

Morgan Lewis

Kenneth M. Kulak

Partner
+1.215.963.5384
ken.kulak@morganlewis.com

May 6, 2024

VIA eFILING

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

**Re: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v.
PECO Energy Company – Electric Division
Docket No. R-2024-3046931**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed please find the **Prehearing Conference Memorandum of PECO Energy Company**, in the above-captioned matter.

As indicated on the enclosed Certificate of Service, copies have been served upon all parties of record.

If you have any questions regarding this filing, please contact me directly at 215.963.5384.

Very truly yours,



Kenneth M. Kulak

KMK/tp
Enclosures

c: Per Certificate of Service (w/encls.)

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

2222 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-3007
United States

T +1.215.963.5000
F +1.215.963.5001

Morgan Lewis

Kenneth M. Kulak

Partner
+1.215.963.5384
ken.kulak@morganlewis.com

May 6, 2024

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

The Honorable Marta Guhl
Administrative Law Judge
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Office of Administrative Law Judge
801 Market Street, Suite 4063
Philadelphia, PA 19107

The Honorable Darlene Heep
Administrative Law Judge
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Office of Administrative Law Judge
801 Market Street, Suite 4063
Philadelphia, PA 19107

**Re: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v.
PECO Energy Company – Electric Division
Docket No. R-2024-3046931**

Dear Judge Guhl and Judge Heep:

Enclosed please find the **Prehearing Conference Memorandum of PECO Energy Company**, in the above-captioned matter.

As indicated on the enclosed Certificate of Service, copies have been served upon all parties of record.

If you have any questions regarding this filing, please contact me directly at 215.963.5384.

Very truly yours,



Kenneth M. Kulak

KMK/tp
Enclosures

c: Per Certificate of Service (w/encls.)

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

2222 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-3007
United States

T +1.215.963.5000
F +1.215.963.5001

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC
UTILITY COMMISSION**

v.

**PECO ENERGY COMPANY –
ELECTRIC DIVISION**

:
:
:
:
:
:
:

DOCKET NO. R-2024-3046931

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify and affirm that I have this day served a copy of the **Prehearing Memorandum of PECO Energy Company - Electric Division** on the following persons in the manner specified in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54:

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

The Honorable Marta Guhl
Administrative Law Judge
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Office of Administrative Law Judge
801 Market Street, Suite 4063
Philadelphia, PA 19107
mguhl@pa.gov

The Honorable Darlene Heep
Administrative Law Judge
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Office of Administrative Law Judge
801 Market Street, Suite 4063
Philadelphia, PA 19107
dheep@pa.gov

Erin L. Gannon
Barrett C. Sheridan
Gina L. Miller
Jacob D. Guthrie
Consumer Advocate
Office of Consumer Advocate
Forum Place, 5th Floor
555 Walnut Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923
OCAELECPECO2024@paoca.org
*Counsel for Office of Consumer
Advocate*

Sharon E. Webb
Rebecca Lyttle
Office of Small Business Advocate
Forum Place
555 Walnut Street, 1st Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
swebb@pa.gov
relyttle@pa.gov
*Counsel for Office of Small Business
Advocate*

Carrie Wright
Director & Chief Prosecutor
Bureau of Investigation & Enforcement
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commerce Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
carwright@pa.gov
*Counsel for Bureau of Investigation
& Enforcement*

Charles T. Joyce
Samuel E. Shopp
Spear Wilderman, P.C.
230 South Broad Street, Suite 1650
Philadelphia, PA 19102
ctjoyce@spearwilderman.com
sshopp@spearwilderman.com
*Counsel for Local 614 of the
International Brotherhood of
Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO*

David P. Zambito
Jonathan P. Nase
Cozen O'Connor
17 North Second Street, Suite 1410
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1236
dzambito@cozen.com
jnase@cozen.com
*Counsel for The Trustees of the University of
Pennsylvania and The Hospital at the
University of Pennsylvania*

William A. Lesser
Cozen O'Connor
3 WTC
175 Greenwich Street, 55th Floor
New York, NY 10007
wlesser@cozen.com
Counsel for Electrify America, LLC

Charis Mincavage
Adeolu A. Bakare
Brigid Landy Khuri
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
100 Pine Street
P.O. Box 1166
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166
cmincavage@mcneeslaw.com
abakare@mcneeslaw.com
bkhuri@mcneeslaw.com
*Counsel for Philadelphia Area Industrial
Energy Users Group*

Nicholas J. Enoch
Lubin & Enoch, P.C.
349 North 4th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85003-1505
nick@lubinandenoch.com
*Counsel for Local 614 of the
International Brotherhood of
Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO*

Charlotte E. Edelstein
Joline R. Price
Vikram A. Patel
Robert W. Ballenger
Community Legal Services, Inc.
1424 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102
cedelstein@clsphila.org
jprice@clsphila.org
vpatel@clsphila.org
rballenger@clsphila.org
*Counsel for The Tenant Union
Representative Network and the Coalition
for Affordable Utility Services and Energy
Efficiency in Pennsylvania*

Stephen Bright
Electrify America, LLC
1950 Opportunity Way, Suite 1500
Reston, VA 20190
steve.bright@electrifyamerica.com
Counsel for Electrify America, LLC

Derrick Price Williamson
Barry A. Naum
Steven W. Lee
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
1100 Bent Creek Boulevard, Suite 101
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050
dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com
bnaum@spilmanlaw.com
slee@spilmanlaw.com
Counsel for Walmart Inc.

