



Utility Consumer Activities Report and Evaluation

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission





Utility Consumer Activities Report and Evaluation 2012

July 2014

Published by:

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
PO Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
www.puc.pa.gov

Bureau of Consumer Services
Alexis Bechtel, Director

Table of Contents

1. Consumer Contacts to the Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS)	
Consumer Rating of BCS Service.....	2
Total Volume of Consumer Complaints and Payment Agreement Requests to the BCS in 2012.....	3
Consumer Complaints by Industry 2011-12	4
Payment Agreement Requests by Industry 2011-12	6
Categories of 2012 Inquiries.....	7
2. Performance Measures	
Consumer Complaint Rate	11
Justified Consumer Complaint Rate	11
Response Time to Consumer Complaints.....	12
Payment Agreement Request Rate	12
Justified Payment Agreement Request Rate	12
Response Time to Payment Agreement Requests	13
Infraction Rate	13
Termination Rate.....	14
BCS Performance Measures and Industry Chapters.....	14
Universal Service and Energy Conservation Programs.....	15
3. Electric Industry	
Consumer Complaints	16
Payment Agreement Requests	20
Termination and Reconnection of Service.....	23
Compliance	25
4. Natural Gas Industry	
Consumer Complaints	27
Payment Agreement Requests	31
Termination and Reconnection of Service.....	34
Compliance	36

5. Water Industry

- Consumer Complaints 38
- Payment Agreement Requests 42
- Compliance 45
- Programs That Assist Low-Income Customers 46

6. Telephone Industry

- Consumer Complaints 48
- Payment Agreement Requests 52
- Termination of Service 55
- Compliance 56
- Universal Service Programs 58
- Lifeline and Lifeline 135 Service 58
- Universal Telephone Assistance Program 60
- Automatic Notification Program 60
- Wireless ETC Designation 61

Glossary of Terms 62

Appendices

A. Consumer Ratings of BCS Service	65
B. 2011-12 Total Volume of Consumer Complaints and Payment Agreement Requests to BCS	66
C. 2012 Residential Consumer Complaints for Companies Not Included in Industry Chapters	67
D. Classification of Consumer Complaints	
1. Electric, Gas & Water	72
2. Telephone	74
E. Consumer Complaint Categories: 2012	
Table 1 - Major Electric	76
Table 2 - Major Gas	77
Table 3 - Major Water	78
Table 4 - Major Telephone	79
F. 2011-12 Residential Consumer Complaint Statistics	
Table 1 - Major Electric	80
Table 2 - Major Gas	81
Table 3 - Major Water	82
Table 4 - Major Telephone	83
G. 2011-12 Residential Payment Agreement Request Statistics	
Table 1 - Major Electric	84
Table 2 - Major Gas	85
Table 3 - Major Water	86
Table 4 - Major Telephone	87
H. Infraction Categories: 2012	
Table 1 - Major Electric	88
Table 2 - Major Gas	89
Table 3 - Major Water	90
Table 4 - Major Telephone (Chapter 63)	91
Table 5 - Major Telephone (Chapter 64)	92
Consumer Access to the PUC	Inside Back Cover

1. Consumer Contacts to the Bureau of Consumer Services

The Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission's Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS) began investigating and writing decisions on utility consumer complaints and service termination cases in April 1977. Since then, BCS has investigated 1,777,479 cases (consumer complaints and payment agreement requests (PARs)) and has received 1,484,143 opinions and requests for information (inquiries). The Public Utility Commission (PUC) received 67,872 utility customer contacts that required investigation in 2012. It is important to note that our statistical analysis indicates that nearly 88 percent of those customer complaints had been appropriately handled by the subject utilities before the customers brought them to the PUC. In these instances, the PUC has upheld the utility's actions.

Case Handling

The handling of utility complaint cases is the foundation for a number of BCS's programs. The case-handling process provides an avenue through which consumers can gain redress for errors and responses to inquiries. However, customers are required by Commission regulations to attempt to resolve problems directly with their utilities prior to filing a complaint or requesting a payment agreement with the PUC. Although exceptions are permitted under extenuating circumstances, BCS generally handles those cases in which the utility and customer could not find a mutually satisfactory resolution to the problem.

Once a customer contacts the PUC with an informal complaint or PAR, BCS notifies the utility that a complaint or PAR has been filed. There were 175,809 telephone contacts to BCS by consumers in 2012, representing about 95 percent of the informal complaints filed. The utility sends BCS all records concerning the complaint, including records of its contacts with the customer regarding the complaint. A BCS investigator reviews the records, interacts with both the complainant and utility, as necessary, renders a decision and closes the case.

Consumer Feedback Survey

In order to monitor its own service to consumers, BCS surveys customers who have contacted BCS with a utility-related problem or PAR. The purpose of the survey is to collect information from the consumer's perspective about the quality of the BCS complaint-handling service. BCS uses a 3rd party to survey a sample of consumers who have been served by BCS staff. The table on the next page shows how consumers rate the service they received from BCS.

Consumer Rating of BCS Service

How would you rate the service you received from the PUC (BCS)?	2011	2012
Excellent	61%	58%
Good	21%	25%
Fair	9%	9%
Poor	9%	7%

According to the survey results, 83 percent of consumers who contacted BCS in 2012 rated the BCS's service as "excellent" or "good." Appendix A presents more information about how consumers rated the service they received from BCS in 2011 and 2012. BCS management frequently reviews the findings of the consumer feedback survey and promptly investigates any negative trends to improve staff performance.

Databases

To manage and use its complaint data, BCS maintains a computer-based Consumer Services Information System (CSIS) through a contract with the Pennsylvania State University. This system enables BCS to aggregate and analyze the thousands of informal complaints that are reported to the Commission each year. In this way, BCS can address generic, as well as individual, problems. BCS policy analysts categorize complaints into one of seven major problem areas, as well as one of 36 specific problem categories. This case information is entered into the CSIS database. The analysis from case information is used by BCS to generate reports to the Commission, utilities, legislators and the public. The reports may present information regarding utility performance, industry trends, investigations, new policy issues and the impact of utility or Commission policy.

The majority of the data presented in this report is from CSIS. In addition, this report includes statistics from BCS's Collections Reporting System (CRS), Local Exchange Carrier Reporting System (LECRS) and Compliance Tracking System (CTS). Both the CRS (for electric and gas) and the LECRS (for telephone) provide valuable resources for measuring changes in company collection performance, including the number of residential service terminations, while CTS maintains data on the number and type of apparent infractions attributable to the major utilities.

Distinctions Among Cases

A number of cases were segregated from the analyses that appear later in this report because the cases did not fairly represent company behavior. One treatment of the data involved the removal of complaints about problems over which the Commission has no jurisdiction; information requests that did not require investigation; and most cases where the customers indicated that they had not contacted the company prior to complaining to the Commission.

Commercial customer contacts also were excluded from the data used in the analysis. Although BCS's regulatory authority has largely been confined to residential accounts, the Bureau handled 1,665 cases from commercial customers in 2012. Of these cases, 292 were related to loss of utility service, while 1,373 were consumer complaints.

With respect to the 292 commercial cases, BCS does not make payment agreements for those accounts. Due to its limited jurisdiction, BCS does not issue decisions regarding commercial disputes. Instead, Bureau investigators give commercial customers information regarding the company position or attempt to mediate a mutually acceptable agreement regarding the disputed matter. Many such cases are referred to the Office of Administrative Law Judge's Mediation Unit for Alternative Dispute Resolution where an attempt is made to mediate a resolution between the utility and its customer.

All cases in 2012 that involved commercial accounts were deleted from the analyses in subsequent chapters of this report. The table below shows that the vast majority of cases handled by BCS in 2012 involved residential utility service. Appendix B presents a comparison of the number of residential and commercial consumer complaints and PARs for 2011 and 2012.

Total Volume of Consumer Complaints and Payment Agreement Requests (PARs) to BCS in 2012

Industry	Consumer Complaints		Payment Agreement Requests	
	Residential	Commercial	Residential	Commercial
Electric	7,742	778	36,158	183
Gas	2,543	190	11,585	78
Water	724	91	4,607	21
Telephone	2,443	314	394	10
Other	5	0	6	0
Total	13,457	1,373	52,750	292

Generally, customer contacts to BCS fall into three basic categories: consumer complaints, PARs and inquiries. BCS classifies consumer complaints as contacts regarding disputes about utilities' actions related to billing, service delivery, repairs, etc. PARs are classified as contacts involving payment negotiations for unpaid utility service. Consumer complaints and PARs are often collectively referred to as informal complaints. Inquiries include information requests and opinions from consumers, most of which do not require investigation on the part of BCS.

Consumer Complaints

Most consumer complaints regarding the electric, gas, water, sewer and steam heat industries deal with matters covered under 52 Pa. Code, Chapter 56, Standards and Billing Practices for Residential Utility Service and/or Chapter 14, the Responsible Utility Customer Protection Act. (Sewer and steam heat complaints are designated as “other” in the previous table and the tables that follow.) For the telephone industry, most of the cases found in the consumer complaint category deal with matters covered by 52 Pa. Code, Chapter 64 Standards and Billing Practices for Residential Telephone Service and Chapter 63 regulations for telephone service. For the most part, consumer complaints represent customer appeals to the Commission resulting from the inability of the utility and the customer to reach a mutually satisfactory resolution to a dispute.

Consumer Complaints by Industry* 2011-12

Industry	2011	2012	% Change
Electric	7,401	8,520	15%
Gas	2,550	2,733	7%
Water	860	815	-5%
Telephone	3,901	2,757	-29%
Other	6	5	-17%
Total	14,718	14,830	1%

* Table includes both residential and commercial consumer complaints.

During 2012, electric and gas utilities accounted for 57 percent and 18 percent, respectively, of all consumer complaints investigated by BCS. Water utilities accounted for 6 percent, while telephone utilities were the subject of 19 percent.

Justified Consumer Complaints

Once a BCS investigator issues a decision regarding a consumer complaint, BCS reviews the utility's records to determine if the utility took appropriate action when handling the customer's contact. BCS uses these records to determine the outcome of the case. This approach focuses strictly on the regulatory aspect of the complaint and evaluates utilities negatively only where, in the judgment of BCS, the utility did not follow appropriate complaint-handling procedures or properly apply regulations. Specifically, a case is considered “justified” in the appeal to BCS if it is found that, prior to BCS intervention, the company did not comply with Commission Orders, regulations, reports, Secretarial Letters, tariffs, etc.

Classification of Consumer Complaints

BCS has categorized the 2012 residential complaints into 13 categories for each of the electric, gas and water utilities and into 11 categories for each of the telephone utilities. The tables that show the percent of complaints in each category in 2012 appear in each industry chapter. The percentages shown in the tables are for all of the cases that residential consumers filed with BCS, not just the cases that are determined to be justified in coming to BCS. BCS analyzes the categories that generate complaints or problems for customers, even if the utility records indicate that the utility followed Commission procedures and guidelines in handling the complaint. BCS often discusses its findings with individual utilities so they can use the information to review their complaint-handling procedures in categories that seem to produce large numbers of consumer complaints to the Commission. The four tables in Appendix E show the actual number of cases in each category in 2012.

Payment Agreement Requests

PARs principally include contacts to BCS involving requests for payment terms in one of the following situations:

- Suspension/termination of service is pending;
- Service has been terminated and the customer needs payment terms to have service restored; or
- The customer wants to eliminate a debt or arrearage from a past-due balance.

