

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-3265

Petition of PPL Electric  
Utilities Corporation for  
Approval of a Distribution  
System Improvement Charge

Public Meeting: April 9, 2015  
2325034-OSA  
Docket No. P-2012-2325032

PPL Electric Utilities  
Corporation

v.

Office of Consumer Advocate  
Alan D. Whitehouse  
Pamela Mosconi  
John E. Hoag  
James Weaver

Docket No. C-2013-2346390  
Docket No. C-2013-2345750  
Docket No. C-2013-2346375  
Docket No. C-2013-2345729  
Docket No. C-2013-2351090

DISSENTING STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER CAWLEY

Before us are the Exceptions of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation and the Office of Consumer Advocate filed on August 21, 2014, to the Recommended Decision of Administrative Law Judge Kandace F. Melillo, issued on August 1, 2014, relative to the Petition of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation for Approval of a Distribution System Improvement Charge (DSIC).

The final order in this proceeding reverses the decision of Judge Melillo with respect to the inclusion of the Act 129 Compliance Rider (ACR) rates and the Competitive Enhancement Rider (CER) rates in establishing the maximum allowable DSIC charges. While I appreciate the small increase in complexity this may introduce into the maximum DSIC charges allowable under an approved DSIC, the plain language of Act 11 limits these rates to an approved percentage of *distribution rates*. As articulated by Judge Melillo, there is an insufficient nexus between the CER and ACR charges relative to distribution charges, as required under the statute. Accordingly, I agree with her that PPL's DSIC should be recalculated without the inclusion of ACR and CER revenues and PPL should have issued appropriate refunds.

Lastly, if there is a need to increase the DSIC charges above 5% of distribution rates, utilities are permitted to request a higher allowance merely by petitioning this Commission.

April 9, 2015  
Date

  
James H. Cawley, Commissioner