

**Legal Department**

2301 Market Street/S23-1  
P.O. Box 8699  
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699

Telephone 215.841.4000  
Fax 215.568.3389  
www.exeloncorp.com

Direct Dial: 215.841.5974

September 12, 2011

**Via E-Filing and Overnight Mail**

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

**Re: Smart Meter Procurement and Installation  
Docket No. M-2009-2092655**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing are the original and three copies of the Reply Comments of PECO Energy Company to the July 8, 2011 Tentative Order in the above-captioned proceeding.

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

Very truly yours,



Jeanne J. Dworetzky  
Counsel for PECO Energy Company

JJD/adz  
Enc.

Cc: Kriss Brown, Law Bureau (kribrown@state.pa.us)  
Annunciata E, Marino, Bureau of Fixed Utility Services (annmarino@state.pa.us)

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**SMART METER PROCUREMENT AND :  
INSTALLATION PLAN :  
: DOCKET NO. M-2009-2092655  
:**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Jeanne J. Dworetzky, hereby certify and affirm that I have this day served a true and correct copy of the **Reply Comments of PECO Energy Company** regarding the July 8, 2011

Tentative Order electronically upon the following:

Tanya J. McCloskey  
Senior Assistant Consumer Advocate  
Darryl Lawrence  
Assistant Consumer Advocate  
Office of Consumer Advocate  
555 Walnut Street  
5th Floor, Forum Place  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923  
[tmccloskey@paoca.org](mailto:tmccloskey@paoca.org)

William Lloyd  
Small Business Advocate  
Office of Small Business Advocate  
Commerce Building, Suite 1102  
300 North Second Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
[willloyd@pa.gov](mailto:willloyd@pa.gov)

Johnnie Simms  
Bureau of Investigation & Enforcement  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
P.O. Box 3265  
400 North Street, 2nd Floor West  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265  
[josimms@pa.gov](mailto:josimms@pa.gov)

Kriss Brown  
Law Bureau  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
400 North Street, 2nd Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
[kribrown@pa.gov](mailto:kribrown@pa.gov)

Annunciata E. Marino  
Bureau of Fixed Utility Services  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
400 North Street, 2nd Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
[annmarino@pa.gov](mailto:annmarino@pa.gov)

*Jeanne J. Dworetzky*

---

Jeanne J. Dworetzky (Pa. No. 62389)  
Exelon Business Services Company  
2301 Market Street  
P.O. Box 8699  
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699  
Phone: 215.841.5974  
Fax: 215.568.3389  
E-mail: [jeanne.dworetzky@exeloncorp.com](mailto:jeanne.dworetzky@exeloncorp.com)

Dated: September 12, 2011

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**SMART METER PROCUREMENT                   :       Docket No. M-2009-209655**  
**AND INSTALLATION                             :**

**REPLY COMMENTS OF PECO ENERGY COMPANY  
REGARDING THE JULY 8, 2011 TENTATIVE ORDER**

Pursuant to the July 8, 2011 Tentative Order entered by the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (the “Commission”) in the above-captioned docket, PECO Energy Company (“PECO” or the “Company”) hereby submits its Reply Comments to the Initial Comments filed in response to the Tentative Order.

PECO believes that the Initial Comments reflect substantial consensus among electric distribution companies (“EDCs”) on many of the issues addressed by the Tentative Order, including the need for implementation timelines to reflect scheduled technology deployments under an EDC’s smart meter plan, the importance of avoiding the creation of uncertainty associated with implementation of those Commission-approved plans, and inherent problems in the scope of work the Commission has proposed for the Electronic Data Exchange Working Group (“EDEWG”). With respect to EDEWG, PECO agrees with all other comments – including those of EDEWG’s leadership – in concluding that the Commission’s proposed EDEWG review of EDC systems and operational costs are beyond EDEWG’s existing expertise and resources. Consistent with its Initial Comments, PECO believes that the Commission should clarify that approved EDC smart meter plans are not subject to revision by EDEWG or otherwise amended in the absence of formal proceedings, and that any process to develop a statewide solution is sufficiently robust and incorporates expertise and input from key stakeholders.