All of the measures pertaining to PARs are based on assessments of contacts to BCS from individual customers. As with consumer complaints, almost all customers had already contacted the utility prior to contacting BCS. During 2012, BCS handled 53,042 PARs from customers of the utilities under the Commission's jurisdiction.

Act 201 of 2004 amended Title 66 by adding Chapter 14, the Responsible Utility Customer Protection Act, which changed the rules for terminations, reconnections and PARs. On June 9, 2011, the Commission adopted a final rulemaking order incorporating Chapter 14 into Chapter 56. The Independent Regulatory Review Commission (IRRC) approved these regulations on July 21, 2011. The revised Chapter 56 regulations have been in effect since Oct. 8, 2011.

In 2012, the overall volume of PARs handled by the Commission decreased by 10 percent from the previous year. PARs from electric customers decreased 15 percent, while PARs from gas and water customers increased 4 and 1 percent, respectively, since 2011. PARs from telephone customers declined 14 percent from 2011 to 2012.

Payment Agreement Requests (PARs) by Industry* 2011-12

Industry	2011	2012	% Change
Electric	42,826	36,341	-15%
Gas	11,254	11,663	4%
Water	4,579	4,628	1%
Telephone	469	404	-14%
Other	4	6	50%
Total	59,132	53,042	-10%

* Table includes both residential and commercial PARs. Please note: All consumer contacts requesting a payment agreement are taken in and classified as a PAR. However, not all customers requesting a PAR receive one. BCS does not have the authority to offer PARs for commercial accounts.

As in past years, the majority of requests for payment agreements in 2012 involved electric or gas companies. Sixty-nine percent of the PARs (36,341 cases) were from electric customers, and 22 percent (11,663 cases) were from gas customers. Also, 9 percent of PARs (4,628 cases) came from customers of various water utilities. Only 1 percent of PARs (404) came from telephone customers.

Inquiries and Opinions

During 2012, BCS received 63,113 customer contacts that, for the most part, required no follow-up investigation beyond the initial contact. BCS classifies these contacts as "inquiries." The inquiries for 2012 include contacts to the BCS Utility Customer Hotline, as well as contacts to BCS using mail service and email communication.

In large part, the inquiries in 2012 involved competition issues and requests for information about competition. BCS also classifies certain PARs as inquiries. For example, BCS does not issue payment decisions on requests to restore or avoid suspension/termination of toll or non-basic telephone service. When consumers call with these problems, BCS classifies these requests as inquiries. Similarly, if a customer has recently been through the BCS payment agreement process and calls again with a new request regarding the same account, BCS does not open a new PAR case. In these instances, BCS classifies the customer's contact as an inquiry.

As in past years, BCS also has shifted some contacts that originated as consumer complaints and PARs into the inquiry category because it was not appropriate to count these contacts as informal complaints. Examples include complaints that were found to be duplicates, informal complaints filed against the wrong company, informal complaints that BCS handled in spite of the fact that customers had not previously contacted their companies about their problems and cases that the investigators verbally dismissed. These 528 cases accounted for 1 percent of inquiries in 2012.

BCS is able to expand its list of 79 reasons for contact as consumer reasons grow and change. Possible actions by BCS intake staff include: recording the consumer's opinion; giving information to the consumer; referring the consumer to a utility company; and referring the consumer to an agency or organization outside of the Commission. If the contact requires further action, the intake staff refers the contact to a BCS investigator, and the contact becomes a consumer complaint or a PAR. The following table shows the various reasons for contact for the 2012 inquiries.

Categories of 2012 Inquiries

Reason for Contact	Number	Percent
Competition issues and requests for information	14,344	23%
CAP review – declined	10,065	16%
Termination or suspension of service	9,666	15%
Unable to open new PAR – service on	6,078	10%
PUC has no jurisdiction	4,825	8%
Request for general information	4,441	7%
Billing dispute	2,990	5%
Applicant/deposit issue	1,755	3%
People-delivered company service	1,341	2%
Service (company facilities)	891	1%
Rate protest	533	1%
Weather outage	371	1%
Rate complaint	162	<1%
Unable to open new PAR – service off	125	<1%
Cramming	17	<1%
Slamming	7	<1%
Other miscellaneous reasons	4,071	6%
Reason for contact is not available	1,431	2%
Total	63,113	100%

Residential Consumer Complaints Not Included in Industry Chapters

Traditionally, the primary focus of BCS's review of utilities' complaint handling has been on the performance of the major electric, gas, water and telephone utilities. However, for the past several years, BCS has included a limited amount of complaint information for the non-major utilities and the other service providers in the UCARE. In 2012, BCS experienced a major increase in the overall number of residential consumer complaints. For the non-major utilities, consumer complaints increased over the year in the electric industries, but decreased in the gas, water and telephone industries. In the electric industry, consumer complaints rose significantly for the non-major companies, up 114 percent from 2011. This

section presents information about the residential consumer complaints that are not included in the industry chapters that follow.

In 2012, BCS staff investigated consumer complaints about a variety of problems that consumers were having with the non-major companies under the Commission's jurisdiction. The vast majority of complaints not included in the industry chapters involved billing disputes.

The next-highest volume of complaints coming from residential customers of the non-major electric, gas, water and telephone companies involved deceptive advertising or slamming. Those three types of complaints accounted for 82 percent of the residential consumer complaints about the non-major companies in the electric industry; 49 percent of residential consumer complaints about the non-major gas companies; and 36 percent of the complaints about the non-major telecommunications companies. BCS did not receive any complaints about these three issues from customers of the non-major water companies in 2012.

Appendix C presents a summary of the residential consumer complaints that are not included in the electric, gas, water and telephone chapters that follow. The table lists the non-major companies for these industries; the electric generation suppliers and natural gas suppliers; and other providers of telecommunications services having five or more residential consumer complaints in 2012.

Calls to the Commission about Electric and Gas Competition

In 2012, the Commission's call center employees used BCS's computerized information system to record information from the consumer contacts about electric and gas competition. Statistics show that 96 percent of contacts about electric and gas competition are related to the electric industry, while 4 percent concern the gas industry.

Call center employees recorded information from 15,914 consumer contacts about competition in the energy industries. Many calls came from consumers who called about various issues associated with customer choice in the electric and gas industries. Most frequently, consumers called to request competition documents and to seek information about competition in general (44 and 16 percent of calls, respectively).

In most instances, BCS classified these contacts as inquiries because they required no investigation or follow-up. The BCS or call center staff person took care of the consumer's request or question at the initial contact. However, some consumer contacts required further investigation and possibly action to resolve the consumer's concerns. In these cases, BCS classified the contact as a consumer complaint and investigated the consumer's issue. In 2012, deceptive advertising/sales produced the largest volume of competition-related consumer complaints. Appendix D-1 explains the types of competition complaints BCS handles.

In prior years, BCS investigated a number of consumer complaints in which consumers alleged they were assigned to an electric or gas supplier without their consent or knowledge (slamming). In 2012, BCS received 352 allegations of electric slamming and 12 allegations of slamming in the gas industry. There were 28 allegations of slamming in the telephone

industry. With respect to slamming, the Commission has stated clearly, it "...will have zero tolerance for slamming by any means and in any form."¹ The Commission views customer slamming as among the most serious violations of consumer regulations. Of the 392 slamming complaints received by BCS, 344 were filed by residential customers.

During the early phases of electric and gas competition, BCS expected it would receive consumer complaints associated with the transition to customer choice. As expected, many customers experienced a variety of problems as they began choosing electric and gas suppliers. BCS found that, after investigating these complaints, it was often difficult to determine who was at fault in causing the complaint. Thus, BCS decided that it would be unfair to include competition complaints with consumer complaints about other issues when it calculates the performance measures it uses to evaluate and compare companies within the electric and gas industries. BCS continued this practice in 2012. Therefore, BCS excluded 1,756 competition-related complaints from the data set used to prepare the tables in the electric industry chapter and 73 such complaints in the gas industry chapter.

Informal Compliance Process and Infractions

BCS's informal compliance process remains its primary compliance effort. This process gives each utility specific examples of apparent infractions of Chapters 14, 56, 63 and 64. The informal compliance process uses consumer complaints to identify, document and notify utilities of apparent deficiencies. The utilities can use the information to pinpoint and voluntarily correct deficiencies in their customer-service operations. The process begins by BCS notifying a utility of an alleged infraction. A utility that receives notification of an allegation has an opportunity to respond. If the information about the allegation is accurate, BCS expects the utility to take action to correct the problem or address any deficiencies that led to the infraction. Corrective actions may entail: modifying a computer program; revising company procedures or the text of a notice, bill or letter; or providing additional staff training to ensure the proper use of a procedure.

If the utility states the information is inaccurate, it needs to provide specific details and supporting data to disprove the allegation. BCS always provides a final determination to the utility regarding the alleged infraction. For example, if the utility provides supporting data indicating that the information about the allegation is inaccurate, BCS, after reviewing all of the information, informs the utility that, in this instance, the facts do not reflect an infraction of the regulations. On the other hand, if the company agrees the information forming the basis of the allegation is accurate, or if BCS does not find that the data supports the utility's position that the information is inaccurate, BCS informs the company that the facts reflect an infraction of a particular section of the regulations. The notification process allows utilities to receive written clarifications of Chapter 14, 56, 63 or 64 provisions and the policies of the Commission and BCS.

The significance of apparent infractions identified by the informal compliance process is frequently emphasized by the fact that some represent systemic errors that are

¹ L-00970121, Public Meeting of May 21, 1998.

widespread and affect many utility customers. Since BCS receives only a small portion of the complaints that customers have with their utility companies, limited opportunities exist to identify such errors. Therefore, the informal compliance process is specifically designed to help utilities identify systemic errors. One example of a systemic error is a termination notice with text that does not comply with the requirements of Chapter 56. Each recipient of the notice is affected by that error. When such an error is discovered, BCS encourages utilities to investigate the scope of the problem and take corrective action. Some utilities have developed their own information systems to identify problems by reviewing complaints before they come to the Commission's attention. BCS encourages utilities to continue this activity and share their findings with Bureau staff.

2. Performance Measures

For the most part, BCS uses complaints it receives from customers of the major electric, gas, water and telephone utilities to assess utilities' complaint-handling performance. In nearly every case, the customer had already contacted the company about the problem prior to contacting BCS. BCS reviews the utility's record as to how the utility handled the complaint when the customer contacted the company. The review includes several classifications and assessments that form the basis of all the performance measures presented in this and the next four chapters, with the exception of the number of terminations and termination rate. The termination statistics for the electric and gas companies are drawn from reports required by Chapter 56 at §56.231(8), while telephone termination statistics are drawn from reports required by Chapter 64 at §64.201(7). The sections that follow explain the various measures BCS employs to assess utility performance.

Consumer Complaint Rate

The calculation of consumer complaint rate (consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers) permits the reader to make comparisons among utilities of various sizes. BCS has found that high consumer complaint rates and extreme changes in consumer complaint rates from one year to the next are often indicative of patterns and trends that it should investigate. However, since many of the complaints in the consumer complaint rates are not "justified," BCS considers the "justified consumer complaint rate" (justified consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers) to be a more clear indication of a utility's complaint handling performance.

