

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Julia Bohnenberger
v.
PECO Energy Company

Public Meeting held November 20, 2025
3054369-ALJ
Docket No. C-2025-3054369

STATEMENT OF VICE CHAIR KIMBERLY BARROW

Before us for consideration is the Initial Decision sustaining the Formal Complaint filed by Julia Bohnenberger against PECO Energy Company (PECO).¹ Ms. Bohnenberger's Formal Complaint alleged unreasonable service after receiving 11 bills over a two-month period, because PECO did not issue monthly bills the prior 11 months. PECO filed an Answer admitting that Ms. Bohnenberger did not receive a monthly bill from March 2024 through January 2025 due to technical issues with PECO's billing system.²

An evidentiary hearing was held on June 18, 2025, and an Initial Decision was issued on September 23, 2025, sustaining the Formal Complaint and ordering a \$1,000 civil penalty for a single violation of 52 Pa. Code § 56.11(a) and 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501.³ Of note, the Administrative Law Judge found that PECO failed to issue monthly bills from March 2024 through December 2024, provided unreasonable service when it issued 11 bills over a 2-month period, and failed to timely explain the make-up bills.

I agree with the decision in this case but wanted to voice my disappointment in PECO's lack of customer service and outreach related to this billing issue. PECO should have provided outreach to this customer during the 11-month period that bills were not issued, and again when the influx of makeup bills were issued. I highly encourage PECO to do better and be proactive with its customers when billing issues arise.

November 20, 2025



Kimberly Barrow, Vice Chair

¹ PECO provided electric and gas services to Ms. Bohnenberger. Hearing Transcript, pg. 18 (June 18, 2025).

² PECO implemented a new billing system in February 2024. Hearing Transcript, pgs. 15-16 (June 18, 2025).

³ The Administrative Law Judge did not find a violation of 52 Pa. Code § 56.14 relating to previously unbilled service. I agree with this finding as PECO offered Ms. Bohnenberger a 36-month and 48-month payment arrangement, which she declined, and also provided a credit in the amount of \$930.76, the difference between Ms. Bohnenberger's supplier rate and PECO's price to compare as she was unable to switch during the 11-month period. Hearing Transcript, pgs. 19-20 (June 18, 2025); PECO Exhibit 2.