Laura Antinucci
Deputy City Solicitor
James Kellett
Divisional Deputy City Solicitor
Philadelphia Law Department
1515 Arch Street. 16th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19102
laura.antinucci@phila.gov
james.kellett@phila.gov
*Counsel for City of Philadelphia and
Philadelphia Energy Authority*

Bernice I. Corman
Bicky Corman Law, PLLC
1200 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
bcorman@bickycormanlaw.com
Counsel for EVgo Services, LLC

Lindsey Stegall
Katelyn Lee
EVgo Services, LLC
11835 West Olympic Boulevard, Suite
900E
Los Angeles, CA 90064
lindsey.stegall@evgo.com
katelyn.lee@evgo.com
Counsel for EVgo Services, LLC

Alan Michael Seltzer
John F. Povilaitis
Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC
409 North Second Street, Suite 500
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1357
alan.seltzer@bipc.com
john.povilaitis@bipc.com
*Counsel for Constellation Energy
Generation, LLC and Constellation
NewEnergy, Inc.*

Baird Brown
eco(n)law, LLC
230 South Broad Street, 17th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19102
baird@eco-n-law.net
*Counsel for City of Philadelphia and
Philadelphia Energy Authority*

Alan McCarthy
705 East Barnard Street
West Chester, PA 19382
alanmccarthy25@hotmail.com



Kenneth M. Kulak (Pa. No. 75509)
Mark A. Lazaroff (Pa. No. 315407)
Catherine G. Vasudevan (Pa. No. 210254)
Brooke E. McGlinn (Pa. No. 204918)
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
2222 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-3007
215.963.5384 (bus)
215.963.5001 (fax)
ken.kulak@morganlewis.com
mark.lazaroff@morganlewis.com
catherine.vasudevan@morganlewis.com
brooke.mcglinn@morganlewis.com

Dated: May 6, 2024

Counsel for PECO Energy Company

DB1/ 145583231.1

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. R-2024-3046931
	:	
PECO ENERGY COMPANY – ELECTRIC DIVISION	:	

**PREHEARING MEMORANDUM
OF
PECO ENERGY COMPANY – ELECTRIC DIVISION**

This memorandum is submitted in response to the Prehearing Conference Order issued by Administrative Law Judges Marta Guhl and Darlene Heep dated April 29, 2024.

I. INTRODUCTION

On March 28, 2024, PECO Energy Company (“PECO” or “the Company”) filed with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“Commission”) Tariff Electric – Pa. P.U.C. No. 8 (“Tariff No. 8”). Tariff No. 8 reflects an increase in annual distribution revenue of approximately \$464 million. PECO is also proposing a one-time credit of \$64 million, resulting in a net electric increase of \$399 million in 2025. The Company submitted a detailed Statement of Reasons supporting its requested rate increase with its initial filing, attached as Exhibit “A” hereto. By Order entered April 25, 2024, the Commission instituted a formal investigation to determine the lawfulness, justness and reasonableness of PECO’s existing and proposed rates, rules and regulations. Accordingly, Tariff No. 8 was suspended by operation of law until December 27, 2024.¹

¹ Order, *Pa. P.U.C. v. PECO Energy Company*, Docket No. R-2024-3046931 (Order entered April 25, 2024).

Accompanying its tariff filing, PECO submitted extensive and detailed supporting information, including the prepared written testimony and exhibits of its ten initial witnesses. During this case, PECO may submit additional testimony and exhibits in response to presentations of, or cross-examination by, other parties and with respect to any specific issues that might be raised by such parties. In addition, certain testimony and exhibits will be updated, as necessary, to reflect known changes that should be considered in this proceeding.

In support of its proposed rate increase, PECO has presented complete and separate data for the historic test year (“HTY”) ended December 31, 2023, the future test year (“FTY”) ending December 31, 2024, and the fully projected future test year (“FPFTY”) ending December 31, 2025. PECO intends, however, to rely primarily on the FPFTY data. PECO submits that the record at the close of this proceeding will fully demonstrate that the proposed rates are lawful, just and reasonable and should be approved in full by the Commission.

On April 2, 2024, Carrie B. Wright, Esquire, Prosecutor for the Commission’s Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (“I&E”) filed her Notice of Appearance. On April 11, 2024, the Office of Consumer Advocate (“OCA”) filed a Notice of Appearance on behalf of Erin L. Gannon, Esquire, Gina L. Miller, Esquire, Barrett C. Sheridan, Esquire, and Jacob D. Guthrie, Esquire, as well as a formal Complaint and Public Statement. The Office of Small Business Advocate (“OSBA”) filed their Notice of Appearance on behalf of Sharon E. Webb, Esquire and Rebecca Lyttle, Esquire, as well as a formal Complaint and Public Statement on April 16, 2024. On April 17, 2024, a *pro se* Formal Complaint was filed against PECO by Alan McCarthy and on April 24, 2024, the Philadelphia Area Industrial Energy Users Group (“PAIEUG”) filed a Complaint.

As of this date, the Company has been served with Petitions to Intervene by Local 614 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO (“IBEW”) on April 12, 2024, the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania and the Hospital at the University of Pennsylvania (“UPENN”) on April 22, 2024, the Tenant Union Representative Network (“TURN”) and the Coalition for Affordable Utility Services and Energy Efficiency in Pennsylvania (“CAUSE-PA”) on April 26, 2024, EVgo Services, LLC on May 1, 2024, Walmart Inc. (“Walmart”) on May 2, 2024, Electrify America, LLC on May 2, 2024, the City of Philadelphia and Philadelphia Energy Authority on May 3, 2024, and Constellation Energy Generation, LLC and Constellation NewEnergy, Inc., on May 3, 2024.

II. ISSUES

Generally, every rate case presents two major issues for resolution: (1) the total amount of the revenue increase to which the utility is entitled; and (2) the allocation of the increased revenues among the utility’s rate classifications through a rate structure and rate design that will produce the required revenue.

A determination of the total revenue increase to which a utility is entitled involves several elements which may be grouped under three headings and characterized as the following major sub-issues herein:

A. Total Return. The total return (utility operating income) required by the utility to provide a fair rate of return on its claimed rate base. Fair rate of return involves the determination of the appropriate cost or return rate for the capital employed by the Company to furnish electric service. Such return must be sufficient to enable the Company to maintain the financial integrity of its existing capital and to attract additional capital on reasonable terms. In addition, the Company must be permitted an opportunity to earn, on the portion of its rate base

financed by common equity, a return commensurate with the returns on investments in other enterprises having similar risks. The appropriate rate of return for the Company, and in particular the appropriate return rate for the Company's common equity, is an issue which is critical to the well-being of the Company and its ability to continue to provide the service that its customers have been receiving and are entitled to receive in the future.