Justified Consumer Complaint Rate

BCS uses case evaluation to identify whether correct procedures were followed by the utility in responding to the customer's complaint prior to the intervention of BCS. Case evaluation is used to determine whether a case is "justified." A customer's case is considered "justified" if it is found that, prior to BCS intervention, the company did not comply with Commission Orders, policies, regulations, reports, Secretarial Letters or tariffs in reaching its final position. In the judgment of BCS, a case that is "justified" is a clear indication that the company did not handle a dispute properly or effectively, or, in handling the dispute, the company violated a rule, regulation or law.

The performance measure called "justified consumer complaint rate" reflects both volume of complaints and percent of consumer complaints found justified. The justified consumer complaint rate is the number of justified consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers. By using this ratio, the reader can use the "justified" rate to compare utilities' performance within an industry and over time. BCS perceives the justified consumer complaint rate to be the bottom-line measure of performance that evaluates how effectively a company handles complaints from its customers.

BCS monitors the complaint rates and justified rates of the major utilities, paying particular attention to the number of justified complaints that customers file with the Commission. Justified complaints may indicate areas where BCS should discuss complaint-

handling procedures with a utility so that its customers receive fair and equitable treatment when they deal with the utility. When BCS encounters company case-handling performance (justified consumer complaint rate) that is significantly worse than average, there is reason to suspect that many customers who contact the utility are at risk of improper dispute handling by the utility. As part of the monitoring process, BCS compares the “justified” rates of individual utilities and industries over time and investigates significant changes when they occur. In the chapters that follow, BCS compares the consumer complaint rates and the justified consumer complaint rates of the major utilities within the electric, gas, water and telephone industries.

Response Time to Consumer Complaints

Once a customer contacts BCS with a complaint about a utility, the utility is notified. The utility then sends BCS its records of its contact with the customer regarding the complaint. Response time is the time span in days from the date of BCS's first contact with the utility regarding a complaint to the date on which the utility provides BCS with its report regarding the complaint. Response time quantifies the speed of a utility's response to BCS' informal complaints. In the following chapters, response time is presented as the average number of days that each utility took to supply BCS with its utility reports in response to consumer complaints.

Payment Agreement Request Rate

BCS normally intervenes at the customer's request only after direct payment negotiations between the customer and the company have failed. The volume of PARs from a utility's customers may fluctuate from year to year, or even from month to month, depending upon the utility's collection strategy, as well as economic factors. The calculation of the PAR rate (PARs per 1,000 residential customers) permits the reader to make comparisons among utilities with differing numbers of residential customers. Nevertheless, unusually high or low rates and sizable changes in rates from one year to the next may reflect changes in company policies or bill collection philosophies, or they may be indicative of problems. BCS views such variations as potential areas for investigation. Improved access to BCS is one factor influencing the number of consumers who are able to contact BCS about payment agreements.

Justified Payment Agreement Request Rate

Just as with consumer complaints, once a customer contacts BCS with a PAR, BCS notifies the utility. The company sends a report to BCS that details the customer's payments, usage and payment negotiation history. Many of these cases are “straight” PARs, without any other issue or complaint against the company. Those cases are processed in an automated fashion and are not evaluated in the justified rate. In cases where the utility claims ineligibility for a PUC payment plan, or where there are complaints or claims in addition to the PAR, a BCS investigator considers the customer's record and makes a decision regarding the amortization of the amount owed and notifies the company and the customer of the decision. BCS policy analysts review a sampling of these case records to determine if the utility negotiated properly with the customer and uses this record to

determine the outcome of the case. This approach evaluates companies negatively only when BCS finds appropriate payment negotiation procedures were not followed, or where the regulations have been misapplied. Specifically, a case is considered “justified” in the appeal to BCS if it is found that, prior to BCS intervention, the company did not comply with Commission regulations, reports, Secretarial Letters, tariffs or guidelines.

Changes in company policy can influence not only the volume of PARs to the Commission, but also the effectiveness of a utility’s payment negotiations. BCS uses the “justified PAR rate” to measure a utility’s performance at handling PARs from customers. The justified PAR rate is the ratio of the number of justified PARs per 1,000 residential customers. BCS monitors the justified PAR rates of the major utilities. For example, BCS compares the “justified” rates of individual utilities and industries over time and investigates significant changes when they occur. In the chapters that follow, BCS compares the PAR rates and the justified PAR rates of the major utilities within the electric, gas, water and telephone industries. Because BCS receives a very large volume of requests for payment terms, it reviews a random sample of cases for the companies with the largest number of PARs. For these companies, the justified PAR rate and response time are based on a statistically valid subset of the cases that came to BCS.

Response Time to Payment Agreement Requests

Once a customer contacts BCS for a PAR, BCS notifies the utility. The utility then sends BCS records that include the customer’s payment history, the amount owed, prior payment agreements and the results of the most recent payment negotiation with the customer. Response time is the number of days from the date BCS first contacts the utility regarding a PAR, to the date on which the utility provides BCS with its utility report so that BCS is able to issue payment terms, resolve any other issues raised by the customer and determine whether the customer was justified in seeking a payment agreement through BCS. Response time quantifies the speed of a utility’s response to BCS PARs. In the following chapters, response time is presented as the average number of days that each utility took to supply BCS with its utility report.

BCS calculates response time for the major electric, gas and water companies using only their responses to PARs from customers whose service has been terminated, who have a dispute with the company, or who have previously had a BCS payment agreement for the amount that they owe.

However, response time to PARs for the telephone companies is the average number of days that each telephone company took to supply BCS with a utility report for all categories of PARs.

Infraction Rate

During 2012, BCS continued its informal compliance notification process to improve utility compliance with applicable statutes and regulations relating to the treatment of residential accounts. In order to compare utilities of various sizes within an industry, BCS has calculated a measure called the infraction rate. The infraction rate is the number of informally verified infractions for each 1,000 residential customers.

Several considerations are important to keep in mind when viewing the infraction rate charts in the chapters that follow. First, the data does not consider the causes of the individual infractions. Second, some infractions may be more serious than others because of their systemic nature, and therefore may show ongoing or repetitive occurrences. Still other infractions may be more serious because they involve threats to the health and safety of utility customers.

The value of the infraction rate is to depict industry trends over time. The trend for 2012 is calculated using BCS's Compliance Tracking System (CTS) data as of Nov. 14, 2013, for the electric, gas and water industries, and April 4, 2013, for the telephone industry. The 2012 trends may change if the total number of infractions increases or decreases upon review by BCS. This would occur if new infractions are discovered from customer complaints that originated in 2012, but were still under investigation by BCS when the data was retrieved from CTS. Often, the total number of infractions for the year will change from the number cited in this report. BCS will update the number of infractions found on 2012 cases in the report on 2013 complaint activity. Infraction rates for each major electric, gas, water and telephone utility company are shown for 2010, 2011 and 2012 in upcoming chapters. Appendix H shows detailed information about the infractions BCS gleaned from its review of the 2012 consumer complaints and PARs. The information presented in Appendix H shows the infractions of Chapter 56, Chapter 14 and other regulations for the major electric, gas and water companies, and the infractions of Chapters 63 and 64 for the major telephone companies.

Termination Rate

Payment over time through a mutually acceptable payment agreement is one possible outcome when a customer owes an outstanding balance to a utility company. Termination of the utility service is another. BCS views termination of utility service as a utility's last resort when customers fail to meet their payment obligations. The calculation of the termination rate allows the reader to compare the termination activity of utilities with differing numbers of residential customers. For the electric and natural gas industries, the termination rate is the number of service terminations divided by the number of residential customers. For the telephone industry, the termination rate is the number of terminations for each 1,000 residential customers. Any significant increase in the termination rate would indicate a trend or pattern the Commission may need to investigate. Water utilities do not report service termination statistics to the Commission. Thus, the water industry chapter does not include termination rate information.

BCS Performance Measures and Industry Chapters

The tables in the following chapters present the data alphabetically by company name. Each chapter includes tables that show the consumer complaint rate and the justified consumer complaint rate of each major utility. Also included in the industry chapters are tables that show the prior year's justified consumer complaint rates and justified PAR rates for each of the major utilities. The tables also reflect the average rates of the major utilities within the industry for each of these measures. In addition, each industry chapter presents tables that show infraction rates for the major utilities, response times to consumer

complaints and PARs, and the termination rates for the major electric, gas and telephone utilities.

It is important to note that the electric and gas industry chapters present only data from those utilities that have more than 100,000 residential customers. In the water industry chapter, data for the "Class A" water utilities that have fewer than 100,000 residential customers are presented together as a whole. The telephone chapter presents data from those local service providers serving more than 50,000 residential customers.

BCS has found the inclusion of statistics for the smaller utilities can skew the average of industry statistics in ways that do not fairly represent industry performance. For this reason, BCS excluded the statistics involving UGI-Electric when it calculated the 2011 and 2012 averages for the electric industry. Similar to previous years, statistics for UGI-Electric are included in the appendices of this report.

Universal Service and Energy Conservation Programs

The Commission has a long history of involvement in universal service and energy conservation programs that help utility consumers obtain and keep service, and conserve energy. At the end of the water and telephone chapters that follow, readers will find highlights of the water and telephone programs that the Commission has supported and encouraged, not only in 2012, but in prior years as well.

BCS monitors and evaluates the universal service and energy conservation programs of the electric and gas companies. The Commission's goal in monitoring these programs is to help the Commission fulfill its oversight responsibilities by increasing the effectiveness of utility collections while protecting the public's health and safety.

The electric and gas programs include: Customer Assistance Programs; the Low-Income Usage Reduction Programs; Utility Hardship Fund Programs; Customer Assistance and Referral Evaluation Services programs; and other programs to assist low-income customers. BCS's reporting on these programs is no longer included in this report.

In Nov. 2013, the Commission released the 13th annual report on Universal Service Programs and Collections Performance. BCS prepared the report, which presents 2012 universal service and collections data for the major electric and natural gas distribution companies. The report is available on the Commission's website at:

http://www.puc.pa.gov/General/publications_reports/pdf/EDC_NGDC_UniServ_Rpt2012.pdf

3. Electric Industry

In 2012, the Commission had jurisdiction over 15 electric distribution companies (EDCs). However, the majority of the consumer complaints and PARs involving the electric industry were from residential customers of the seven major EDCs: Duquesne Light Co. (Duquesne); PECO Energy Co. (PECO); PPL Electric Utilities Inc. (PPL) and four FirstEnergy companies – Metropolitan Edison Co. (Met-Ed); Pennsylvania Electric Co. (Penelec); Pennsylvania Power Co. (Penn Power) and West Penn Power Co. (West Penn). This chapter will focus exclusively on those seven companies. Most of the complaints and PARs dealt with matters covered under 52 Pa. Code, Chapter 56, Standards and Billing Practices for Residential Utility Service or 66 Pa. C.S.A. Chapter 14, Responsible Utility Customer Protection. Generally, consumer complaints and PARs represent customer appeals to the Commission resulting from the inability of the company and the customer to reach a mutually satisfactory resolution to a dispute or payment negotiation.

The statistics in the tables on the pages that follow depict the performance of each of the seven major electric utilities in 2012. The tables in the appendices also include UGI-Electric, a major EDC with fewer than 100,000 residential customers. PECO's statistics include data for both electric and gas service. Because their gas and/or electric customers contact the same call center and receive only one bill per billing period, PECO is unable to separate and report data by gas and electric service. BCS investigated complaints in 2012, generated as a result of the electric choice program, which allows customers to choose an electric generation supply company. However, as mentioned in the first chapter, BCS removed these complaints from the data it used to prepare the tables on consumer complaints and PARs. Appendices F and G present statistics on the performance of the seven largest EDCs, as well as UGI-Electric, in 2011 and 2012.

