



November 26, 2025

**VIA EFILE**

Matthew L. Homsher, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
400 North Street, Filing Room  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

**Re: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement  
v. UGI Utilities, Inc – Gas Division**

**Docket No. M-2025-3032708**

Dear Secretary Homsher:

The Coalition for Affordable Utility Services and Energy Efficiency in Pennsylvania (CAUSE-PA), by and through its counsel at the Pennsylvania Utility Law Project, files this *Letter* in response to supplemental data and information filed jointly by the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (I&E) and UGI Utilities, Inc. on November 7, 2025. I&E and UGI filed their supplemental data and information pursuant to the Commission’s October 9, 2025 Tentative Opinion and Order, which concluded that there was insufficient evidence in the record to determine whether the Joint Settlement proposed by UGI and I&E is in the public interest. (Tentative Opinion and Order at 3).

This matter, and the proposed Joint Settlement at issue in this proceeding, concerns UGI’s failure to comply with various provisions of the Commission’s Chapter 56 regulations, which resulted in the unlawful termination of approximately 4,000 residential customers in March 2022, April 2022, and April 2023. (Tentative Opinion & Order at 5-9; 52 Pa. Code § 56.93, 56.191).

The supplemental data and information filed by I&E and UGI contain a number of additional factual averments shedding further light on the depth and severity of harm to residential consumers as a result of UGI's failure to comply with Commission regulation – and the unreasonably lengthy timeframe for UGI to fully remedy that harm. Indeed, the harm to many consumers – especially low income households – was never fully addressed.

### **Procedural Concerns with the Filing**

Before turning to the content of the supplemental data and information filed by UGI and I&E, CAUSE-PA is concerned that the factual averments contained therein were not properly verified and authenticated and, as such, are not properly considered part of the formal record in this proceeding. Paragraph 2 of the ordering paragraphs contained in the Commission's October 9, 2025 Tentative Opinion and Order required I&E and UGI to “file supplemental statements in support and/or stipulated facts in support of the proposed Joint Petition for Approval of Settlement.” (Tentative Opinion & Order at 26, Ordering para. 2). The supplemental data and information filed by UGI and I&E was neither a supplemental statement in support – nor did it contain any explicitly stipulated facts. The factual averments contained I&E and UGI's joint filing, ostensibly titled “Supplemental Record”, was signed by an I&E Prosecutor and outside legal counsel retained by UGI – but was not accompanied by any verification or attestation of a person with direct knowledge of the data and information contained in the averments. (See 52 Pa. Code § 1.36, 5.41, 5.232).

Of further procedural note, the Commission explicitly ordered that its October 9, 2025 Tentative Opinion and Order be served on the Office of Consumer Advocate and CAUSE-PA, which each filed comments in this matter. In turn, consistent with section 1.51 of the Commission's procedural regulations, counsel for CAUSE-PA and OCA are listed as interested parties in the Commission's efile system. While I&E and UGI served copies of their respective reply comments in this proceeding, they inexplicably omitted CAUSE-PA and OCA from service of its supplemental filing. (Supplemental Information Service List)

### **Substantive Concerns with the Filing**

I&E and UGI jointly assert that no security deposits were charged to impacted customers but admit that reconnection fees were charged to 174 verified low income customers. (Supplemental Data at 4). In total, UGI improperly assessed reconnection fees to 1,597 residential consumers – amounting to \$113,144. (Id. at 5). Refunds were issued over a lengthy period, ranging between a few months and a few years. In total, over \$14,000 in refunds were held for 11-12 months after the March 2022 and April 2022 incidents, and an additional \$3,000 in refunds were issued between 1-3 years after the unlawful termination occurred. (Id. at 5). I&E and UGI assert, generally, that delays in refunding the reconnection fees were caused by issues with the third-party auto-dialer vendor identifying impacted accounts. (Id. at 5).

Notably, UGI and I&E use the term “reverse” and “refund” interchangeably, raising questions regarding the method used to return unlawfully collected reconnection fees to consumers. (Id. at 5, Table). CAUSE-PA recommends that the Commission further clarify whether UGI “reversed” the improper charges by issuing bill credits, through internal accounting adjustments, or by issuing checks or credit card reversals, and how the refunds were confirmed, particularly for customers who moved or who were otherwise never able to reconnect service. (Id. at 5).

UGI further admits that it failed to pay interest on the reconnection fee refunds until specifically asked by the Commission. UGI notes that, to date, it has only paid interest to 389 of 825 customers owed, leaving over half uncompensated. (Id. at 6). It appears the remaining customers owed interest payments no longer have active service – though it is unclear whether this is because the household has relocated or because they are part of the group that remain in terminated status following the March 2022, April 2022, and April 2023 incidents.

In response to Commission’s questions regarding the length of time that impacted households remained without service, UGI and I&E assert that, following the March 2022 incident, customers were without service for an average of 44 days, with the median termination lasting 4 days. (Id. at 6). Following the April 2022 incident, customers waited an average of 15.3 days to be reconnected, while the median was 2 days. Following the April 2023 incident, the average time without service was 41 days, compared to a median of 4 days. CAUSE-PA submits that reliance on the median values misrepresents the fact that many customers, especially low-income households, went weeks or months without gas service. Notably, UGI omitted households that never reconnected from its reconnection statistics and the Company failed to provide an updated count of customers who remain without service. CAUSE-PA urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the harms and determining which corrective actions are in the public interest.

