

Direct Dial: 215.841.6841

May 17, 2016

VIA EMAIL and FIRST CLASS MAIL

Secretary Rosemary Chiavetta
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

**Re: David Adriance v. PECO Energy Company
PUC Docket No. F-2015-2462537**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Kindly recall that an Initial Decision was sent to the parties on April 1, 2016, for the above-referenced matter with exceptions due on April 21, 2016 and Reply Exceptions due April 30, 2016.

Please find enclosed a copy of Exceptions that were sent via facsimile to PECO Energy by the Complainant on May 13, 2016. I note that the Exceptions are dated April 21, 2016; however, they were not sent to PECO until May 13th. Additionally, the PUC docket does not reflect that these Exceptions have been docketed.

The cover letter accompanying the Initial Decision makes it clear that pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.533, Exceptions must be filed with the Commission within 20 days of the notice of the letter and mailed or hand-delivered to the opposing party within 20 days.

As the Complainant's Exceptions were not filed by April 21, 2016, and PECO was not served with the Exceptions until May 13, 2016, PECO objects to the Exceptions being docketed for consideration by the Commission.

I thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,



Shawane L. Lee
Assistant General Counsel, PECO
Encl.

cc:

David Adriance (*via first class mail*)

Home Computer
None

confidential
fax

To: Shawana Lee
Fax Number: 2155683389

From: David Adriance
Fax Number: (610) 485-4940
Business Phone: None
Home Phone: (610) 485-4940

Pages: 2
Date/Time: 5/13/2016 3:35:21 AM
Subject: RE: Reply to Request

Att: Shawana Lee

F-2015-2462537

Reply to Exception

Dear Mr. Secretary: 4/21/16

My wife and I are presently making what we stated at the time of our telephonic hearing on July 25th, 2015. We are still experiencing financial hardship given the amount of late charges, and especially the high interest rate that has accrued on the disputed amount since this whole situation commenced. My wife and I are currently paying on the current monthly budget payments. We could possibly afford \$250.00/ month on the disputed amount plus the current monthly budget payments. Until the disputed amount is satisfied. The current settlement makes it impossible to meet this obligation.

I myself have taken a transfer to a new position within the county of Delaware to make a larger salary to meet our obligations. However for this present time my salary will not be enough to offset what is owed. Also my wife has done what she can to increase her salary that has also not been enough to offset what we owe. My wife and I are currently looking into selling our home and downsizing to a smaller home with a smaller mortgage. I am also looking into filing bankruptcy so that we can try and meet our financial obligations. We have tried repeatedly in the past to apply for programs to secure help in this situation with PECO. But for various reasons have not been successful.

The time periods of my injury and illness as outlined in the history of the proceedings in Judge Veros initial decision have done much to put my wife and I behind with our other creditors, a long with PECO. We are doing our best to get ourselves out of debt. It would be our hope that the commission would reconsider the amount asked for in the commission's recent decision, and possibly consider something a bit closer to what my wife and I could reasonably afford as what was previously offered.

The facts and figures that PECO sights in the outlined history are correct but does not truly reflect the efforts that we have made to try and be proactive with addressing the situation before it escalated to the point that it has. All during this time PECO failed to try and work with us to remedy the situation.

I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you in advance for your attention in this matter.

**Sincerely Yours,
David Adriance**