Consumer Complaints

During 2012, BCS handled 6,332 consumer complaints from residential customers of the various EDCs and 1,410 consumer complaints from residential customers of electric generation supply companies. Of these residential complaints, 81 percent (6,237) were from customers of the seven largest EDCs. For the analyses in this chapter, BCS excluded a total of 188 consumer complaints about the major EDCs that involved competition issues.

Consumer Complaint Categories

The following table shows the percentage of 2012 complaints from residential customers of the seven largest EDCs, in each of the 13 categories used by BCS policy analysts. Appendix E, Table 1, provides the actual number of cases that fell into each category in 2012.

Consumer Complaint Categories: 2012 Major Electric Distribution Companies

Categories	Duquesne	Met-Ed	PECO+**	Penelec	Penn Power	PPL**	West Penn	Electric Majors
Personnel Problems	30%	15%	17%	16%	17%	12%	16%	18%
Metering	2%	27%	3%	21%	11%	6%	18%	15%
Billing Disputes	9%	9%	17%	13%	17%	12%	7%	10%
Service Interruptions	2%	15%	3%	7%	5%	5%	13%	9%
Discontinuance/ Transfer	7%	5%	10%	6%	9%	16%	3%	7%
Credit and Deposits	6%	4%	11%	5%	6%	2%	5%	5%
Other Payment Issues	6%	3%	7%	3%	6%	5%	4%	5%
Damages	2%	3%	2%	5%	5%	2%	8%	4%
Service Extensions	1%	3%	2%	3%	1%	2%	9%	3%
Scheduling Delays	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	6%	3%
Service Quality	2%	4%	2%	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%
Rates	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%	1%
All Other Problems	31%	9%	24%	17%	17%	30%	8%	18%
Total-Number*	578	847	356	511	109	370	640	3,411

* Based on residential complaints evaluated by BCS as of July 12, 2013.

** Based on a probability sample of cases.

+ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

- Categories are for all residential complaints filed with BCS, whether or not they were found to be justified. See Appendix D-1 for an explanation of complaint categories and Appendix E, Table 1, for the number of cases in each category.
- In 2012, personnel problems accounted for 18 percent of the consumer complaints for the major EDCs. Metering disputes accounted for 15 percent of the consumer complaints, and billing disputes accounted for 10 percent of the consumer complaints. These three categories accounted for 43 percent of consumer complaints about the major EDCs.

**2012 Residential Consumer Complaint Rates/
Justified Consumer Complaint Rates
Major Electric Distribution Companies**

Company	Consumer Complaint Rate	Justified Consumer Complaint Rate
Duquesne	1.55	0.16
Met-Ed	2.41	0.34
PECO+	1.09	0.15*
Penelec	1.39	0.12
Penn Power	1.09	0.14
PPL	0.77	0.10*
West Penn	1.45	0.30
Average	1.39	0.19

* Justified consumer complaint rate based on a probability sample of cases.

+ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

- The consumer complaint rate equals the number of consumer complaints for each 1,000 residential customers. The justified consumer complaint rate equals the number of justified consumer complaints for each 1,000 residential customers.
- For the major EDCs, the average of the consumer complaint rates is more than seven times greater than the average of the justified consumer complaint rates.
- Appendix F, Table 1, presents the number of consumer complaints, the consumer complaint rate, the number of justified consumer complaints and the justified consumer complaint rate for each major EDC in 2011 and 2012.

2011-12 Justified Residential Consumer Complaint Rates Major Electric Distribution Companies

Company	2011	2012
Duquesne	0.18	0.16
Met-Ed	0.12	0.34
PECO*+	0.20	0.15
Penelec	0.09	0.12
Penn Power	0.04	0.14
PPL*	0.08	0.10
West Penn	0.11	0.30
Average	0.12	0.19

* Based on a probability sample of cases.

+ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

- The justified consumer complaint rate equals the number of justified consumer complaints for each 1,000 residential customers.
- The average of the justified consumer complaint rates for the major electric distribution companies increased from 0.12 in 2011 to 0.19 in 2012.
- Of the seven major EDCs, five have justified consumer complaint rates that are lower than the industry average. Met-Ed and West Penn have justified consumer complaint rates that are higher than the 2012 industry average.
- Appendix F, Table 1, presents the number of consumer complaints, the consumer complaint rate, the number of justified consumer complaints and the justified consumer complaint rate for each major EDC in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Response Time to BCS
Residential Consumer Complaints
Major Electric Distribution Companies**

Company	Number of Days 2011	Number of Days 2012	Change in Days 2011 to 2012
Duquesne	17.7	19.5	1.8
Met-Ed	12.1	15.3	3.2
PECO+	8.3	7.6	-0.7
Penelec	12.2	15.4	3.2
Penn Power	10.4	13.2	2.8
PPL	21.4	18.4	-3.0
West Penn	12.0	17.4	5.4
Average	13.4	15.3	1.9

+ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

- The calculation for average response time includes all residential consumer complaints for the major electric companies.
- Overall, the average response time increased from 13.4 days in 2011 to 15.3 days in 2012.
- PECO had the shortest consumer complaint response time in 2012 at 7.6 days, while Duquesne had the longest at 19.5 days. West Penn's consumer complaint response time increased by more than five days from 2011 to 2012.

Payment Agreement Requests

In 2012, BCS handled 36,158 PARs from residential customers of the EDCs. There were 61 PARs from residential customers of Pennsylvania's electric generation supply companies. Ninety-eight percent (35,367) of the residential PARs were from customers of the seven largest EDCs. In 2012, BCS reviewed a representative sample of the PARs for six of the seven largest EDCs: Duquesne, Met-Ed, PECO, Penelec, PPL and West Penn. Thus, the calculation for justified PAR rate that appears in the pages that follow is based on a subset of cases that BCS received from the customers of these utilities. BCS believes that the size of the samples gives a reasonable indication of the performance of these companies. Appendix G, Table 1, provides additional statistics regarding the PARs from residential customers of the major EDCs.

**2012 Residential Payment Agreement Request (PAR) Rates/
Justified PAR Rates*
Major Electric Distribution Companies**

Company	PAR Rate	Justified PAR Rate
Duquesne	11.46	0.13
Met-Ed	4.88	0.11
PECO+	5.52	0.05
Penelec	4.18	0.08
Penn Power	4.32	0.09
PPL	12.25	0.45
West Penn	2.33	0.08
Average	6.42	0.14

* All companies, with the exception of Penn Power, have justified PAR rates based on a probability sample of cases.

+ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

- The PAR rate equals the number of PARs for each 1,000 residential customers. The justified PAR rate equals the number of justified PARs for each 1,000 residential customers.
- On average, there were more than six PARs to BCS for each 1,000 residential customers of the major EDCs in 2012. There was less than one justified PAR for each 1,000 residential customers.
- The implementation of Chapter 14 had an impact on the 2012 PAR rates and justified PAR rates.
- Appendix G, Table 1, presents the number of PARs, the PAR rate, the number of justified PARs and the justified PAR rate for each major EDC in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Justified Residential
Payment Agreement Request (PAR) Rates*
Major Electric Distribution Companies**

Company	2011	2012
Duquesne	0.13	0.13
Met-Ed	0.06	0.11
PECO+	0.10	0.05
Penelec	0.06	0.08
Penn Power	0.12	0.09
PPL	0.90	0.45
West Penn	0.24	0.08
Average	0.23	0.14

* All companies, with the exception of Penn Power, have justified PAR rates based on a probability sample of cases.

+ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

- The justified PAR rate equals the number of justified PARs for each 1,000 residential customers.
- The average of the justified PAR rates for the seven major EDCs decreased from 0.23 in 2011 to 0.14 in 2012.
- The justified PAR rates decreased for four of the seven major EDCs from 2011 to 2012. One of the major EDCs has a justified PAR rate greater than the 2012 industry average while six of the major EDCs have justified PAR rates below the industry average.
- The implementation of Chapter 14 had an impact on the 2011 and 2012 justified PAR rates.
- Appendix G, Table 1, presents the number of PARs, the PAR rate, the number of justified PARs and the justified PAR rate for each major EDC in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Response Time to BCS
Residential Payment Agreement Requests (PARs)
Major Electric Distribution Companies**

Company	Number of Days 2011	Number of Days 2012	Change in Days 2011 to 2012
Duquesne	10.6	12.6	2.0
Met-Ed	3.4	9.5	6.1
PECO+	3.4	3.2	-0.2
Penelec	3.5	9.5	6.0
Penn Power	3.9	9.0	5.1
PPL	15.5	9.5	-6.0
West Penn	5.7	8.4	2.7
Average	6.6	8.8	2.2

+ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

- The calculation for average response time includes all residential PARs for the major electric companies.
- The average response time for the seven major EDCs increased from 6.6 days in 2011 to 8.8 days in 2012.
- There is a wide range of PAR response times among the major EDCs for 2012, from a low of 3.2 days for PECO to a high of 12.6 days for Duquesne.

Termination and Reconnection of Service

Each month, the electric companies report to the Commission the number of residential accounts that they terminated for non-payment during the previous month. They also report the number of previously terminated residential accounts that they reconnected during the month. Some EDCs maintain a fairly consistent pattern of termination behavior, while others fluctuate from year to year. The number of reconnections varies from year to year and from company to company, depending on a variety of factors. The EDC reconnects a customer's terminated service when a customer either pays his/her debt in full or makes a significant payment on the debt and agrees to a payment agreement for the balance owed to the company. The following tables indicate the annual number of residential accounts each of the seven largest EDCs terminated and reconnected in 2010, 2011 and 2012. The first table also presents the termination rates for each of these companies.

Residential Service Terminations/Termination Rates Major Electric Distribution Companies

Company	Residential Service Terminations				Termination Rates		
	2010	2011	2012	% Change 2011-12	2010	2011	2012
Duquesne	21,915	22,927	23,533	3%	4.18	4.37	4.48
Met-Ed	10,676	18,169	17,995	-1%	2.20	3.73	3.69
PECO+	78,180	81,408	73,887	-9%	5.51	5.71	5.16
Penelec	6,750	17,513	13,747	-22%	1.34	3.46	2.72
Penn Power	1,705	3,622	3,514	-3%	1.22	2.58	2.50
PPL	33,536	33,641	38,303	14%	2.77	2.77	3.15
West Penn	16,803	15,351	11,092	-28%	2.73	2.49	1.79
Major Electric	169,565	192,631	182,071	-5%			
Average of Rates					2.85	3.59	3.36

+ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

- The termination rate is the number of service terminations divided by the number of residential customers, expressed as a percent.
- Overall, the seven major EDCs terminated 5 percent fewer residential accounts in 2012 than in 2011.

Residential Service Reconnections Major Electric Distribution Companies

Company	2010	2011	2012	% Change 2011-12
Duquesne	15,946	16,846	18,179	8%
Met-Ed	7,650	14,696	14,651	<1%
PECO+	55,863	58,323	52,512	-10%
Penelec	4,111	14,209	10,989	-23%
Penn Power	1,104	3,316	3,208	-3%
PPL	22,158	22,727	26,326	16%
West Penn	10,121	9,914	9,082	-8%
Major Electric	116,953	140,031	134,947	-4%

+ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

- Overall, the seven major EDCs reconnected 4 percent fewer residential accounts in 2012 than in 2011.