B. Operating Expenses. The future or ongoing level of the utility's operating expenses to provide electric service, including depreciation, amortizations and taxes, which must be recovered from customers through rates.

C. Revenues. The electric distribution revenue normally available to the utility under present rates and the level of revenue that will be produced by the proposed rates.

By comparing the electric distribution revenue produced by the utility's present rates with its total required operating income and anticipated electric distribution operating expenses, depreciation, amortizations and taxes, the necessary increase in revenue and rate levels required to provide a fair rate of return is determined.

PECO proposes certain changes in rate design, which include principally aligning fixed distribution/customer charges with, or closer to, customer-classified costs. Certain other changes in rate design and in the rules, regulations and riders set forth in the Company's tariff are described in the testimony of Mr. Joseph A. Bisti and Ms. Megan A. McDevitt (PECO Statement Nos. 7 and 8, respectively).

III. WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE

Listed below are the initial witnesses for PECO, together with a brief summary of the subject matter of their direct testimony.

1. **Nicole L. LeVine** (PECO Statement No. 1) is PECO's Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer. Ms. LeVine describes PECO's electric distribution operations; provides an overview of this rate filing, including an introduction of the other witnesses who will present testimony in support of PECO's case-in-chief; explains PECO's capital investment process and identifies the types of projects that comprise PECO's claimed FTY and FPFTY plant additions; describes various measures by PECO to ensure system reliability; discusses PECO's customer service operations and several additional programs to help customers save energy and use new energy technologies; describes measures taken by the Company with respect to safety, security, and its environmental impact; describes the fulfillment of the commitments made by the Company as part of the settlement approved by the Commission in PECO's 2021 electric base rate proceeding; discusses PECO's community work and support for economic and workforce development and diversity, equity and inclusion; and addresses PECO's overall management performance in relation to the factors identified in Section 523 of the Public Utility Code.

2. **Marissa Humphrey** (PECO Statement No. 2) is Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer at PECO. Ms. Humphrey discusses PECO's need for rate relief and its efforts to minimize both customer and PECO's costs. Ms. Humphrey also provides an overview of PECO's principal accounting exhibits; discusses PECO's budgeting process; describes the services that PECO receives from affiliated entities and the estimated costs of those services during the FTY and FPFTY; and discusses the impact of the Corporate Alternative Minimum Tax.

3. **Michael J. Trzaska** (PECO Statement No. 3) is a Principal Regulatory and Rates Specialist at PECO. Mr. Trzaska sponsors PECO Exhibits MJT-1, MJT-2 and MJT-3, which set forth PECO's revenue requirement for the FPFTY ending December 31, 2025, FTY ending

December 31, 2024, and HTY ended December 31, 2023, respectively. In those exhibits and his direct testimony, Mr. Trzaska specifically supports PECO's rate base, revenue, operating expense and tax claims, as well as the Company's proposed Storm Reserve Account, and describes the customer credits of fiber network fees and COVID-19 pandemic benefits.

4. **Caroline Fulginiti** (PECO Statement No. 4) is the Vice President and Assistant Controller at Exelon. Ms. Fulginiti describes PECO's accounting processes; supports the assignment and allocation of common costs between PECO's electric and gas operations; and explains the development of the depreciated original cost of the Company's electric utility plant in service and its claim for annual depreciation expense.

5. **Paul R. Moul** (PECO Statement No. 5) is the Managing Consultant of P. Moul & Associates, Inc. Mr. Moul presents testimony concerning the rate of return that PECO should be afforded an opportunity to earn on its rate base. He supports PECO's claimed capital structure ratios, its embedded costs of debt, and its requested equity allowance.

6. **Tamara J. Jamison** (PECO Statement No. 6) is Senior Manager, Revenue Policy at PECO. Ms. Jamison presents an unbundled, fully allocated, customer class cost-of-service study ("COSS").

7. **Joseph A. Bisti** (PECO Statement No. 7) is a Manager of Rate Analysts at PECO. Mr. Bisti presents PECO's proposed tariff rates and explains how the results of Ms. Jamison's COSS, as well as the consideration of other factors, were utilized in the rate design process.

8. **Megan A. McDevitt** (PECO Statement No. 8) is a Senior Manager, Retail Rates at PECO. Ms. McDevitt discusses proposed changes and clarifications to PECO's electric service tariff.

9. **Steven J. DeMott** (PECO Statement No. 9) is PECO's Senior Manager, Strategic Planning. He discusses PECO's proposal to extend its pilot incentive programs for electric vehicle ("EV") charging and the Company's proposal to extend and modify its Electric Vehicle Fast Charging Pilot Rider.

10. **Jacqueline F. Golden** (PECO Statement No. 10) is the Director of Customer Financial Operations at PECO. Ms. Golden addresses Company proposals regarding Customer Assistance Program ("CAP") cost recovery, other universal service programs, enhancements to PECO's Matching Energy Assistance Fund ("MEAF"), and expanded outreach and education plans for low to moderate income customers.

The Company may present additional witnesses to address the direct testimony of other parties; however, such witnesses cannot be identified until the direct testimony of such parties is reviewed and evaluated.

IV. DISCOVERY

To date, PECO has been served with 461 interrogatories and data requests, and PECO has responded to approximately 425 of those inquiries. PECO encourages informal exchanges of information and is prepared to meet with representatives of the other active parties to discuss issues of interest.

PECO proposes that discovery should be conducted in accordance with the Commission's regulations at 52 Pa. Code, Chapter 5, Subchapter D, subject to the modifications proposed in the attached Exhibit "B" hereto.

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.341(b) and § 5.342(e), respectively, neither discovery requests and responses, nor objections to interrogatories, are to be served on the Commission or

the Administrative Law Judges, although a certificate of service should be filed with the Commission's Secretary.

In addition, PECO has submitted to the parties for their consideration a proposed Protective Order, which is attached as Exhibit "C" hereto. It is substantially the same form of Protective Order approved by the presiding Administrative Law Judge in PECO's 2021 electric base rate proceeding. PECO also expects that the parties will have no objections to its adoption, and respectfully requests that the Administrative Law Judges enter the proposed Protective Order.

