

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

Wayne O. Aultman, Jr.

v.

PECO Energy Company

Public Meeting February 8, 2018

2601961-ALJ

Docket No. F-2017-2601961

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER JOHN F. COLEMAN, JR.

I agree with the Initial Decision to dismiss the above-captioned Formal Complaint seeking to invalidate changes made to PECO Energy Company's (PECO) Customer Assistance Program or CAP. The changes to PECO's CAP resulted in the Complainant paying a non-discounted rate for electric service, despite what is essentially unchanged income.¹ Upon review, PECO's actions here were reasonable and entirely consistent with the terms of its CAP.

PECO provided credible record evidence that the Complainant no longer qualifies for a rate discount under its CAP. In short, the Complainant's bill was determined to be affordable under the new program design, which is why the Complainant no longer receives a CAP discount. Moreover, PECO's new program design was specifically approved by the Commission in a prior universal service plan proceeding.² Thus, PECO was acting in this case in accordance with a Commission-approved program.

I acknowledge that under PECO's new CAP, approximately 40,000 customers, including Mr. Aultman, no longer qualified for a rate discount, based on their service being deemed affordable. However, this outcome was by design. The parties who supported the change reasoned that the money freed up from those CAP customers whose service was deemed affordable would be better utilized if redirected to those CAP customers whose bills were not affordable. Moreover, customers like Mr. Aultman still can benefit from being in CAP even without a discount. These customers are still eligible to receive arrearage forgiveness and other protections and services of CAP, including prioritization for PECO's Low-Income Usage Reduction Program. Finally, PECO took steps to mitigate the effects of losing the CAP discount in the form of a Phase-Out Benefit for one year provided to affected households. As noted by the record, Mr. Aultman did, in fact, receive this Phase-Out Benefit.

DATE: February 8, 2018


JOHN F. COLEMAN, JR.
COMMISSIONER

¹ The Complainant has been enrolled in PECO's CAP since 2014 and previously paid a discounted rate.

² *PECO Energy Company Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan for 2013-2015 Submitted in Compliance with 52 Pa. Code §§ 54.74 and 62.4*, Docket No. M-2012-2290911 (Recommended Decision dated June 11, 2015; Final Order entered July 8, 2105).