Compliance

BCS provides utilities with written clarifications or explanations of Chapter 56 provisions and other Commission regulations and policies. The use of "infraction rate" is intended to help the Commission monitor the duty of electric companies at 66 Pa. C.S. §2807(d) to, at a minimum, maintain customer services under retail competition at the same level of quality as existed prior to the beginning of the Electricity Generation Customer Choice and Competition Act of 1996.

The infraction rates in the table that follows are based on all informal complaints that residential consumers filed with BCS from 2010 through 2012. Infractions identified on complaints involving competition issues are included in the infraction statistics. Appendix H, Table 1, presents detailed information about the infractions identified in 2012 cases to the BCS.

Commission Infraction Rates Major Electric Distribution Companies

Company	2010	2011	2012
Duquesne	0.08	0.11	0.10
Met-Ed	0.06	0.08	0.23
PECO+	0.07	0.04	0.04
Penelec	0.03	0.07	0.07
Penn Power	0.06	0.06	0.06
PPL	0.06	0.02	0.05
West Penn	0.11	0.07	0.10

+ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

- The infraction rate is the number of informally verified infractions per 1,000 residential customers.
- The infraction rates from 2011 to 2012 for Met-Ed, PPL and West Penn increased, while the rate for Duquesne decreased. The rates remained stable for PECO, Penelec and Penn Power.
- Appendix H, Table 1, presents the actual number of infractions for 2012 categorized by infraction category.
- As shown in Appendix H, Table 1, the dispute handling category is noteworthy due to both high volume and high percentage of the total number of infractions.

4. Natural Gas Industry

In 2012, the Commission had jurisdiction over 30 natural gas distribution companies (NGDCs). However, the majority of the consumer complaints and PARs involving the gas industry came from residential customers of the seven major NGDCs: Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania Inc. (Columbia); Equitable Gas Co. (Equitable); National Fuel Gas Distribution Corp. (NFG); Peoples Natural Gas Co. (Peoples); Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW); UGI Utilities Inc. -Gas; and UGI Penn Natural Gas. This chapter will focus exclusively on those seven utilities. As with the electric industry, most of the complaints and PARs dealt with matters covered under 52 Pa. Code, Chapter 56, Standards and Billing Practices for Residential Utility Service or 66 Pa. C.S.A. Chapter 14, Responsible Utility Customer Protection. Generally, those consumer complaints and PARs represent customer appeals to the Commission resulting from the inability of the company and the customer to reach a mutually satisfactory resolution to a dispute or payment negotiation.

The statistics in the tables on the pages that follow depict the performance of each of the seven major gas utilities in 2012. Appendices F and G provide statistics for these utilities from 2011 and 2012.

Consumer Complaints

During 2012, BCS handled 2,486 consumer complaints from residential customers of the various NGDCs and 57 consumer complaints from residential customers of natural gas suppliers (NGSs). Of these residential complaints, 95 percent (2,410) were from customers of the seven largest NGDCs. For the analyses of the seven major gas companies that appear in this chapter, BCS excluded 19 consumer complaints that involved competition issues.

Consumer Complaint Categories

The following table shows the percentage of 2012 complaints from residential customers of the seven major gas utilities in each of the 13 categories, used by BCS policy analysts to categorize consumer complaints about electric, gas and water utilities. Appendix E, Table 2, provides the actual number of cases that fell into each category in 2012.

Consumer Complaint Categories: 2012 Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies

Categories	Columbia	Equitable	NFG	Peoples	PGW**	UGI-Gas	UGI Penn Natural	Gas Majors
Personnel Problems	28%	36%	15%	20%	18%	26%	14%	22%
Billing Disputes	9%	13%	11%	18%	22%	14%	16%	17%
Metering	7%	1%	12%	13%	18%	2%	3%	11%
Discontinuance/Transfer	3%	6%	15%	5%	16%	11%	10%	10%
Other Payment Issues	6%	4%	4%	11%	8%	3%	9%	7%
Credit and Deposits	6%	6%	3%	1%	1%	14%	17%	5%
Damages	6%	4%	4%	11%	1%	4%	1%	4%
Service Extensions	6%	4%	3%	2%	<1%	10%	10%	3%
Service Quality	6%	7%	3%	5%	2%	1%	1%	3%
Scheduling Delays	4%	4%	7%	4%	2%	2%	0%	3%
Rates	6%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%
Service Interruptions	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	<1%
All Other Problems	11%	16%	24%	8%	12%	14%	18%	13%
Total-Number*	159	141	74	225	474	132	90	1,295

* Based on residential complaints evaluated by BCS as of July 12, 2013.

** Based on a probability sample of cases.

- Categories are for all residential complaints filed with BCS, whether or not they were found to be justified. See Appendix D-1 for an explanation of complaint categories and Appendix E, Table 2, for the number of cases in each category.
- In 2012, personnel problems generated 22 percent of the complaints about the major gas companies followed by billing disputes (17 percent). Complaints about metering accounted for 11 percent of residential consumer complaints about the major gas companies.

**2012 Residential Consumer Complaint Rates/
Justified Consumer Complaint Rates
Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies**

Company	Consumer Complaint Rate	Justified Consumer Complaint Rate
Columbia	0.57	0.05
Equitable	0.72	0.04
NFG	0.50	0.07
Peoples	0.92	0.19
PGW	2.72	0.68*
UGI-Gas	0.59	0.05
UGI Penn Natural	0.80	0.09
Average	0.98	0.17

* Justified consumer complaint rate based on a probability sample of cases.

- The consumer complaint rate equals the number of consumer complaints for each 1,000 residential customers. The justified consumer complaint rate equals the number of justified consumer complaints for each 1,000 residential customers.
- In 2012, the average of the consumer complaint rates is more than five times the average of the justified consumer complaint rates for the seven major gas companies.
- Appendix F, Table 2, presents the number of consumer complaints, the consumer complaint rate, the number of justified consumer complaints and the justified consumer complaint rate for each major gas company in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Justified Residential
Consumer Complaint Rates
Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies**

Company	2011	2012
Columbia	0.06	0.05
Equitable	0.06	0.04
NFG	0.04	0.07
Peoples	0.14	0.19
PGW*	0.29	0.68
UGI-Gas	0.03	0.05
UGI Penn Natural	0.11	0.09
Average	0.10	0.17

* Justified consumer complaint rate based on a probability sample of cases.

- The justified consumer complaint rate equals the number of justified consumer complaints for each 1,000 residential customers.
- In 2012, three of the major gas companies had justified consumer complaint rates lower than their justified consumer complaint rates in 2011. The justified consumer complaint rate for PGW increased by 134 percent in 2012.
- The justified consumer complaint rates among the major gas companies ranged from a low of 0.04 for Equitable to a high of 0.68 for PGW in 2012. Overall, the industry average justified consumer complaint rate increased from 0.10 in 2011 to 0.17 in 2012.
- Appendix F, Table 2, presents the number of consumer complaints, the consumer complaint rate, the number of justified consumer complaints and the justified consumer complaint rate for each major gas company in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Response Time to BCS
Residential Consumer Complaints
Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies**

Company	Number of Days 2011	Number of Days 2012	Change in Days 2011 to 2012
Columbia	7.3	5.5	-1.8
Equitable	2.9	3.0	0.1
NFG	7.0	5.2	-1.8
Peoples	13.4	8.4	-5.0
PGW	11.7	20.4	8.7
UGI-Gas	4.9	5.5	0.6
UGI Penn Natural	4.6	6.2	1.6
Average	7.4	7.7	0.3

- The calculation for average response time includes all residential consumer complaints for the major gas companies.
- The average response times for the major gas companies increased from 7.4 days in 2011 to 7.7 days in 2012.
- Consumer complaint response time performance varied among the major gas companies in 2012, from a low of 3.0 days for Equitable to a high of 20.4 days for PGW.

Payment Agreement Requests

In 2012, BCS handled 11,583 PARs from residential customers of the natural gas distribution companies (NGDCs). There were two PARs from residential customers of Pennsylvania's natural gas supply companies. Ninety-five percent (11,039) of the residential PARs were from customers of the seven major natural gas distribution companies. In 2012, BCS reviewed a representative sample of the PARs for case outcome for all the major gas companies except Columbia and Peoples. Thus, the calculation for justified PAR rate that appears in the pages that follow is based on a subset of cases that BCS received from customers of these utilities. BCS believes that the size of the samples gives an adequate indication of the performance of these companies. Appendix G, Table 2, provides additional statistics regarding the PARs from residential customers of the major natural gas distribution companies.

**2012 Residential Payment Agreement Request (PAR) Rates/
Justified PAR Rates*
Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies**

Company	PAR Rate	Justified PAR Rate
Columbia	2.22	0.03
Equitable	4.39	0.06
NFG	3.40	0.02
Peoples	1.58	0.11
PGW	8.41	0.15
UGI-Gas	7.46	0.44
UGI Penn Natural	10.39	0.65
Average	5.41	0.21

* All companies, with the exception of Columbia and Peoples, have justified PAR rates based on a probability sample of cases.

- The PAR rate equals the number of PARs for each 1,000 residential customers. The justified PAR rate equals the number of justified PARs for each 1,000 residential customers.
- On average, there were more than five PARs to BCS for each 1,000 residential customers of the major NGDCs in 2012. There was less than one justified PAR for each 1,000 residential customers.
- The implementation of Chapter 14 had an impact on the 2012 PAR rates and justified PAR rates.
- Appendix G, Table 2, presents the number of PARs, the PAR rate, the number of justified PARs and the justified PAR rate for each major gas company in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Justified Residential
Payment Agreement Request (PAR) Rates*
Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies**

Company	2011	2012
Columbia	0.01	0.03
Equitable	0.05	0.06
NFG	0.08	0.02
Peoples	0.05	0.11
PGW	0.18	0.15
UGI-Gas	0.19	0.44
UGI Penn Natural	0.19	0.65
Average	0.11	0.21

* All companies, with the exception of Columbia and Peoples, have justified PAR rates based on a probability sample of cases.

- The justified PAR rate equals the number of justified PARs for each 1,000 residential customers.
- The average of the justified PAR rates for the seven major gas utilities increased from 0.11 in 2011 to 0.21 in 2012. Five of the seven major gas companies had increases in their justified PAR rates, the greatest of which was UGI Penn Natural by 242 percent.
- The 2012 justified PAR rates among the major NGDCs ranged from a low of 0.02 for NFG to a high of 0.65 for UGI Penn Natural.
- The implementation of Chapter 14 had an impact on the 2011 and 2012 justified PAR rates.
- Appendix G, Table 2, presents the number of PARs, the PAR rate, the number of justified PARs and the justified PAR rate for each major gas company in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Response Time to BCS
Residential Payment Agreement Requests (PARs)
Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies**

Company	Number of Days 2011	Number of Days 2012	Change in Days 2011 to 2012
Columbia	2.8	2.7	-0.1
Equitable	1.4	1.0	-0.4
NFG	2.9	2.6	-0.3
Peoples	6.8	4.9	-1.9
PGW	5.8	12.1	6.3
UGI-Gas	1.6	2.2	0.6
UGI Penn Natural	1.4	1.9	0.5
Average	3.2	3.9	0.7

- The calculation for average response time includes all residential PARs for the major gas companies.
- From 2011 to 2012, the average of response times increased by 0.7 days. The response time for PGW went up by more than six days from 2011 to 2012.
- The 2012 PAR response times for the major NGDCs varied from a low of 1.0 day for Equitable to a high of 12.1 days for PGW.