V. PROPOSED PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

PECO proposes the schedule attached as Exhibit "D" to this Memorandum for the submission of testimony, public input hearings, the conduct of evidentiary hearings, and briefing. The Company believes this schedule should be acceptable to the parties, subject to approval by the Administrative Law Judges of any scheduling accommodations in the order of witnesses at hearings.

VI. SETTLEMENT

PECO will pursue stipulations of individual issues with the parties and the possibility of settlement that might lead to a comprehensive resolution of this matter.

VII. SERVICE LIST

PECO requests that the official service list entry for the Company be as follows:

Jack R. Garfinkle (Pa. No. 81892)
Jennedy S. Johnson (Pa. No. 203098)
Caroline S. Choi (Pa. No. 320554)
PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone: 267.533.1999
Fax: 215.568.3389
jack.garfinkle@exeloncorp.com
jennedy.johnson@exeloncorp.com
caroline.choi@exeloncorp.com

PECO also requests that a copy of all correspondence, discovery, testimony and other materials sent to the Company be provided to:

Kenneth M. Kulak (Pa. No. 75509)
Mark A. Lazaroff (Pa. No. 315407)
Catherine G. Vasudevan (Pa. No. 210254)
Brooke E. McGlinn (Pa. No. 204918)
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
2222 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-3007
Phone: 215.963.5384
Fax: 215.963.5001
ken.kulak@morganlewis.com
mark.lazaroff@morganlewis.com
catherine.vasudevan@morganlewis.com
brooke.mcglinn@morganlewis.com

Additionally, PECO also requests that a copy of all correspondence, discovery, testimony and other materials sent to the Company be provided to Andrea Preate via electronic mail at andrea.preate-regni@morganlewis.com.

The lead attorney for the Company for purposes of the Prehearing Conference will be Kenneth M. Kulak of Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Based on the evidence referenced above, PECO submits that the rates proposed in Tariff Electric – Pa. P.U.C. No. 8 are lawful, just and reasonable in all respects. Accordingly, the requested rate increase should be approved by the Administrative Law Judges and the Commission at the close of this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,



Jack R. Garfinkle (Pa. No. 81892)
Jennedy S. Johnson (Pa. No. 203098)
Caroline S. Choi (Pa. No. 320554)
PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone: 267.533.1999
Fax: 215.568.3389
jack.garfinkle@exeloncorp.com
jennedy.johnson@exeloncorp.com
caroline.choi@exeloncorp.com

Kenneth M. Kulak (Pa. No. 75509)
Mark A. Lazaroff (Pa. No. 315407)
Catherine G. Vasudevan (Pa. No. 210254)
Brooke E. McGlinn (Pa. No. 204918)
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
2222 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-3007
Phone: 215.963.5384
Fax: 215.963.5001
ken.kulak@morganlewis.com
mark.lazaroff@morganlewis.com
catherine.vasudevan@morganlewis.com
brooke.mcglinn@morganlewis.com

Dated: May 6, 2024

Counsel for PECO Energy Company

EXHIBIT A

Statement of Reasons

PECO ENERGY COMPANY

STATEMENT OF SPECIFIC REASONS FOR PROPOSED INCREASE IN ELECTRIC RATES

I. Introduction

PECO Energy Company (“PECO” or the “Company”) is requesting an annual overall electric rate increase of approximately \$464 million. PECO is also proposing a one-time credit of \$64 million, resulting in a net electric rate increase of \$399 million in 2025. In accordance with Section 1308 of the Public Utility Code, the tariff setting forth the Company’s proposed rates bears an effective date of May 27, 2024. However, the Company anticipates that its requested increase will be suspended and investigated by the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“PUC” or the “Commission”) and, therefore, the Company does not expect that new Commission-approved rates will become effective until approximately January 1, 2025.

PECO last filed for a rate increase in 2021. The principle reasons for the Company’s proposed rate increase are: (1) to permit the Company to earn a fair return on the substantial investments used and useful in the Company’s provision of safe and reliable electric service to customers; (2) to support additional investments in utility infrastructure in accordance with the Company’s Commission-approved infrastructure replacement program; (3) to deploy new information technology to meet our customers’ expectations and drive operational improvements and efficiencies; and (4) to recover higher operating expenses necessary to provide electric utility service, including increased costs of labor, contracting, and materials.

II. Reasons for the Requested Rate Increase

A. Fair return on the substantial investments used to serve customers

PECO provides electric distribution service to approximately 1.7 million electric customers located throughout a 2,100 square-mile area in southeastern Pennsylvania. The Company's electric operations include thousands of miles of underground distribution cable, aerial distribution lines, and higher-voltage transmission lines. In addition, the Company operates and maintains 440 power substations. It takes considerable expertise and significant capital investment and operations and maintenance ("O&M") activities to provide PECO's customers with safe and reliable service. PECO continuously strives to improve its system reliability, customer service, and service offerings to meet evolving customer expectations and needs.

Since PECO last requested a base rate increase for its electric operations in 2021,¹ PECO has continued to make substantial investments in new and replacement utility plant to ensure that customers can continue to receive the safe and reliable service they have come to expect. Between January 1, 2023 and December 31, 2025, the end of the fully projected future test year ("FPFTY") in this filing, PECO will have invested over \$3.5 billion in new and replacement electric distribution plant. Absent a rate increase, the Company's overall rate of return at present rates is projected to be only 4.43% for the FPFTY, as shown in Schedule A-1 of PECO Exhibit MJT-1, the Direct Testimony of Mr. Michael J. Trzaska (PECO Statement No. 3). More importantly, the indicated return on common equity under present rates is anticipated to be only 4.31%, which is inadequate by any reasonable standard

¹ *PECO Energy Company General Base Rate Filing for Electric Operations*, Docket No. R-2021-3024601, filed on March 30, 2021.

and far less than required to provide the Company with a reasonable opportunity to attract capital.

Without the requested rate relief, PECO's financial results would deteriorate even further in 2025 and thereafter. This would jeopardize the Company's ability to appropriately invest in the infrastructure needed to maintain and improve its safety, reliability, and customer-service levels. It would also have an adverse impact on PECO's credit-coverage ratios and negative implications with respect to maintaining the Company's current credit ratings, which would increase the Company's financing costs and, ultimately, the cost to customers.

