**BEFORE THE**

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission : R-2015-2469275

Office of Consumer Advocate : C-2015-2475448

Office of Small Business Advocate : C-2015-2478277

PP&L Industrial Customer Alliance : C-2015-2480265

C. Wintermeyer : C-2015-2485827

Cathleen A. Woomert : C-2015-2484588

Michael B. Young : C-2015-2485860

Joseph E. McAndrew : C-2015-2489524

Michael C. Muller : C-2015-2501983

:

v. : :

PPL Electric Utilities Corporation :

:

PPL Electric Utilities Corporation :

Petition for a Waiver of the Distribution : P-2015-2474714

System Improvement Charge Cap of 5% :

of Billed Revenues :

**ERRATA NOTICE**

A review of ALJ Susan D. Colwell’s Recommended Decision, served October 5, 2015, revealed a typographical error on Page 36 in the “Settlement Revenue Allocation” column. The figure ($3,900) was used in error and this reference is changed to properly state $3,900.

**Rate Schedule Company Proposal Settlement Revenue Allocation**

(thousands) (thousands)

RS $155,278 $110,875

RTS $3,103 $1,800

GS-1 $13,047 $9,745

GS-3 $(9,985) $(3,200)

LP-4 $5,181 $(3,900) – should be $3,900

LP-5 $(1,528) $(750)

LPEP $2,552 $1,071

GH-2 $265 $355

SL/AL $(433) $204

Total $167,500 $124,000

The corrected page of the decision is attached to this notice. Please replace the incorrect page in your copy of the RD. Thank you.

The Recommended Decision on the PA PUC website will be corrected as indicated above. This correction will not affect the exception period established by the Commission’s Service Letter. Please accept our apologies for any inconvenience this may have caused you.

**Rate Schedule Company Proposal Settlement Revenue Allocation**

(thousands) (thousands)

RS $155,278 $110,875

RTS $3,103 $1,800

GS-1 $13,047 $9,745

GS-3 $(9,985) $(3,200)

LP-4 $5,181 $3,900

LP-5 $(1,528) $(750)

LPEP $2,552 $1,071

GH-2 $265 $355

SL/AL $(433) $204

Total $167,500 $124,000

(PPL Electric Exhibit JDT, p. 10); PPL Electric Stmt. in Support at 8-10.

OCA notes that the Company's original proposal was to allocate 94.7% of its proposed increase to residential customers. OCA countered the Company's cost of service study with its own, which was based on class peak demands rather than customer counts. OCA recommended allocating $109.1 million to the residential classes instead of the Company's proposed $157.3 million.

The Settlement confers $112.675 million to the residential classes, Settlement

¶ 23, which is a meaningful reduction of the proposed total distribution increase to the residential classes. OCA states:

Under the Settlement, a typical bill for a residential customer using 1,000 kWh per month will increase by $7.53 per month, or 5.11%, from $147.31 to $154.84 on a total bill basis. This is as opposed to the Company's original proposal, which would have increased the typical residential customer's total bill by $10.19 per month, or approximately 6.9%. While this provision still allocates a significant proportion of the increase to the residential classes, it is less than originally proposed and, when considered as a whole with the other provisions of the Settlement, is in the public interest.

OCA Stmt. in Support at 7.