## I. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

### A. Meter-Level Interval Usage Data Should Be Made Available Upon Request

No electric generation suppliers (“EGSs”) filed comments in response to the Tentative Order regarding the appropriate method or timeline for making historical interval usage data or bill quality usage data available at the meter level. PECO currently provides interval usage data at the account level, which facilitates billing for some of PECO’s largest customers where multiple meters are linked to a single account.<sup>1</sup> Meter level data may not be as helpful as account level information for billing purposes with respect to such customers. Because the actual interest in receiving more voluminous meter level data remains unclear, PECO believes that it would be prudent to offer historical interval usage data and bill quality interval data at the meter level only upon request to allow customers and EGSs to select the most appropriate level of data for their circumstances. However, PECO also agrees with other EDCs that the implementation timeframes for providing interval data solutions should be extended, in light of the both the need for adequate development time and the need for coordination with each EDC’s scheduled technology deployments. *See* Comments of Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Power Company and West Penn Power Company (“FirstEnergy”), p. 5; PPL Electric Utilities Corp. (“PPL”) Comments, pp. 7, 9; Duquesne Light Company (“Duquesne”) Comments, pp. 6-7; Energy Association of Pennsylvania (“EAP”) Comments, p. 5.

---

<sup>1</sup> This does not appear to be the case for all EDCs; in its Initial Comments, FirstEnergy states that account level and meter level are generally the same because delivery is commonly provided through a single meter. FirstEnergy Comments, pp. 6-7.

**B. The Scope Of The Commission's Charge To EDEWG Exceeds EDEWG's Capabilities**

In the Tentative Order, the Commission tasks EDEWG with a variety of standardization efforts, including: (1) estimating system and operational costs for each required functionality for each EDC; and (2) reviewing the availability and costs of a statewide solution for each required functionality. Reports outlining EDEWG's findings on these topics are due within 90 days of entry of a Final Order. *See* Tentative Order, p. 9.

PECO agrees with EDEWG and other EDCs that EDEWG is not equipped to perform these tasks. *See* EDEWG Comments, p. 3; FirstEnergy Comments, pp. 8-9; PPL Comments, p. 15; EAP Comments, pp. 7-8. EDEWG is comprised of technical experts who perform their duties on a volunteer basis; the group does not have experience or expertise regarding financial analysis or broad policy planning. Therefore, without additional resources and additional expertise and input from a broad group of stakeholders, EDEWG is not the appropriate body to perform cost analysis of smart meter functionalities or develop statewide policy recommendations for the Commission. Even if EDEWG had the requisite expertise, 90 days is simply too short a timeframe to develop meaningful findings for Commission review.

**C. EDC Implementation Of Any New Standards Should Be Accomplished Through A Focused Plan Amendment Process And Not A Reevaluation Of Approved Smart Meter Plans**


PECO and other EDCs have spent a significant amount of time and money to begin implementation of their approved smart meter plan, including extensive information technology work and pilot programs. *See* PECO Comments, pp. 1-2, 10; Duquesne Comments, p. 3; EAP Comments, p. 7. PECO agrees with PPL that any new data exchange or access requirements should be incorporated into each EDC's plan in a manner that is coordinated with existing implementation efforts and assures cost recovery. *See* PPL Comments, pp. 8, 9, 13-15.

Furthermore, any new requirements should be incorporated only through a formal plan amendment proceeding that does not subject an EDC's entire smart meter plan to review and reevaluation. Uncertainty regarding an EDC's ability to proceed with implementation under its existing plan will likely complicate and delay ongoing efforts, possibly increasing costs and extending deployment timeframes. A formal amendment process will ensure that adequate consideration is given to each EDC's implementation schedule. The Commission should clarify in its Final Order that incorporation of new standards will be accomplished through a focused amendment proceeding that will not subject entire smart meter plans to review and revision.

## II. CONCLUSION

PECO appreciates the opportunity to participate in this important proceeding and urges the Commission to adopt the Company's proposed clarifications and recommendations as set forth in its Initial Comments and in these Reply Comments.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony E. Gay (Pa. No. 74624)  
Jeanne J. Dworetzky (Pa. No. 62389)  
Exelon Business Services Company  
2301 Market Street  
P.O. Box 8699  
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699  
Phone: 215.841.4635  
Fax: 215.568.3389  
[anthony.gay@exeloncorp.com](mailto:anthony.gay@exeloncorp.com)  
[jeanne.dworetzky@exeloncorp.com](mailto:jeanne.dworetzky@exeloncorp.com)

September 12, 2011

*For PECO Energy Company*