B. Support for Commission-approved infrastructure replacement

Many of the Company's capital investments are made in coordination with the goals and requirements of PECO's Long-Term Infrastructure Improvement Plan ("LTIIIP"), which the Commission approved on November 19, 2020. In that proceeding, the Commission approved PECO's plans to spend \$1.36 billion on targeted reliability projects to prevent storm-related outages, replace electric cable, and replace or retire substation equipment and small substations. These LTIIIP investments are in addition to the capital spending associated with the Company's proposed rate increase but involve many of the same types of capital work. By aligning the Company's planned capital investments through the FPFTY and the Company's planned LTIIIP expenditures, the Company is able to improve reliability and replace aging infrastructure more efficiently and at lower overall cost to customers.

C. Deployment of new information technology for grid modernization and customer service

PECO is making significant capital investments in information technology to drive operational improvements and efficiencies, reduce risk, and increase reliability. The

Company is investing in its upgraded Advanced Distribution Management System to provide state-of-the-art, modernized tools to improve reliability, resiliency, and customer experience during storms, increase operational efficiency, and provide a coordinated platform for implementation and deployment of the new operational capabilities that our customers want the electric distribution system to provide. Information technology investments relating to customer operations and service include substantial improvements to the technology PECO customers use to access account and outage information; enroll in assistance and energy-saving programs; make start, stop, and move requests; receive usage data; and receive and pay bills.

D. Increased costs to provide public service

Continued investment in PECO's electric distribution system is needed to serve customers, but the cost of doing so has increased significantly. Inflation and interest rates have also risen at a historic pace, which has raised the cost of investment and led to increases in the Company's labor, contracting, and materials expense.

The Company has successfully mitigated the impact of these costs to the extent possible. Notably, PECO's annual growth rate in O&M expenses since 2022 is 25% lower than the recent average 5.5% inflation increase in the Consumer Price Index, and PECO's projected O&M growth rate is 4.1% when adjusted for storms and "make ready" work requested by third parties.

Notwithstanding PECO's aggressive cost-containment and management efforts, the Company faces significant increases in a variety of areas that are not within PECO's control. These include inflation and other financial costs, as well as numerous other operational cost increases that cannot be avoided. In planning for and implementing capital investments, PECO

must manage a variety of global and domestic supply chain challenges that continue to impact equipment costs and the availability and lead time for certain materials, including transformers critical for PECO's system.

In addition, even with increased efforts focused on vegetation management across PECO's system, costs associated with certain storms have been significantly more volatile. Such costs are very difficult to predict given the nature of storms, and as such, PECO is proposing a new Storm Reserve Account in this proceeding. The Company's use of the Storm Reserve Account will enable PECO to recover its actual storm damages – neither more nor less – and ensure that customers are only paying for actual storm costs.

III. Management Performance

As set forth in the testimony accompanying this rate case filing, PECO has demonstrated superior management performance. The Company's efforts and accomplishments include:

Quality and Reliability of Service

- Outperforming the Commission's target levels for System Average Interruption Frequency Index and System Average Interruption Duration Index and achieving first quartile ranking when benchmarked against similar utilities.
- Installing new distribution system automation technology in 2021-2023 to avoid more than 2.2 million customer interruptions.
- Reducing frequency of interruptions for customers experiencing multiple interruptions by an average of 36% since our last rate case.
- Achieving the lowest power outage rate in Company history, with 86% of customers experiencing zero or one outage in 2023.
- Achieving first quartile performance (99.83%) by the Company's advanced metering infrastructure, which is above the current industry average.

Energy Efficiency and Customer Energy Savings

- Continuing PECO's award-winning Energy Efficiency and Conservation Program, now in its third year of its fourth phase (2021-2026) and saving PECO

customers more than 545,045 MWh of energy in the first two years of the current program.

- Being recognized as an ENERGY STAR Partner of the Year Sustained Excellence award recipient, as well as an ENERGY STAR New Construction Market Leader Award recipient for the past four consecutive years in recognition of the Company's commitment to energy efficient new home construction.
- Developing new innovative programs to help customers save energy, including an Act 129 Health and Safety Pilot for low-income customers resulting in \$500,000 of health and safety services leading to \$1.3 million in energy efficiency work completed at no cost for these customers.

Customer Service

- Ranking second out of seventeen utilities in the JD Power East Large Region Electric Utility Residential Customer Satisfaction Study.
- Offering residential customers an electric vehicle registration rebate and non-residential customers rebates for installing electric vehicle chargers.
- Deploying a Digital Solar Toolkit with an interactive viability map to facilitate customer solar applications and interconnections, as well as automating technical analyses for a majority of solar applications.

Employee Safety

- Maintaining the highest standards for workplace safety, finishing 2022 and 2023 with zero High Energy Serious Injuries or Fatalities.
- Continuously improving performance and fostering a safety culture that engages the entire workforce to prevent accidents, injuries, and occupational illnesses.

Environmental Achievements

- Continuing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from Company operations, with a reduction of approximately 50% from 2015 through 2023.
- On track to achieving goals of electrifying 30% of the Company's vehicle by 2025 and 50% by 2030.

Promoting PECO's Communities and Diversity as well as Economic and Workforce Development

- Investing more than \$38 million through corporate donations and employee giving campaigns (with corporate matching gifts) in hundreds of local and regional non-profit programs, organizations and institutions in Southeastern Pennsylvania that provide access to arts and culture, and support STEM

education, the environment and green spaces, community vitality, workforce development, and reduction of gun violence.

- Supporting our employees in volunteering nearly 60,000 hours with a wide variety of community organizations.
- Along with other Exelon operating companies and the Exelon Foundation, creating a \$36 million Community Equity Capital Fund to begin establishing access to capital for small businesses from under-resourced communities so that they can create more jobs, grow their companies, and reinvest in their neighborhoods and communities.

IV. Supporting Data

PECO is filing all of the supporting data required by the Commission’s regulations, including data for the historic test year (“HTY”) ended December 31, 2023; the future test year (“FTY”) ending December 31, 2024; and the FPFTY ending December 31, 2025.

