

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
1325 G STREET, N.W., SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005**

July 31, 2025

**FORMAL CASE NO. 1171, IN THE MATTER OF THE INVESTIGATION INTO
COMMUNITY RENEWABLE ENERGY FACILITY PRACTICES IN THE DISTRICT.**

INQUIRY OF COMMISSIONER BEVERLY

This inquiry is issued pursuant to D.C. Code §34-802, which gives each Commissioner independent authority to pursue any line of inquiry that the Commission itself could pursue. This is not an action of the full Commission.

By Order No. 21600, the Commission found Pepco to be currently in violation or having previously been in violation of relevant laws and regulations relating to: 1) installation of its own production meters on CREFs; 2) failure to timely and accurately remit community net metering (“CNM”) credits; and 3) failure to timely and accurately remit unsubscribed energy payments.¹ The Commission directed Commission Staff to appoint an independent auditor, paid by Pepco, to oversee Pepco’s “reconciliation of all CREF crediting dating back to May 8, 2015.”² (emphasis added). Pepco was given specific detailed data requirements to complete the reconciliation that would be reviewed by the auditor.³

By Order No. 22415, issued May 7, 2025, after the conclusion of the audit, the Commission determined that Pepco had yet to comply with the directives related to the reconciliation in Order No. 21600, and directed Pepco to provide all files in e-Bridge within 20 days of the date of the Order.⁴ Pepco filed additional data pursuant to Order No. 22415 on May 27, 2025⁵ and June 10, 2025.⁶

¹ *GD-2022-01-E and Formal Case No. 1171, In the Matter of the Investigation into Community Renewable Energy Facility Practices in the District (“Formal Case No. 1171”),* Order No. 21600, ¶ 1 (“Order No. 21600”). April 24, 2023.

² Order No. 21600, ¶ 40.

³ Order No. 21600, ¶ 40.

⁴ *GD-2022-01-E and Formal Case No. 1171,* Order No. 22415, rel. May 7, 2025.

⁵ *Formal Case No. 1171,* Potomac Electric Power Company’s Filing of Additional Data in Response to Order 22415 (“Pepco Additional Data”). May 27, 2025.

⁶ *Formal Case No. 1171,* Potomac Electric Power Company’s Filing of Unsubscribed Energy Data in Response to Order 22415 (“Pepco Unsubscribed Data”). June 10, 2025.

Regarding “monthly and total production credited to subscribers,” Pepco states that it has uploaded additional attachments that were not provided to the auditor: “The Company is able to provide its data in Attachment A.1-A.4, which is the Company’s record of kWh and dollar amounts provided to all subscribers. This data set is greater than the scope of the Audit because it includes all subscribers not just those where CREF data was provided.”⁷ Pepco also states that for “monthly and total production credited as unsubscribed energy for each individual CREF,” it required additional time to compile the data due to a formatting issue,⁸ and uploaded the additional data on June 10, 2025.⁹

I note that we ordered an audit and reconciliation of CREF “crediting” in Order No. 21600, after finding that Pepco had been in violation of District laws and regulations related to metering, remitting CNM credits, and remitting unsubscribed energy payments. Pepco, in its effort to comply with Order No. 21600, has provided additional datasets that were previously unavailable to the auditor. Order No. 21600 specifically required monthly and total “production credited to subscribers.”¹⁰ While Pepco has provided a larger dataset than previously submitted to the auditor, this dataset provides the value of metered generation, rather than the actual credits to subscribers. Secondly, Pepco has compiled all the unsubscribed energy payments, but not by month as required by Order No. 21600. The auditor also did not have access to this unsubscribed energy payment dataset for all CREFs. Therefore, it’s unclear to me how the auditor could have completed an audit of Pepco’s remittance of CNM credits or unsubscribed energy payments, an omission which may render the audit essentially worthless.

Inasmuch as Pepco has been unable or unwilling to provide the relevant data so that the auditor and this Commission can identify actual errors, DOEE has suggested two pathways forward: 1) direct Pepco to provide the missing reconciliation data to WatsonRice and have WatsonRice review the data for discrepancies; or 2) WatsonRice could review the data in DOEE’s possession to determine an error rate that could be applied to reimburse missing credits across all CREFs.¹¹ WatsonRice is no longer under contract to the Commission. Under the circumstances, the development of an error rate may be the best path forward. I request that DOEE respond to me in this docket within 20 days to the following inquiries:

- Does the data now available on e-Bridge allow DOEE to determine an error rate for CNM credits for Solar for All CREFs?
 - If not, what additional data is required?
- Does the data now available on e-Bridge allow DOEE to determine an error rate for unsubscribed energy payments for Solar for All CREFs?
 - If not, what additional data is required?

⁷ Pepco Additional Data at 3.

⁸ Pepco Additional Data at 3.

⁹ Pepco Unsubscribed Data at A-1.

¹⁰ Order No. 21600, ¶ 40.

¹¹ DCG Reply at 5-6.

- Is DOEE able to develop a CNM credit error rate recommendation as either a \$ per MW of installed CREF capacity or \$ per CREF subscriber for the entire CREF market based on information available from the Solar for All projects?
 - If yes, how long would it take to compile such a recommendation?
- Is DOEE able to develop an unsubscribed energy error rate recommendation as a \$ per MW of installed CREF capacity or \$ per CREF for the entire CREF market based on the information available from the Solar for All projects?
 - If yes, how long would it take to compile such a recommendation?