submitted in Compliance with 52 Pa. Code § 62.4, Docket No. M-2016-2542415, Tentative Order at 42-43 (Jan. 26, 2017).

Unlike other USECP proceedings, the Commission has approved PGW’s Petition to Amend on an expedited basis by only permitting an Answer and not allowing further investigation or comment from interested parties. Pursuant to the Milesburg decision, due process is required in order to address the “private interest” to ratepayers of the proposed \$27-\$29 million increase in the universal service and energy conservation charge for non-CAP ratepayers. PGW’s Petition to Amend raises genuine issues of material fact, including the accuracy of PGW’s projected budgets for 2021 and 2022, the cost impact of each amendment, and whether other limitations should be placed on the Pilot Program. This is aggravated by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which is likely to have a material impact upon the information contained in PGW’s Petition to Amend. The

Commission's order here would allow the modifications to proceed without any further investigation of any of these critical issues.

While not addressed in the Commission's Order, Commissioner Sweet, in oral remarks, stated his position that that due process was satisfied because the issues raised were addressed in a two-year stakeholder process, which resulted in the Commission's new Policy Statement on customer assistance programs.³ The OCA submits that a generic investigation resulting in a non-binding Policy Statement cannot usurp due process in an agency adjudication seeking to implement that Policy Statement. As noted in the Commission's Order on Reconsideration/Clarification of the OCA's Petition regarding the Policy Statement Order:

[The Commission will] remind stakeholders that the maximum energy burden percentages in the Annex to the November 5 Order are recommendations, not iron-clad limits on what a utility can charge a CAP household. Issues related to a specific utility's energy burdens are still subject to scrutiny in that utility's USECP proceedings.

OCA Petition for Reconsideration at 10-11. A review of the energy burdens and their cost impact is what the OCA sought to do in this proceeding. The Commission here has prevented interested

³ Commissioner Sweet, in an oral remark at the Commission's March 26 Public Meeting, cited to ARIPPA v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n as support for his position that due process was afforded in its approval of PGW's Petition to Amend. 792 A.2d 636 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Feb. 21, 2002) (ARIPPA). The OCA submits that the circumstances of ARRIPA differ markedly from the circumstances in this proceeding. In ARIPPA the Commission approved a non-unanimous settlement after providing opposing parties 42 hours to respond. Id., at 660-61. The Commission held that the settlement was substantially similar to a previous settlement that the parties were already afforded an opportunity to review and had this non-unanimous settlement been their first time reviewing, they would have allowed an additional round of reply exceptions. Id.

In this proceeding, the stakeholder collaborative reviewing customer assistance programs held over a two-year period dealt with policy issues in a generic, statewide manner, not in a utility-specific manner. Furthermore, while the Commission attempted to collect data from each utility regarding the utility-specific impacts of changing Pennsylvania's energy burdens, the Commission noted in its energy affordability report that discrete recommendations from that process proved elusive for several reasons, including "inconsistencies in utility reporting and limitations in the utility data." Energy Affordability for Low Income Customers, Docket No. M-2017-2587711, Home Energy Affordability for Low-Income Customers in Pennsylvania at 4 (Jan. 2019). Still the Commission issued its amended Policy Statement on Nov. 5, 2019, noting that issues related to a specific utility's energy burdens are still subject to scrutiny in utility-specific USECP proceedings. OCA Petition for Reconsideration at 10-11. Accordingly, unlike ARRIPA, the OCA and other interested parties have not been able to investigate utility-specific implementation of the amended CAP Policy Statement. The OCA is entitled to procedural due process in this matter.

parties from conducting a full and complete investigation of the issues that it had specifically put into this type of proceeding.

B. The Commission Appears To Have Overlooked Its Recent Determination Regarding The Evaluation Of Cost Increases In USECP Proceedings.

Pursuant to the Quick standard, the OCA submits that the Commission also appears to have overlooked its determination in the CAP Policy Statement Reconsideration Order regarding the evaluation of costs for the programs. See, 2019 Amendments to Policy Statement on Customer Assistance Programs, 52 Pa. Code §§ 69.261- 69.267, Docket No. M-2019-3012599, OCA Reconsideration Order (February 6, 2020). In the OCA Reconsideration Order, the Commission addressed the OCA's concerns regarding how the CAP Policy Statement addressed the proposed costs and budgets of the changes by stating that the issues could be addressed in utility-specific proceedings. The Commission specifically provided in response to the OCA's concerns about the cost impact:

As a second contention, OCA requests that the Commission direct utilities to submit an estimate of the costs of change when a CAP is revised because some costs increase and some costs decrease. OCA asserts this information is essential to evaluate a proposed change and to assess the impact on the ratepayers who bear the cost of universal service. OCA Petition at 7.