Because the Company is basing its claim principally on the level of operations for the FPFTY, the discussion that follows will address FPFTY data.

Rate Base. PECO’s measures of value reflect the Company’s balances of electric distribution plant on December 31, 2025, including common plant used in, and appropriately allocated to, electric distribution operations, as shown in Schedule C of PECO Exhibit MJT-1. The estimated original cost of gross plant on December 31, 2025 was developed by adding the estimated plant additions by account for 2024 and 2025 to, and subtracting the estimated plant retirements for 2024 and 2025 from, the estimated original cost of gross plant as of December 31, 2023. The estimated accumulated book reserve on December 31, 2025 was calculated in similar fashion. Specifically, the December 31, 2025 estimated accumulated depreciation was developed by: (1) adding the 2024 and 2025 estimated annual depreciation accruals to the actual accumulated depreciation by account as of January 1, 2024; (2) subtracting the estimated 2024 and 2025 plant retirements by account; and (3) adding 2024 and 2025 estimated salvage and subtracting estimated removal costs that are closed to the book reserve,

by account. The depreciated original cost of utility plant in service, cash working capital, and materials and supplies were included in the determination of the measures of value, while accumulated deferred Federal income taxes, a thirteen-month average of customer advances, and a thirteen-month average of customer deposits were deducted from measures of value.

Operating Revenue and Expenses. The revenue and expense claims for the FPFTY have been prepared in accordance with accepted practices of the Commission. Operating revenues at present rates were derived from budgeted revenues for PECO's electric operations for the twelve months ending December 31, 2025 and adjusted in the manner summarized on Schedule D-5 of PECO Exhibit MJT-1. Principal revenue adjustments include the removal of revenues related to portions of the Company's business that are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, decreased revenues resulting from the implementation of Act 129 energy efficiency programs, the removal of revenues billed under the surcharges (i.e., non-base rate revenue) that recover the cost of implementing the Company's energy efficiency and conservation programs pursuant to Act 129, the annualization of revenues for changes in the number of customers and the discounts provided to customers in PECO's Customer Assistance Plan, and increasing revenue to reflect a normalized annual service period containing 365.25 days.

Pro forma FPFTY operating expenses were developed from PECO's budget for electric operations for the twelve months ending December 31, 2025. Budgeted expenses were prepared based on the business activities and related cost categories of PECO's electric division (e.g., payroll, pensions, employee benefits, outside contracting costs). The expenses were distributed to the accounts identified in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") Uniform System of Accounts based on the expense distribution experienced by the

Company during the HTY. The budget data, as distributed to FERC accounts, were annualized and/or normalized in accordance with established Commission ratemaking practices, and other appropriate adjustments were made, all of which are set forth in Schedule D of PECO Exhibit MJT-1. The necessary adjustments were made to the appropriate FERC accounts.

Annual depreciation expense for electric and common plant in service on December 31, 2025 was calculated using the remaining life method, which the Commission has previously approved for PECO's electric operations. PECO's claim for the estimated annualized depreciation accrual associated with electric plant in service on December 31, 2025 is set forth in Schedule D-17 of PECO Exhibit MJT-1 and is described by Mr. Trzaska in PECO Statement No. 3. The manner in which PECO developed its claimed annual accrual is described by Ms. Caroline Fulginiti (PECO Statement No. 4).

Income Taxes. Income taxes were calculated using procedures commonly accepted by the Commission. The interest expense deduction was synchronized with the Company's measures of value and claimed weighted-average cost of long-term debt. The normalization method was used to reflect the tax-book timing differences associated with the use of accelerated methods of tax depreciation to the extent permitted by the Commission and legal precedent. In addition, there are adjustments to other tax-book differences and flow-through amounts. The income tax expense claims for the FPFTY at present rate and proposed rate revenue levels are shown on PECO Exhibit MJT-1, Schedule D-18.

As is evident from the foregoing and the extensive supporting data filed by the Company, the proposed increase is just and reasonable and is the minimum increase necessary to enable the Company to earn a reasonable return on the fair value of its property that is used

and useful in the public service, to maintain the integrity of its existing capital, and to attract new capital.

V. Rate Structure and Rate Design

As Mr. Joseph A. Bisti (PECO Statement No. 7) explains, in developing its rate-structure proposal, the Company considered the results of a cost of service study performed by Ms. Tamara J. Jamison (PECO Statement No. 6). While the cost of service study was used as a guide, the Company also considered the principle of gradualism that has traditionally been applied in Pennsylvania. Accordingly, the proposed rates were designed to mitigate the impact on each major rate class, to the extent practicable, while still making meaningful movement toward the system average rate of return.

PECO proposes certain changes in rate design, which include principally aligning fixed distribution/customer charges with, or closer to, customer-classified costs. Certain other changes in rate design and in the rules, regulations, and riders set forth in the Company's tariff are described in the testimony of Mr. Bisti and Ms. Megan McDevitt (PECO Statement No. 8).

VI. Customer Credit

During the first year new rates would be in effect (2025), PECO is proposing to credit our customers with amounts PECO received for past use of its electronic fiber network by PECO affiliates and certain benefits PECO obtained during the COVID-19 pandemic, which would reduce 2025 rates by a combined total of \$64 million.

VII. Conclusion

The requested increase in revenues is the minimum necessary to enable the Company to appropriately invest in the infrastructure needed to maintain and improve its

safety, reliability and customer-service levels; to maintain the integrity of PECO's existing capital; to attract additional capital at reasonable costs; and to have an opportunity to achieve a fair rate of return on its investment in property dedicated to public service. The Company's proposed revenue allocation and rate design are just, reasonable, and non-discriminatory. Accordingly, the Company's proposed rates, rules, and terms of service should be permitted to become effective as filed.

