

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

**Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission,  
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement**

**Public Meeting April 16, 2026  
3032708-OSA  
Docket No. M-2025-3032708**

v.

**UGI Utilities, Inc. – Gas Division**

**STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER JOHN F. COLEMAN, JR.**

Before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) for consideration and disposition is a proposed Joint Petition for Approval of Settlement filed by the Commission’s Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (I&E) and UGI Utilities, Inc. – Gas Division (UGI) (collectively, the Parties).

The proposed Settlement resolves an informal investigation of UGI’s compliance with Section 56.93 of the Commission’s Regulations.<sup>1</sup> Section 56.93 requires a utility to attempt to make personal contact at least 3 days prior to a scheduled termination. Due to issues with the auto-dialer system used by UGI’s vendor, UGI terminated service to approximately 3,500 residential customers without providing the proper 3-day personal contact.

Under the terms of the proposed Settlement, UGI agreed to pay a civil penalty of \$90,000. I agree with the Parties that the proposed Settlement is in the public interest and is consistent with the Commission’s Policy Statement at 52 Pa. Code § 69.1201, *Factors and Standards for Evaluating Litigated and Settled Proceedings Involving Violations of the Public Utility Code and Commission Regulations* (Policy Statement).

I do not agree with the proposed modification to convert the entire civil penalty to a \$200,000 hardship fund contribution. The Policy Statement sets forth ten factors that the Commission may consider in evaluating civil penalties and proposed settlements. The Policy Statement’s eighth factor is the amount of the civil penalty or fine necessary to deter future violations.<sup>2</sup> The payment of a civil penalty or fine to the Commonwealth’s General Fund that results in a loss of revenue to a utility company is a meaningful deterrent to future violations. In contrast, a donation by a utility into its own hardship fund does not result in any actual loss to the utility. The utility is merely “paying itself” the donation amount. This type of settlement has no deterrent effect. Instead, the utility benefits from its own mistakes.<sup>3</sup>

Moreover, the record in this case does not support the proposed modification. UGI has already restored service and refunded reconnection fees and security deposits to the impacted customers. Also, as noted by I&E in its Reply Comments, “[t]here is no evidence before the Commission regarding the income or familial status of” the impacted customers. There is simply no connection between the improper terminations, the impacted customers, and UGI’s hardship fund.

---

<sup>1</sup> 52 Pa. Code § 56.93.

<sup>2</sup> 52 Pa. Code § 69.1201(c)(8).

<sup>3</sup> These contributions are generally a tax-deductible business expense.

Finally, the recommendation for the proposed modification fails to discuss the actual budget for UGI's hardship fund. Under UGI's current Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan, UGI contributes \$584,500 per year to its hardship fund. I question why UGI should contribute an additional \$200,000, or approximately 34% of its annual hardship fund budget, in response to improper terminations that impacted a much smaller percentage of its residential customers.

The proposed modification to the Parties' proposed Settlement is neither in the public interest, nor is it consistent with the Commission's Policy Statement. As such, I will be voting no.

**Date: April 16, 2026**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J.F. Coleman, Jr.", written over a horizontal purple line.

**JOHN F. COLEMAN, JR.  
COMMISSIONER**