The November 5 Order directs that utilities provide enrollment and budget projections in their addendums for the new CAP provision they propose to implement. This requirement has been reiterated in our order addressing the EAP petition for reconsideration at Docket Nos. P-2020-3016889 and M-2019-3012599. **To the extent that further granularity may be warranted, it can be addressed in utility-specific proceedings.**

OCA Reconsideration Order at 11 (emphasis added). The OCA Reconsideration Order specifically denies the opportunity to review all EDC and NGDC proposed cost impacts as a part of the CAP Policy Statement proceeding and defers the issue to the USECP proceeding. However,

now, in the USECP specific proceeding, the OCA is also being denied the opportunity for a full review and evaluation of the Company's costs.

In the Commission's March 26 Order, the Commission has overlooked that the proposed \$27-\$29 million increase in cost and budgets proposed by PGW have not been examined, in either this proceeding or in the CAP Policy Statement proceeding. The proposed \$27-\$29 million increase in costs have also never been evaluated in the full context of PGW's Plan, or how the energy affordability burden changes will impact the costs of the maximum CAP credit changes and \$5 co/pay changes. In their Joint Statement, Commissioners Coleman and Yanora correctly identify concerns with the significant cost increase proposed by PGW and the lack of examination presented in this proceeding of those costs. As they correctly state, the costs will increase by approximately \$27 million in 2021 and approximately \$29 million in 2022. Joint Statement of Commissioners Coleman and Yanora at 4.

The Commission's Order in this matter, while acknowledging the financial hardship to customers from these modifications, accepts PGW's proposed rate increase without any examination of the costs and whether the proposed cost increase is appropriate. The Commission relies upon an untested assumption of possible benefits and PGW's assertion that this is a pilot program even though it applies to all CAP participants. Order at 19. There is simply no basis in this proceeding to reach this conclusion, and as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic continues to unfold, the benefits of such a significant change require greater scrutiny.

In oral statements at the March 26th Public Meeting, Commissioner Sweet indicated that the issues have previously been addressed as a part of the CAP Policy Statement, and therefore, do not need to be addressed further in this proceeding. The OCA submits that this is contrary to the Commission's identified procedures in the Reconsideration Order. It was not until the Company's January 6, 2020 filing that PGW identified which elements the Company proposed to

change and the Company's January 6th filing is the first time that PGW identified the policies that it proposed to change. PGW's prior filing in the CAP Policy Statement only provided a preliminary estimate of the costs of meeting the new energy burdens if the Commission determined to make changes to its CAP Policy Statement.

In addition to the energy affordability changes, PGW made several other changes to its Plan that will have an impact on costs including removal of the \$5 co/pay for customers with arrearages and changes to the maximum CAP credit. Moreover, PGW did not strictly adhere to all aspects of the Commission's CAP Policy Statement. For example, PGW did not adopt a zero income form. Order at 12. PGW also did not modify its recertification requirements, modify its determination of household income, or modify its process for reviewing CAP customer bills quarterly to determine whether an actual or PIPP amount would be appropriate. Order at 12. The CAP Policy Statement proceeding did not provide the OCA the opportunity to review the details of PGW's specific plan and the impact of the interrelated components of that plan

The OCA submits that the Commission's CAP Policy Statement Order and Reconsideration Order anticipated that the changes would be evaluated as a part of the Company-specific USECP proceeding, as needed. Here, the OCA submits is the opportunity to review the proposed changes, and the OCA has requested, consistent with the Reconsideration Order, that such a review be completed. The Commission has denied that opportunity for review, contrary to its own statements about how these issues would be addressed.

C. The Commission Has Overlooked Its Normal Process Of Review For USECPs.

The Commission also overlooked its normal process for evaluating universal service and energy conservation plans. Historically, when a Company files its Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan, the Bureau of Consumer Services will hold an informal stakeholder meeting

to discuss issues and obtain information regarding the Company's proposed Plan.⁴ After this stakeholder meeting, the Commission will issue a Tentative Order and interested stakeholders have the opportunity to provide Comments and Reply Comments on the Plan. Stakeholders may also request that the issue be referred to an Administrative Law Judge for further fact-finding. The Commission will then issue a Final Order, only after having heard from interested stakeholders on the specifics of the Plan.