EXHIBIT B

Proposed Discovery Modifications

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION	:	
	:	Docket No. R-2024-3046931
v.	:	
PECO ENERGY COMPANY – ELECTRIC DIVISION	:	
	:	
	:	

PECO PROPOSED DISCOVERY PROCEDURE MODIFICATIONS

1. After the Company’s rebuttal testimony is served, answers to written interrogatories are to be served in-hand within twelve (12) calendar days of service of the interrogatories.
2. Objections to interrogatories are to be communicated orally within three (3) days of service; unresolved objections are to be served on the Administrative Law Judge in writing within five (5) days of service of the interrogatories.
3. Motions to dismiss objections and/or direct the answering of interrogatories are to be filed within three (3) business days of service of written objections.
4. Answers to motions to dismiss objections and/or directing the answering of interrogatories shall be filed within three (3) business days of service of such motions.
5. Requests for admission are deemed admitted unless answered within ten (10) calendar days or objected to within five (5) calendar days of service.
6. When an interrogatory, request for production, request for admission or motion is served after 12:00 p.m. on a Friday or the day before a holiday, the appropriate response period is deemed to start on the next business day.
7. Interrogatories, requests for production and requests for admissions that are objected to but which are not made the subject of a motion to compel will be deemed withdrawn.
8. Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §5.341(b), neither discovery requests nor responses thereto are to be served on the Commission or the Administrative Law Judge, although a certificate of service may be filed with the Commission’s Secretary.

EXHIBIT C

Proposed Protective Order

3. For purposes of this Protective Order there are two categories of Proprietary Information: “CONFIDENTIAL” and “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” protected material. A producing party may designate as “CONFIDENTIAL” those materials that are customarily treated by that party as sensitive or proprietary, that are not available to the public, and that, if generally disclosed, would subject that party or its clients to the risk of competitive disadvantage or other business injury. A producing party may designate as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” those materials that are of such a commercially sensitive nature, relative to the business interests of parties to this proceeding, or of such a private or personal nature, that the producing party determined that a heightened level of confidential protection with respect to those materials is appropriate. The parties shall endeavor to limit the information designated as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” protected material.

4. Subject to the terms of this Protective Order, Proprietary Information shall be provided to counsel for a party who meets the criteria of a “Reviewing Representative” as set forth below. Such counsel shall use or disclose the Proprietary Information only for purposes of preparing or presenting evidence, testimony, cross examination or argument in this proceeding. To the extent required for participation in this proceeding, such counsel may allow others to have access to Proprietary Information only in accordance with the conditions and limitations set forth in this Protective Order.

5. Information deemed “CONFIDENTIAL” shall be provided to a “Reviewing Representative.” For purposes of “CONFIDENTIAL” Proprietary Information, a “Reviewing Representative” is a person who has signed a Non-Disclosure Certificate and is:

- i. A statutory advocate, or an attorney for a statutory advocate pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 1.8 or an attorney who has formally entered an appearance in this proceeding on behalf of a party;
- ii. An attorney, paralegal, or other employee associated for purposes of this case with an attorney described in subparagraph (i) above;
- iii. An expert or an employee of an expert retained by a party for the purpose of advising that party or testifying in this proceeding on behalf of that party; or
- iv. Employees or other representatives of a party to this proceeding who have significant responsibility for developing or presenting the party's positions in this docket.

6. Information deemed "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" protected material shall be provided to a Reviewing Representative, provided, however that a Reviewing Representative, for purposes of "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" protected material, is limited to a person who has signed a Non-Disclosure Certificate and is:

- i. A statutory advocate, or an attorney for a statutory advocate, pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 1.8 or an attorney who has formally entered an appearance in this proceeding on behalf of a party;
- ii. An attorney, paralegal, or other employee associated for purposes of this case with an attorney described in subparagraph (i);
- iii. An outside expert or an employee of an outside expert retained by a party for the purposes of advising that party or testifying in this proceeding on behalf of that party; or
- iv. A person designated as a Reviewing Representative for purposes of HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL protected material pursuant to paragraph 11.

Provided, further, that in accordance with the provisions of Sections 5.362 and 5.365(e) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (52 Pa. Code §§ 5.362, 5.365(e)) any party may, by objection or motion, seek further protection with respect to HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL protected material, including, but not limited to, total prohibition of disclosure or limitation of disclosure only to particular parties.

7. For purposes of this Protective Order, a Reviewing Representative may not be a “Restricted Person” absent agreement of the party producing the Proprietary Information pursuant to Paragraph 11. A “Restricted Person” shall mean: (a) an officer, director, stockholder, partner, or owner of any competitor of the parties or an employee of such an entity if the employee’s duties involve marketing or pricing of the competitor’s products or services or advising another person who has such duties; (b) an officer, director, stockholder, partner, or owner of any affiliate of a competitor of the parties (including any association of competitors of the parties) or an employee of such an entity if the employee’s duties involve marketing or pricing of the competitor's products or services or advising another person who has such duties; (c) an officer, director, stockholder, owner, agent (excluding any person under Paragraph 6.i or 6.ii), or employee of a competitor of a customer of the parties or of a competitor of a vendor of the parties if the Proprietary Information concerns a specific, identifiable customer or vendor of the parties; and (d) an officer, director, stockholder, owner or employee of an affiliate of a competitor of a customer of the parties if the Proprietary Information concerns a specific, identifiable customer of the parties; provided, however, that no expert shall be disqualified on account of being a stockholder, partner, or owner unless that expert’s interest in the business would provide a significant motive for violating the limitations of permissible use of the Proprietary Information. For purposes of this Protective Order, stocks, partnership or other ownership interests valued at more than \$10,000 or constituting more than a 1% interest in a business establish a significant motive for violation. A “Restricted Person” shall not include an expert for the Office of Small Business Advocate or Office of Consumer Advocate.

8. If an expert for a party, another member of the expert’s firm or the expert’s firm generally also serves as an expert for, or as a consultant or advisor to, a Restricted Person (other than an expert or expert firm retained by the Office of Small Business Advocate or Office of

Consumer Advocate), that expert must: (1) identify for the parties each Restricted Person and all personnel in or associated with the expert's firm that work on behalf of the Restricted Person; (2) take all reasonable steps to segregate those personnel assisting in the expert's participation in this proceeding from those personnel working on behalf of a Restricted Person; and (3) if segregation of such personnel is impractical, the expert shall give to the producing party written assurances that the lack of segregation will in no way adversely affect the interests of the parties or their customers. The parties retain the right to challenge the adequacy of the written assurances that the parties' or their customers' interests will not be adversely affected. No other persons may have access to the Proprietary Information except as authorized by order of the Commission.