UGI and I&E assert that UGI notified affected customers after discovering the improper terminations; however, its supplemental response confirms that customer notification only occurred after inquiries from the Bureau of Consumer Services, not through proactive identification and outreach by UGI. (Id. at 6-8). It took nearly two months (April 4, 2022 to May 27, 2022) before UGI sent its first communications to some of the impacted households. (Id. at 7). While the timeline provided in the supplemental information indicates that UGI sent notice to households that had not yet reconnected, it remains unclear from UGI and I&E’s supplemental filing whether households that reconnected service prior to May 27, 2022 were similarly advised of UGI’s error.

CAUSE-PA believes that these facts support its recommendation in prior comments that the Commission exercise its authority to modify the proposed Settlement to increase the civil penalty and direct proceeds to the universal service programs to help facilitate reconnections.

UGI and I&E assert that it is pertinent for the Commission to consider that the Company spent \$17,653 to restore service to impacted customers when making its determination in this matter. (Id. at 9). UGI and I&E indicate that “the majority of these costs related to voluntary restoration activities.” (Id.) It is unclear what UGI and I&E consider to be “voluntary restoration” activities. The consumers impacted in the March 2022, April 2022, and April 2023 incidents were subject to involuntary and unlawful termination, and the costs associated with their subsequent restoration are not properly considered as a mitigating factor. Notably, UGI and I&E do not clearly indicate whether these costs were borne by UGI’s shareholders or ratepayers. CAUSE-PA opposes any suggestion that the costs incurred by UGI to restore service to unlawfully terminated households should be considered in any way in assessing the penalty as these customers should never have had their service terminated in the first instance. These costs should be paid by UGI itself and not customers.

For these reasons, and consistent with our earlier comments, CAUSE-PA continues to submit that the proposed Settlement does not adequately remedy the harm to consumers and does not meet the public interest standard. CAUSE-PA opposes approval of the proposed Settlement without substantial modifications to deter future violations by UGI or other large utilities. As stated before, CAUSE-PA submits that the Commission must exercise its authority to modify the proposed Settlement to ensure that it more adequately accounts for the consequences of UGI’s failure to provide appropriate notice of termination.

Specifically, we recommend the Commission increase the penalty to no less than \$250,000 and direct proceeds to UGI’s Hardship Fund program, known as Operation Share. In turn, the Commission should require UGI to send a letter to all impacted customers that are still without service and invite them to apply for a Hardship Fund grant or other universal service programs that may help to facilitate their reconnection.

Sincerely,



---

Elizabeth R. Marx, Esq.  
Attorney ID No. 309014  
[emarx@pautilitylawproject.org](mailto:emarx@pautilitylawproject.org)  
*Counsel for CAUSE-PA*

Cc: Certificate of Service  
Office of Special Assistants, [ra-osa@pa.gov](mailto:ra-osa@pa.gov)

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Pa. Public Utility Commission, :  
 Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement : Docket No. M-2025-3032708  
 v. :  
 UGI Utilities, Inc – Gas Division :

**Certificate of Service**

I hereby certify that I have, on this day, served copies of the **Letter of the Coalition for Affordable Utility Services and Energy Efficiency in Pennsylvania** in the above captioned matter upon the following persons and in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54.

**VIA EMAIL**

Michael Swerling, Esq. UGI Utilities, Inc. 460 North Gulph Road King of Prussia, PA 19406 <a href="mailto:swerlingm@ugicorp.com">swerlingm@ugicorp.com</a>	Mel El Atieh, Esq. Christy Appleby, Esq. Office of Consumer Advocate 555 Walnut Street Forum Place, 5th Fl. Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923 <a href="mailto:MElAtieh@paoca.org">MElAtieh@paoca.org</a> <a href="mailto:cappleby@paoca.org">cappleby@paoca.org</a>
Devin T. Ryan, Esq. Post & Schell, P.C. One Oxford Centre 301 Grant Street, Suite 3010 Pittsburgh, PA 15219 <a href="mailto:dryan@postschell.com">dryan@postschell.com</a>	NazArah Sabree, Small Business Advocate of Pennsylvania Office of the Small Business Advocate 555 Walnut Street 1 <sup>st</sup> Floor, Forum Place Harrisburg, PA 17101 <a href="mailto:ra-sba@pa.gov">ra-sba@pa.gov</a>
Allison Kaster, Esq. Grant Rosul, Esq. PA Public Utility Commission Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement Commonwealth Keystone Bldg 400 North Street, 2nd Fl. Harrisburg, PA 17105 <a href="mailto:akaster@pa.gov">akaster@pa.gov</a> <a href="mailto:grosul@pa.gov">grosul@pa.gov</a>	

Respectfully submitted,  
*Counsel for CAUSE-PA*



Elizabeth R. Marx, Esq., PA ID: 309014  
**PENNSYLVANIA UTILITY LAW PROJECT**  
 118 Locust Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101  
[emarx@pautilitylawproject.org](mailto:emarx@pautilitylawproject.org)

Date: November 26, 2025