Termination and Reconnection of Service

Each month, the gas utilities report to the Commission the number of residential accounts that they terminated for nonpayment during the previous month. They also report the number of previously terminated residential accounts that they reconnected during the month. Historically, utilities have shown a varied pattern of termination behavior, from a consistent pattern to one that fluctuates from year to year. The number of reconnections varies from year to year and from company to company, depending on a variety of factors. The NGDC reconnects a customer's terminated service either when a customer pays his/her debt in full or makes a significant payment on the debt and agrees to a payment agreement for the balance owed to the company. The tables that follow indicate the annual number of residential accounts each of the seven largest gas utilities terminated and reconnected in 2010, 2011 and 2012. The first table also presents the termination rates for each of these companies.

Residential Service Terminations/Termination Rates Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies

Company	Residential Service Terminations				Termination Rates		
	2010	2011	2012	% Change 2011-12	2010	2011	2012
Columbia	9,878	9,650	11,321	17%	2.65	2.58	2.96
Equitable	10,967	10,471	8,394	-20%	4.61	4.36	3.47
NFG	9,296	9,472	8,347	-12%	4.70	4.77	4.20
Peoples	7,135	3,696	6,601	79%	2.18	1.12	2.00
PGW	29,865	28,868	25,507	-12%	6.23	6.02	5.32
UGI-Gas	11,885	11,206	8,434	-25%	3.89	3.61	2.66
UGI Penn Natural	8,569	6,967	5,403	-22%	5.93	4.79	3.67
Major Gas	87,595	80,330	74,007	-8%			
Average of Rates					4.31	3.87	3.47

- The termination rate is the number of service terminations divided by the number of residential customers, expressed as a percent.
- Overall, the seven major gas companies terminated 8 percent fewer residential accounts in 2012 than in 2011.

Residential Service Reconnections Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies

Company	2010	2011	2012	% Change 2011-12
Columbia	5,336	4,958	6,310	27%
Equitable	7,873	7,587	6,221	-18%
NFG	6,445	6,449	5,458	-15%
Peoples	4,602	2,660	4,654	75%
PGW*	30,626	26,011	18,114	-30%
UGI-Gas	6,703	5,426	3,990	-26%
UGI Penn Natural	5,548	4,276	3,453	-19%
Major Gas	67,133	57,367	48,200	-16%

* Prior to 2012, PGW's reconnections were overstated as a result of the company's reporting methodology not validating whether each completed turn-on was associated with the previously terminated customer.

- Overall, the seven major NGDCs reconnected 16 percent fewer residential accounts in 2012 than in 2011.

Compliance

BCS provides utilities with written clarifications or explanations of Chapter 56 provisions and other Commission regulations and policies. The use of “infraction rate” is intended to help the Commission monitor the duty of natural gas companies at 66 Pa. C.S. §2206(a) to, at a minimum, maintain customer services under retail competition at the same level of quality as existed prior to the beginning of the Natural Gas Choice and Competition Act of 1999.

The infraction rates in the table that follows are based on the review of all informal complaints that residential consumers filed with BCS from 2010 through 2012. Infractions identified on complaints involving competition issues are included in the infraction statistics. Appendix H, Table 2, presents detailed information about the infractions identified on 2012 cases to the BCS.

Commission Infraction Rates Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies

Company	2010	2011	2012
Columbia	0.02	0.04	0.02
Equitable	0.06	0.03	0.02
NFG	0.06	0.02	0.10
Peoples	0.14	0.18	0.20
PGW	0.03	0.16	0.29
UGI-Gas	0.08	0.03	0.03
UGI Penn Natural	0.15	0.08	0.04

- The infraction rate is the number of informally verified infractions per 1,000 residential customers.
- From 2011 to 2012, infraction rates decreased for Columbia, Equitable and UGI Penn Natural while the infraction rates increased for NFG, Peoples and PGW. The rate for UGI-Gas remained stable.
- Appendix H, Table 2, presents the actual number of infractions for 2012 categorized by infraction category.
- As shown in Appendix H, Table 2, the dispute handling category is noteworthy due to both high volume and high percentage of the total number of infractions.

5. Water Industry

In 2012, the Commission had jurisdiction over 94 water companies, including 22 municipal water companies. The Commission categorizes the non-municipal water companies into one of three classifications: A, B and C. Those three classifications are based on the amount of the company's annual revenues.

The non-municipal water companies with the largest annual revenues are classified as "Class A" water companies. "Class A" water companies must have annual revenues of \$1 million or more for three years in a row. In 2012, nine "Class A" water companies served residential customers. The number of residential customers for these major companies ranged from 2,346 for United Water Bethel to 589,738 residential customers for Pennsylvania American Water Co. (PAWC). In 2012, the "Class A" water companies were Aqua Pennsylvania Inc. (Aqua), Audubon Water Co., Columbia Water Co., Newtown Artesian Water Co., Pennsylvania American Water Co., Superior Water Co., United Water Bethel, United Water of Pennsylvania Inc. and York Water Co. The tables in this chapter present individual statistics for the two largest water companies, PAWC and Aqua, and for the "Other Class A" companies as a whole.

The other classes of water companies have lower annual revenues and, typically, fewer residential customers. In 2012, 12 "Class B" companies were operating. "Class B" water companies have annual revenues between \$200,000 and \$999,999. In 2012, the number of residential customers for the "Class B" companies ranged from 295 to 2,048. There were 51 "Class C" companies in 2012. "Class C" water companies have annual revenues of less than \$200,000. The number of residential customers for the "Class C" companies ranged from two to 1,149 in 2012.

The municipal water companies are companies owned by municipalities that serve customers outside their boundaries. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to regulating the rates and service of customers outside the municipalities.

As would be expected, the majority of the residential consumer complaints and PARs to BCS came from customers of the "Class A" water companies. Most of the complaints and PARs from water customers dealt with matters covered by 52 Pa. Code, Chapter 56, Standards and Billing Practices for Residential Utility Service or 66 Pa. C.S.A. Chapter 14, Responsible Utility Customer Protection. These consumer complaints and PARs represent customer appeals to the Commission resulting from the inability of the company and the customer to reach a mutually satisfactory resolution to a dispute or payment negotiation.

The tables on the pages that follow depict the performance of the "Class A" water companies in 2012. Appendices F and G also present statistics about the performance of the "Class A" water companies.

Consumer Complaints

During 2012, BCS handled a total of 724 consumer complaints from residential customers of the various water companies. Of those complaints, 96 percent (695) were from customers of the “Class A” companies. The remaining 4 percent were from customers of smaller water companies. While a majority of consumer complaints involved the “Class A” water companies in 2012, the Commission devoted a significant amount of attention to the smaller water companies. Sometimes the amount of time BCS spends on a few complaints from customers of a smaller company exceeds the amount of time it spends dealing with complaints filed against one of the larger companies. This is because larger companies typically have the resources to respond appropriately to complaints and PARs as compared to smaller water companies with limited resources.

In 2012, customers of the small water companies filed complaints with BCS for a variety of reasons. Of the 29 consumer complaints filed about the “Non-Class A” water companies, 48 percent involved complaints about service, including people-delivered service, service quality or other aspects of the companies’ service to customers (14 cases). An additional 34 percent involved billing disputes (10 cases).

Consumer Complaint Categories

The following table shows the percentage of 2012 complaints from residential customers of the “Class A” water companies in each of the categories used by BCS policy analysts to categorize consumer complaints about electric, gas and water companies. Appendix E, Table 3, provides the actual number of cases that fell into each category in 2012.

Consumer Complaint Categories: 2012 Major Water Companies

Categories	Aqua	PAWC	"Other Class A"	All "Class A" Water
Billing Disputes	32%	40%	7%	36%
Personnel Problems	9%	15%	24%	13%
Service Quality	6%	8%	21%	8%
Damages	4%	6%	10%	6%
Scheduling Delays	7%	3%	7%	5%
Metering	4%	3%	3%	3%
Discontinuance/Transfer	<1%	4%	0%	2%
Credit and Deposits	4%	1%	0%	2%
Service Extensions	1%	2%	0%	2%
Service Interruptions	1%	1%	0%	1%
Other Payment Issues	1%	0%	0%	<1%
Rates	0%	<1%	3%	<1%
All Other Problems	30%	17%	24%	22%
Total-Number*	208	338	29	575

* Based on residential complaints evaluated by BCS as of July 5, 2013.

- Categories are for all residential complaints filed with BCS, whether or not they were found to be justified. See Appendix D-1 for an explanation of complaint categories and Appendix E, Table 3, for the number of cases in each category.
- Forty-nine percent of residential complaints for the "Class A" water companies fell into two complaint categories: billing disputes and personnel problems. Billing disputes accounted for more than one-third of the total number of consumer complaints filed against the "Class A" water companies.

**2012 Residential Consumer Complaint Rates/
Justified Consumer Complaint Rates
Major Water Companies**

Company	Consumer Complaint Rate	Justified Consumer Complaint Rate
Aqua	0.67	0.21
PAWC	0.68	0.14
“Other Class A”	0.25	0.01
Average	0.54	0.12

- The consumer complaint rate equals the number of consumer complaints for each 1,000 residential customers. The justified consumer complaint rate equals the number of justified consumer complaints for each 1,000 residential customers.
- The consumer complaint rate for PAWC is nearly five times greater than its justified consumer complaint rate.
- Appendix F, Table 3, presents the number of consumer complaints, the consumer complaint rate, the number of justified consumer complaints and the justified consumer complaint rate for Aqua, PAWC and the “Other Class A” water companies in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Justified Residential
Consumer Complaint Rates
Major Water Companies**

Company	2011	2012
Aqua	0.19	0.21
PAWC	0.15	0.14
"Other Class A"	0.04	0.01
Average	0.13	0.12

- The justified consumer complaint rate equals the number of justified consumer complaints for each 1,000 residential customers.
- There was only a slight change in the justified consumer complaint rates for Aqua and PAWC between 2011 and 2012.
- Appendix F, Table 3, presents the number of consumer complaints, the consumer complaint rate, the number of justified consumer complaints and the justified consumer complaint rate for Aqua, PAWC and the "Other Class A" water companies in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Response Time to BCS
Residential Consumer Complaints
Major Water Companies**

Company	Number of Days 2011	Number of Days 2012	Change in Days 2011 to 2012
Aqua	14.4	7.1	-7.3
PAWC	3.5	6.7	3.2
"Other Class A"	19.7	6.2	-13.5
Average	12.5	6.7	-5.8

- The calculation for average response time includes all residential consumer complaints for the major water companies.
- The average response time for Aqua decreased by 7.3 days from 2011 to 2012. The average response time for PAWC increased 3.2 days, from 3.5 days in 2011 to 6.7 days in 2012.