9. Reviewing Representatives qualified to receive "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" protected material may discuss HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL protected material with their client or with the entity with which they are employed or associated, to the extent that the client or entity is not a "Restricted Person," but may not share with, or permit the client or entity to review or have access to, the HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL protected material.

10. Proprietary Information shall be treated by the parties and by the Reviewing Representative in accordance with the terms of this Protective Order, which are hereby expressly incorporated into the certificate that must be executed pursuant to Paragraph 12(a). Proprietary Information shall be used as necessary, for the conduct of this proceeding and for no other purpose. Proprietary Information shall not be disclosed in any manner to any person except a Reviewing Representative who is engaged in the conduct of this proceeding and who needs to know the information in order to carry out that person's responsibilities in this proceeding, provided, however, that counsel for I&E, the Office of Consumer Advocate, and Office of Small Business Advocate may share Proprietary Information with the I&E Director, the Consumer Advocate, and the Small Business Advocate, respectively, without obtaining a Non-Disclosure

Certificate from these individuals, provided, however, that these individuals otherwise abide by the terms of the Protective Order.

11. Reviewing Representatives may not use anything contained in any Proprietary Information obtained through this proceeding to give any party or any competitor of any party a commercial advantage. In the event that a party wishes to designate as a Reviewing Representative a person not described in paragraph 6 (i) through (iii) above, the party must first seek agreement to do so from the party providing the Proprietary Information. If an agreement is reached, the designated individual shall be a Reviewing Representative pursuant to Paragraph 6 (iv) above with respect to those materials. If no agreement is reached, the party seeking to have a person designated a Reviewing Representative shall submit the disputed designation to the presiding Administrative Law Judge for resolution.

12. (a) A Reviewing Representative shall not be permitted to inspect, participate in discussions regarding, or otherwise be permitted access to Proprietary Information pursuant to this Protective Order unless that Reviewing Representative has first executed a Non-Disclosure Certificate in the form provided in Appendix A, provided, however, that if an attorney or expert qualified as a Reviewing Representative has executed such a certificate, the paralegals, secretarial and clerical personnel under his or her instruction, supervision or control need not do so. A copy of each executed Non-Disclosure Certificate shall be provided to counsel for the party asserting confidentiality prior to disclosure of any Proprietary Information to that Reviewing Representative.

(b) Attorneys and outside experts qualified as Reviewing Representatives are responsible for ensuring that persons under their supervision or control comply with the Protective Order.

13. The parties shall designate data or documents as constituting or containing

Proprietary Information by stamping the documents “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” protected material. Where only part of data compilations or multi-page documents constitutes or contains Proprietary Information, the parties, insofar as reasonably practicable within discovery and other time constraints imposed in this proceeding, shall designate only the specific data or pages of documents which constitute or contain Proprietary Information. The Commission and all parties, including the statutory advocates and any other agency or department of state government will consider and treat the Proprietary Information as within the exemptions from disclosure provided in the Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Act (65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(11)) until such time as the information is found to be non-proprietary.

14. Any public reference to Proprietary Information by a party or its Reviewing Representatives shall be to the title or exhibit reference in sufficient detail to permit persons with access to the Proprietary Information to understand fully the reference and not more. The Proprietary Information shall remain a part of the record, to the extent admitted, for all purposes of administrative or judicial review.

15. Part of any record of this proceeding containing Proprietary Information, including but not limited to all exhibits, writings, testimony, cross examination, argument, and responses to discovery, and including reference thereto as mentioned in paragraph 14 above, shall be sealed for all purposes, including administrative and judicial review, unless such Proprietary Information is released from the restrictions of this Protective Order, either through the agreement of the parties to this proceeding or pursuant to an order of the Commission.

16. The parties shall retain the right to question or challenge the confidential or proprietary nature of Proprietary Information and to question or challenge the admissibility of Proprietary Information. If a party challenges the designation of a document or information as

proprietary, the party providing the information retains the burden of demonstrating that the designation is appropriate.

17. The parties shall retain the right to object to the production of Proprietary Information on any proper ground, and to refuse to produce Proprietary Information pending the adjudication of the objection.

18. Within 30 days after a Commission final order is entered in the above-captioned proceeding, or in the event of appeals, within thirty days after appeals are finally decided, the receiving party, upon request, shall either destroy or return to the parties all copies of all documents and other materials not entered into the record, including notes, which contain any Proprietary Information. In its request, a providing party may specify whether such materials should be destroyed or returned. In the event that the materials are destroyed instead of returned, the receiving party shall certify in writing to the providing party that the Proprietary Information has been destroyed. In the event that the materials are returned instead of destroyed, the receiving party shall certify in writing to the providing party that no copies of materials containing the Proprietary Information have been retained.

Date: _____, 2024

Marta Guhl
Administrative Law Judge

Darlene Heep
Administrative Law Judge

APPENDIX A

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY :
COMMISSION :
 :
v. : **Docket No. R-2024-3046931**
 :
PECO ENERGY COMPANY – :
ELECTRIC DIVISION :

NON-DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The undersigned is the _____ of _____
(the receiving party).

The undersigned has read and understands the Protective Order deals with the treatment of Proprietary Information. The undersigned agrees to be bound by, and comply with, the terms and conditions of said Order, which are incorporated herein by reference.

SIGNATURE

PRINT NAME

ADDRESS

EMAIL

EMPLOYER

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT D

Proposed Rate Case Schedule

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION	:	
	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. R-2024-3046931
	:	
PECO ENERGY COMPANY – ELECTRIC DIVISION	:	

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Rate Case Filing	March 28, 2024
Prehearing Conference	May 7, 2024
Public Input Hearings	Week of June 3, 2024
Non-Company Direct Testimony	June 17, 2024
Rebuttal Testimony	July 16, 2024 (by noon)
Surrebuttal Testimony	July 30, 2024
Written Rejoinder Outline	August 1, 2024 (by 4pm)
Oral Rejoinder Testimony and Hearings	August 5-7, 2024
Main Briefs	August 21, 2024
Reply Briefs	August 30, 2024