

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Frank Toroney
v.
PECO Energy Company

Public Meeting held December 19, 2024
3045932-OSA
Docket No. C-2024-3045932

STATEMENT OF VICE CHAIR KIMBERLY BARROW

The case before us highlights the real importance of the decisions that we made in the past and continue to make that may sometimes feel esoteric or technical, but impact the lives of Commonwealth residents.

Frank Toroney's father signed up for a rate that was supposed to save him money. In 2009 PECO discontinued that rate, and in the process stuck Mr. Toroney with a near perpetual two dollar bill adder. The Commission at the time approved PECO's action as part of a settlement, making no mention of this particular effect on customers.¹ At our last public meeting, the Commission's approval of PECO's most recent base rate settlement had the effect of keeping this charge around, again with no mention of the effect on customers like Mr. Toroney who were saddled with the charge years ago but receive no current benefit.

Unfortunately, I believe that our prior action cannot be revised outside of a base rate proceeding. This two dollar monthly charge may not seem like a lot, but it is deeply inequitable. The Commission, myself included, and all participants in these cases, should do a better job in raising and examining the downstream effects of discontinued tariff provisions on individuals.

December 19, 2024


Kimberly Barrow, Vice Chair

¹ Default Service Program and Rate Mitigation Plan, Docket No. P-2008-2062739 (Order entered June 2, 2009); *see also Pa. PUC v. PECO Energy Company – Electric Division*, Docket No. R-2010-2161575 (Opinion and Order entered December 21, 2010) (PECO's 2010 Base Rate Case); *Pa. PUC v. PECO Energy Company – Electric Division*, Docket No. R-2021-3024601 (Order entered November 18, 2021).