Payment Agreement Requests

In 2012, BCS handled 4,607 PARs from residential customers of the water industry. Ninety-nine percent (4,546) of the residential PARs were from customers of the "Class A" water companies. As in past years, for the companies with the largest volume of requests, BCS policy analysts reviewed a representative sample of PARs for case outcome. In 2012, BCS reviewed a sample of the PARs for Aqua and PAWC. Thus, the calculation for justified PAR rate that appears in the pages that follow is based on a subset of cases that BCS received from customers of these two companies. BCS believes the size of the sample gives a reasonable indication of the performance of these companies. Appendix G, Table 3, provides additional statistics regarding the PARs from residential customers of the "Class A" water companies.

**2012 Residential Payment Agreement Request (PAR) Rates/
Justified PAR Rates
Major Water Companies**

Company	PAR Rate	Justified PAR Rate
Aqua	4.23	0.19*
PAWC	4.56	0.23*
“Other Class A”	1.70	0.00
Average	3.50	0.14

* Justified PAR rates based on a probability sample of cases.

- The PAR rate equals the number of PARs for each 1,000 residential customers. The justified PAR rate equals the number of justified PARs for each 1,000 residential customers.
- On average, there were more than three PARs to BCS for each 1,000 residential customers of the major water companies in 2012. There was less than one justified PAR for each 1,000 residential customers.
- The implementation of Chapter 14 had an impact on the 2012 PAR rates and justified PAR rates.
- Appendix G, Table 3, presents the number of PARs, the PAR rate, the number of justified PARs and the justified PAR rate for Aqua, PAWC and the “Other Class A” water companies in 2011 and 2012.

2011-12 Justified Residential Payment Agreement Request (PAR) Rates Major Water Companies

Company	2011	2012
Aqua	0.16*	0.19*
PAWC	0.41*	0.23*
“Other Class A”	0.00	0.00
Average	0.19	0.14

* Based on a probability sample of cases.

- The justified PAR rate equals the number of justified PARs for each 1,000 residential customers.
- The justified PAR rate increased for Aqua, but decreased for PAWC between 2011 and 2012.
- The implementation of Chapter 14 had an impact on the 2011 and 2012 justified PAR rates.
- Appendix G, Table 3, presents the number of PARs, the PAR rate, the number of justified PARs and the justified PAR rate for Aqua, PAWC and the “Other Class A” water companies in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Response Time to BCS
Residential Payment Agreement Requests (PARs)
Major Water Companies**

Company	Number of Days 2011	Number of Days 2012	Change in Days 2011 to 2012
Aqua	7.0	3.1	-3.9
PAWC	1.8	4.7	2.9
"Other Class A"	2.8	5.9	3.1
Average	3.9	4.6	0.7

- The calculation for average response time includes all residential PARs for the major water companies.
- Aqua's response time decreased by nearly four days from 2011 to 2012 while PAWC's response time increased almost three days, from 1.8 to 4.7 days in 2012.

Compliance

BCS provides water utilities with written clarifications or explanations of Chapter 56 provisions and other Commission regulations and policies.

The infraction rates in the table that follows are based on the review of all informal complaints that residential consumers filed with BCS from 2010 through 2012. Appendix H, Table 3, presents detailed information about the infractions identified on 2012 cases to the BCS.

Commission Infraction Rates Major Water Companies

Company	2010	2011	2012
Aqua	0.20	0.22	0.22
PAWC	0.32	0.13	0.16
"Other Class A"	0.01	0.02	0.01

- The infraction rate is the number of informally verified infractions per 1,000 residential customers.
- The infraction rate for PAWC increased from 2011 to 2012. The infraction rate for "Other Class A" water companies dropped in 2012, while Aqua's rate remained stable.
- Appendix H, Table 3, presents the actual number of infractions for 2012 categorized by infraction category.
- As shown in Appendix H, Table 3, the dispute handling category is noteworthy due to both high volume and high percentage of the total number of infractions.

Programs That Assist Low-Income Customers

Several water companies voluntarily operate programs to assist low-income customers in maintaining water service.

Aqua Pennsylvania Inc. (Aqua) - In 1994, Aqua implemented a pilot program that provided payment assistance and conservation services to low-income customers. Aqua named this program "Helping Hand." In 1996, Aqua made the program a permanent part of its low-income assistance.

Helping Hand is for customers at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level. On April 1, 2009, in recognition of the current economic climate, the company eased the remaining minimum requirements. The company reduced the minimum past-due amount from \$150 to \$110, and the minimum number of days past due from 30 to 21.

Each household enrolled in the Helping Hand program receives a plumbing inspection, including minor repairs and/or a conservation kit, containing water-saving devices. The customer also receives water usage and conservation information. Customers who make their payments on time and in full receive a credit of \$10 per month applied to their arrearage.

At the end of 2012, 887 active participants were enrolled in the Helping Hand program. During the year, Aqua spent \$137,506 to complete eligibility interviews and household audits. In addition, the company provided \$30,560 in arrearage forgiveness credits to 920 program participants.

Pennsylvania American Water Co. (PAWC) – In 1991, PAWC established the “Help to Others” (H2O) program. The H2O program provides customers with a 65 percent discount on their monthly service fees – a savings of about \$8.94 per month. The program also provides water-saving devices and conservation education. As of December 2012, 13,660 customers were receiving the discounted rate.

In addition to a discount for water, the company also offers a discount for wastewater customers in Coatesville, Bushkill, Lehman Pike, Claysville, Clarion, East Stroudsburg, Blue Mountain and Winona Lakes. This discount offers a 15 percent discount off the total wastewater billing for those who qualify. As of December 2012, 378 customers were receiving the discount for wastewater.

As part of the H2O program, PAWC also participates with the Dollar Energy Fund to provide cash grants of up to \$500 per year for those water and wastewater customers listed above. Dollar Energy Fund is a hardship fund administrator that provides cash assistance to utility customers who need help in paying their utility bills. During the 2011-12 program year, PAWC’s shareholders and customers provided \$319,805 in hardship fund benefits to 1,173 water and wastewater customers for an average benefit of \$273.

United Water of Pennsylvania Inc. (United Water) - United Water implemented the “UW Cares” program in 2005. UW Cares is a nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization that provides financial assistance to customers who experience a temporary financial crisis caused by such occurrences as a job loss, severe illness, casualty or extensive military service. Cash grants up to \$100 are provided to qualifying customers who are first screened by the Salvation Army for eligibility. To be eligible for a grant, customers must have made a nominal payment within the last 90 days. During the 2011-12 program year, the company provided grants totaling nearly \$6,300 to qualifying customers.

York Water Co. - In 2005, the York Water Co. established the “York Water Cares” program. This program offers qualified customers up to \$120 in arrearage forgiveness benefits and plumbing repairs. The repairs are designed to help the customer conserve and reduce overall water usage.

During 2012, the company expended \$637 for customer plumbing repairs and enrolled a total of five new customers in the York Water Cares program. As of program end 2012, 14 customers received arrearage forgiveness benefits totaling \$855 for an average benefit of approximately \$61 per customer. The company anticipates an annual savings of \$1,428 in costs for termination proceedings that may be avoided as a result of customer participation in the York Water Cares program.

6. Telephone Industry

During 2012, BCS handled consumer complaints, PARs and inquiries from the customers of a variety of telecommunications service providers, including incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs), competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs), long-distance companies and resellers. Just over 700 providers of telecommunications services were certificated and able to conduct business in Pennsylvania in 2012. Of this group of telecommunications providers, 37 were ILECs. Thirty-two of these ILECs were non-major utilities each serving fewer than 50,000 residential customers. The remaining five ILECs were major companies, each with more than 50,000 residential customers. Collectively, these five major telephone companies served just over 2 million residential customers in 2012.

This chapter will focus exclusively on the five major ILECs in 2012 – CenturyLink (CenturyLink); Frontier Communications Commonwealth Telephone Co. (Frontier Commonwealth); Verizon North Inc. (Verizon North); Verizon Pennsylvania (Verizon PA); and Windstream Communications (Windstream).

Unlike the electric, gas and water chapters, the analyses of the five companies that appear in this chapter include complaints about competition-related issues such as slamming, competition-related service complaints and billing problems. This is the tenth year that BCS included competition-related complaints in its analyses of the largest telephone companies.

Consumer Complaints

Although BCS handled consumer complaints about different types of telecommunications service providers in 2012, the complaints predominantly came from the residential customers of the five major ILECs. Overall, BCS handled 2,443 consumer complaints from residential customers of telecommunications service providers in 2012. Of those complaints, 2,263 were from residential customers of all of Pennsylvania's ILECs while 2,237 were from customers of the five major ILECs. Meanwhile, 157 consumer complaints were from residential customers of the CLECs operating in Pennsylvania. The remaining 23 consumer complaints were from residential customers of other providers of telecommunications services such as long-distance carriers, resellers and Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) providers.

In September 2009, BCS began offering all Verizon PA and Verizon North customers who call with a service issue the voluntary option of being transferred to a special Verizon team that immediately begins working to resolve the customer's complaint. If a customer chooses the voluntary transfer, BCS categorizes the contact as an "inquiry"² rather than as a "consumer complaint."

² BCS categorized 435 of these contacts regarding Verizon service issues as inquiries during 2012.

Consumer Complaint Categories

The following table shows the percentage of 2012 consumer complaints from residential customers of the major telephone companies in each of the 11 categories used by BCS policy analysts to categorize consumer complaints about telephone companies.

Consumer Complaint Categories: 2012 Major Local Telephone Companies

Categories	Century-Link	Frontier Commonwealth	Verizon North	Verizon PA**	Wind-stream	Telephone Majors
Unsatisfactory Service	9%	26%	29%	30%	30%	29%
Service Delivery	20%	14%	32%	24%	33%	24%
Billing Disputes	32%	36%	23%	20%	19%	22%
Service Terminations	17%	13%	5%	5%	4%	6%
Competition	0%	0%	0%	3%	7%	2%
Credit and Deposits	3%	0%	1%	2%	2%	2%
Toll Services	5%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Discontinuance/Transfer	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Non-Recurring Charges	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Annoyance Calls	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%
All Other Problems	13%	10%	9%	13%	5%	12%
Total-Number*	76	72	82	959	57	1,246

* Based on residential complaints evaluated by BCS as of April 19, 2013.

** Based on a probability sample of cases.

- Categories are for all residential complaints filed with BCS, whether or not they were found to be justified. See Appendix D-2 for an explanation of complaint categories and Appendix E, Table 4, for the number of cases in each category.
- Seventy-five percent of all complaints for the major telephone companies fall into one of three complaint categories: unsatisfactory service, service delivery or billing disputes.

- Unsatisfactory service complaints account for 29 percent of the total number of consumer complaints filed against the five major telephone companies in 2012. Last year, unsatisfactory service accounted for 27 percent of all consumer complaints filed against the major telephone companies.
- Service delivery complaints account for 24 percent of all consumer complaints filed against the five major telephone companies. In 2012, billing disputes made up another 22 percent of the complaints filed against the major telephone companies.

The 2011 and 2012 consumer complaint figures for justified consumer complaint rates and response times for each of the major telephone companies are presented on the following pages. Appendix F, Table 4, provides additional statistics about the consumer complaints from residential customers of the five major local telephone companies.

2012 Residential Consumer Complaint Rates/ Justified Consumer Complaint Rates Major Local Telephone Companies

Company	Consumer Complaint Rate	Justified Consumer Complaint Rate
CenturyLink	0.55	0.14
Frontier Commonwealth	0.73	0.27
Verizon North	0.41	0.18
Verizon PA	1.34	0.68*
Windstream	0.55	0.10
Average	0.72	0.27

* Justified consumer complaint rate based on a probability sample of cases.

