

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120**

John J. Rounce

v.

PECO Energy Company

Public Meeting: November 9, 2016

2506941-OALJ

Docket No. C-2015-2506941

STATEMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN ANDREW G. PLACE

Before the Commission for consideration and disposition is the Initial Decision in the complaint proceeding of John J. Rounce against PECO Energy Company (PECO or Company) at the above referenced docket. Mr. Rounce alleged that he has experienced problems with his electric service including numerous outages, surges, spikes and brownouts as a PECO customer over an extended period of time. As relief, Mr. Rounce requested that the Commission conduct independent testing and investigate the alleged service issues to his residence. ALJ Vero conducted a hearing on February 1, 2016 at which exhibits and testimony were entered into the record by the Complainant and the Company.

The record in this proceeding clearly demonstrates that there were eighteen sustained outages at Mr. Rounce's residence over a five year period –January 2011 through to January 2016. The record shows that these outages had many causes – tree growth; a line cut by a contractor; an ice storm; a lightning strike, twice; a fallen tree limb; an underground cable fault, twice, and a car colliding with a utility pole, twice. Both the Complainant and Company entered evidence into the record demonstrating the outages and related causes. The record also demonstrates that PECO addressed these outages as well as the reliability of the Company's Middleton 352 distribution circuit which serves Mr. Rounce's home.

Mr. Rounce alleged "surges and spikes". I.D. at 16, Tr. 47. PECO installed a recording volt meter (RVM) at Mr. Rounce's residence following Mr. Rounce's complaint of "dirty power". Tr. 110-111, PECO Exhibit 5. Following ten days of continuous measurement, the results indicated that the voltage had remained within the limits permitted by Commission regulation. Tr. 113, 118, PECO Exhibit 5. This is the only evidence on the record concerning this particular issue.

In addition, Mr. Rounce alleged that he witnessed PECO laying a high voltage power cable above ground creating an unsafe condition in his neighborhood. I.D. at 16, Tr. 27, 29. The Complainant believed that the high voltage cable and other PECO underground equipment remained exposed for 81 days following a service outage in August 2015 creating unsafe conditions. *Id.*, Tr. 27-30, 45-46. PECO's witness indicated that it installed a temporary cable to restore power and the 2,400 volt line was fully insulated and covered by a cable raise to protect it from oncoming traffic. I.D. at 23-24, Tr. 98-99, 130. PECO also indicated that Mr. Rounce's service was not affected by the power outage in August 2015 or by the cable replacement that followed. I.D. at 24, Tr. 94-97, PECO Exhibit 2. The laying of a protected temporary cable is a permissible practice for the duration of an emergency, however, no facts were presented to dispute the emergency need for the cable in this case.

I believe that the record in this proceeding demonstrates that the Company employed significant remediation efforts, including testing and reliability measures, to address Mr. Rounce's concerns and to restore electrical service to Mr. Rounce's home as well as any other affected properties. I believe that the record was fully developed by both the Complainant and the Company and the evidence clearly demonstrates that PECO corrected the various outages through appropriate and safe measures over the time period involved.

Mr. Rounce has failed to meet his burden of proving that he is entitled to the relief he is seeking from the Commission. Therefore, I support the findings of the Initial Decision that the formal Complaint filed by Mr. Rounce against PECO Energy Company at this docket should be denied.

DATE: November 9, 2016



Andrew G. Place, Vice Chairman