The OCA submits that the Commission's approval of PGW's proposal on this expedited schedule has circumvented this process. PGW's CIS changes have created an artificial timeline for the proposed changes to be implemented, and there is no need to rush the review process to meet this artificial deadline. Other companies such as PPL have identified that they do not plan to implement any changes until their next USECP filing. In its letter to the Commission, PPL proposed to implement changes as a part of its April 2022 USECP filing. See, 2019 Amendments to Policy Statement on Customer Assistance Programs, 52 Pa. Code §§ 69.261- 69.267, Docket Nos. M-2019-3012599, M-2016-2554787 PPL Letter (February 21, 2020). The Commission has overlooked the important value of its process for review.

D. The COVID-19 Impact Must Be Evaluated Further As Circumstances Continue To Unfold.

The OCA also submits that the continuing developments related to the COVID-19 pandemic present new issues that could not have been known or addressed at the time of the filing of the OCA's March 2, 2020 Answer in this proceeding. The expedited treatment for PGW's USECP was predicated on the Company's identification of the need to include the project as a part

⁴ The OCA acknowledges that PGW did present its proposed Plan to interested stakeholders prior to filing the proposed changes, but the OCA did not have the same opportunity to participate in a Commission-sponsored stakeholder process to ask questions and seek information about the proposal. PGW's pre-filing process did not include the Commission's Bureau of Consumer Services.

of the Company's upcoming CIS project. Since the time of the Company's filing and even since the time of the Commission's Order on March 26, the COVID-19 pandemic has continued to unfold and its impacts are only beginning to come to light. As a result of the Emergency Declaration, on March 26, 2020, the Commission also issued its Emergency Order for a period of up to 90 days to place a moratorium on terminations on all utilities, including PGW. See, Re: Public Utility Service Termination Moratorium Proclamation of Disaster Emergency-COVID-19 Emergency Order, Docket No: M-2020-3019244 (March 26, 2020) The OCA fully supports the Commission's actions taken on behalf of consumers during this pandemic crisis. The emergency actions are necessary to maintain the health and safety of the general public. Unemployment levels have skyrocketed and the economy has been significantly impacted. There will, however, be a future cost impact to consumers for this emergency and that cost impact may dramatically increase the costs of the program proposed by PGW and the ability of non-CAP customers to pay for the program. These proposed changes must be considered in that full context.

The OCA notes that PGW's proposed changes will not go into effect until after PGW's billing system changes are made, which was not proposed to occur until 2021. We also do not know at this time whether the COVID-19 situation will have any impact on the timeline for the Company's proposed CIS deployment. The OCA submits that consideration of the significant changes to the economic climate and utility policies needs to be included as a part of this review. The OCA submits that we should not be moving ahead with a proposed \$27-\$29 million increase in rates at a time with so much financial uncertainty.

IV. CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the OCA respectfully requests that the Commission reconsider its decision as set forth above.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Christy M. Appleby
Christy M. Appleby
Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 85824
E-Mail: CApplby@paoca.org

Phillip D. Demanchick
Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 324761
E-Mail: PDemanchick@paoca.org

Darryl A. Lawrence
Senior Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 93682
E-Mail: DLawrence@paoca.org

Counsel for:
Tanya J. McCloskey
Acting Consumer Advocate

Office of Consumer Advocate
5th Floor, Forum Place
555 Walnut Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923
Phone: (717) 783-5048
Fax: (717) 783-7152

DATE: April 10, 2020
286303.doc

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Petition for Expedited Approval of :
PGW's Letter Request to Amend its : Docket No. P-2020-3018867
Pursuant to 2019 Amendments to Policy Statement :
At Docket No. M-2019-3012599 :

VERIFICATION

I, TANYA J. MCCLOSKEY, hereby state that the facts set forth in the Petition of the Office of Consumer Advocate for Reconsideration are true and correct (or are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief) and that I expect to be able to prove the same at a hearing held in this matter. I understand that the statements herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S. Section 4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities).

Signature: /s/ Tanya J. McCloskey
Tanya J. McCloskey
Acting Consumer Advocate

Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923
Phone: (717) 783-5048
Fax: (717) 783-7152

DATE: April 10, 2020
286304.doc