- The consumer complaint rate equals the number of consumer complaints for each 1,000 residential customers. The justified consumer complaint rate equals the number of justified consumer complaints for each 1,000 residential customers.
- For the five major telephone companies, the average of their consumer complaint rates is 2.7 times greater than the average of their justified consumer complaint rates.
- The consumer complaint rate for Windstream is more than five times greater than its justified consumer complaint rate. The consumer complaint rate for CenturyLink is nearly four times greater than its justified consumer complaint rate.
- Appendix F, Table 4, presents the number of consumer complaints, the consumer complaint rate, the number of justified consumer complaints and the justified consumer complaint rate for each major telephone company in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Justified Residential
 Consumer Complaint Rates
 Major Local Telephone Companies**

Company	2011	2012
CenturyLink	0.25	0.14
Frontier Commonwealth	0.41	0.27
Verizon North	0.25	0.18
Verizon PA*	0.92	0.68
Windstream	0.27	0.10
Average	0.42	0.27

* Based on a probability sample of cases.

- The justified consumer complaint rate equals the number of justified consumer complaints for each 1,000 residential customers.
- The industry average of justified consumer complaint rates decreased by 36 percent from 2011 to 2012. All five major telephone companies had a decrease in their justified consumer complaint rate in 2012. Windstream and CenturyLink had the largest percentage decreases. Windstream's justified consumer complaint rate decreased 63 percent, while CenturyLink's justified consumer complaint rate decreased 44 percent since 2011.
- Of the five major telephone companies, only Verizon PA and Frontier Commonwealth had a justified consumer complaint rate that was equal to or higher than the industry average.
- Appendix F, Table 4, presents the number of consumer complaints, the consumer complaint rate, the number of justified consumer complaints and the justified consumer complaint rate for each major telephone company in 2011 and 2012.

2011-12 Response Time to BCS Residential Consumer Complaints Major Local Telephone Companies

Company	Number of Days 2011	Number of Days 2012	Change in Days 2011 to 2012
CenturyLink	22.4	13.3	-9.1
Frontier Commonwealth	14.1	9.3	-4.8
Verizon North	19.1	14.9	-4.2
Verizon PA	18.6	15.8	-2.8
Windstream	18.9	24.7	5.8
Average	18.6	15.6	-3.0

- For the five major telephone companies, the average response time to consumer complaints decreased by three days from 2011 to 2012.
- The response time for CenturyLink decreased by more than nine days. Only Windstream increased their average response time from 2011 to 2012.

Payment Agreement Requests

Telephone service consists of three components: basic service, nonbasic service and toll service. BCS does not handle customer requests for payment agreements that involve toll or nonbasic services. For the telephone industry, PARs are principally contacts to BCS or to companies involving a request for payment terms for arrearages associated with basic service. Most PARs are cases relating to the suspension of basic telephone service for nonpayment. Suspension of basic telephone service involves the temporary cessation of service without the consent of the customer and occurs when the customer owes the local telephone company money. If the customer does not pay or make an agreement to pay the amount owed, the company proceeds to terminate the customer's service, which is the permanent cessation of service. The majority of PARs are from customers who contact BCS to request payment agreements after they have received a suspension notice.

Under Chapter 64, a customer contact in response to a suspension notice is a dispute (as the term is defined in §64.2) only if the contact includes a disagreement with respect to the application of a provision of Chapter 64. Where telephone cases involving telephone service suspension are concerned, failure to negotiate a payment agreement does not in itself mean that a dispute exists. Consequently, in this report, telephone cases that involve PARs have been separated from telephone PARs that also involve a dispute. For the telephone industry, PARs that involve a dispute are classified as consumer complaints. During 2012, BCS handled 394 PARs from residential customers of telecommunications service providers. Of these PARs, 358 were from residential customers of the five major telephone

companies: CenturyLink, Frontier Commonwealth, Verizon North, Verizon PA and Windstream.

As previously mentioned, BCS has used sampling over the years to evaluate the large volume of cases it receives from customers of the largest major companies. Given the large volume of PARs from Verizon PA customers, BCS evaluated a representative sample of the company's PARs to determine justified rate and response time. BCS believes that the size of the sample gives a reasonable indication of the company's performance.

The 2011 and 2012 justified PAR rates and response times for the major telephone companies are presented in the tables that follow.

**2012 Residential Payment Agreement Request (PAR) Rates/
Justified PAR Rates
Major Local Telephone Companies**

Company	PAR Rate	Justified PAR Rate
CenturyLink	0.19	0.05
Frontier Commonwealth	0.09	0.03
Verizon North	0.03	0.00
Verizon PA	0.21	0.01*
Windstream	0.05	0.00
Average	0.12	0.02

* Justified PAR rate based on a probability sample of cases.

- The PAR rate equals the number of PARs for each 1,000 residential customers. The justified PAR rate equals the number of justified PARs for each 1,000 residential customers.
- The overall 2012 PAR rate is six times the overall justified PAR rate for the five major telephone companies.
- For the individual companies, the ratio between the PAR rate and the justified PAR rate varies. For Verizon PA, the company's 2012 PAR rate is 21 times the company's justified PAR rate.
- Appendix G, Table 4, presents the number of PARs, the PAR rate, the number of justified PARs and the justified PAR rate for each major telephone company in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Justified Residential
Payment Agreement Request (PAR) Rates
Major Local Telephone Companies**

Company	2011	2012
CenturyLink	0.02	0.05
Frontier Commonwealth	0.01	0.03
Verizon North	0.01	0.00
Verizon PA*	0.01	0.01
Windstream	0.02	0.00
Average	0.01	0.02

* Based on a probability sample of cases.

- The justified PAR rate equals the number of justified PARs for each 1,000 residential customers.
- The 2012 average justified PAR rate for the five major telephone companies increased from 0.01 in 2011 to 0.02 in 2012. Only CenturyLink and Frontier Commonwealth had justified PAR rates greater than the 2012 industry average.
- Appendix G, Table 4, presents the number of PARs, the PAR rate, the number of justified PARs and the justified PAR rate for each major telephone company in 2011 and 2012.

**2011-12 Response Time to BCS
Residential Payment Agreement Requests (PARs)
Major Local Telephone Companies**

Company	Number of Days 2011	Number of Days 2012	Change in Days 2011 to 2012
CenturyLink	14.4	8.3	-6.1
Frontier Commonwealth	6.1	7.3	1.2
Verizon North	8.5	11.5	3.0
Verizon PA	11.4	7.5	-3.9
Windstream	18.5	21.2	2.7
Average	11.8	11.1	-0.7

- The average response time to PARs for the five major telephone companies decreased slightly from 11.8 days in 2011 to 11.1 days in 2012.
- Of the five major telephone companies, only CenturyLink and Verizon PA reduced their response time to PARs from 2011 to 2012.

Termination of Service

Chapter 64 defines suspension as a temporary cessation of service without the consent of the customer. Termination of service, according to Chapter 64, is the permanent end of service after a suspension without the consent of the customer. Most PARs are cases relating to the termination of telephone service and are registered during the suspension phase. Many customers who have their basic service suspended are able to make payment agreements and avoid termination. Those who are not able to avoid termination cease to be customers once the termination of basic service takes place. Shifts in terminations can signal potential problems with customers maintaining basic telephone service and reflect the impact of universal service programs.

Residential Service Terminations/Termination Rates Major Local Telephone Companies

Company	Residential Service Terminations				Termination Rates		
	2010	2011	2012	% Change 2011-12	2010	2011	2012
CenturyLink	6,468	5,136	8,412	64%	35.19	30.13	52.86
Frontier Commonwealth	408*	552	444	-20%	3.21*	4.08	3.75
Verizon North	11,412	7,056	7,140	1%	39.18	27.14	30.66
Verizon PA	171,648	136,572	57,432	-58%	88.30	80.82	40.49
Windstream	3,984	3,648	3,516	-4%	31.63	30.88	31.25
Major Telephone	193,920	152,964	76,944	-50%			
Average of Rates					39.50	34.61	31.80

* BCS revised the 2010 number of residential service terminations and termination rate for Frontier Commonwealth. It was discovered a submission error was made when reporting the 2010 number of residential customers and 2010 number of terminations to BCS.

- The termination rate equals the number of basic service terminations for each 1,000 residential customers.
- Overall, the average residential service termination rate for the major telephone companies decreased from 2011 to 2012.
- CenturyLink had a significant increase in their number of terminations and their termination rate from 2011 to 2012. Verizon PA had a major decrease in their number of terminations and their termination rate in 2012.

Compliance

The informal compliance notification process enables BCS to provide companies with written clarifications and explanations of Chapter 63 and Chapter 64 provisions and BCS policies. The informal compliance process is specifically designed to identify systemic errors. Companies can then investigate the scope of the problem and take corrective action. Appropriate corrective action usually involves modifying a computer program; revising the text of a notice, a billing or a letter; changing a company procedure; or providing additional staff training to ensure the proper implementation of a sound procedure.

Each year, BCS retrieves infraction data from the BCS Compliance Tracking System and produces tables that present Chapter 63 and Chapter 64 infraction statistics for the major telephone companies reviewed in this chapter. The infraction statistics are typically drawn from all cases that residential consumers filed with BCS in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

Appendix H, Tables 4 and 5, present detailed information about the infractions identified on 2012 cases to the BCS.

Commission Infraction Rates – Chapter 63 Major Local Telephone Companies

Company	2010	2011	2012
CenturyLink	0.14	0.22	0.13
Frontier Commonwealth	0.19	0.60	0.27
Verizon North	0.26	0.52	0.31
Verizon PA	0.98	1.87	1.18
Windstream	0.17	0.18	0.04

- The infraction rate is the number of informally verified infractions per 1,000 residential customers.
- Infraction rates decreased for each of the five major telephone companies in 2012. Windstream's infraction rate had the largest percentage decline since 2011.
- Appendix H, Table 4, presents the actual number of infractions of Chapter 63 found on 2012 informal complaints for the major local telephone companies by infraction category.

Commission Infraction Rates – Chapter 64 Major Local Telephone Companies

Company	2010	2011	2012
CenturyLink	0.24	0.56	0.14
Frontier Commonwealth	0.64	0.61	0.35
Verizon North	0.29	0.22	0.16
Verizon PA	0.63	0.70	0.39
Windstream	0.41	0.36	0.12

- The infraction rate is the number of informally verified infractions per 1,000 residential customers.
- Infraction rates decreased for each of the five major telephone companies in 2012. CenturyLink and Windstream had the largest declines, down 75 and 67 percent, respectively, since 2011.
- Appendix H, Table 5, presents the actual number of infractions of Chapter 64 found on 2012 informal complaints for the major local telephone companies by infraction category.

Universal Service Programs

As part of its ongoing responsibilities, BCS monitors the universal service programs of local telephone companies and wireless companies. For the telephone industry, universal service programs³ include Lifeline 135 Service (Lifeline 135), Lifeline Service (Lifeline) and the Universal Telephone Assistance Program (UTAP). These programs ensure that low-income consumers have access to telephone service by providing discounts or credits for telephone service. The Commission approved the implementation of Pennsylvania's first universal service program for local telephone companies in 1989.⁴ In December 1997, the Commission approved Lifeline service plans for 44 telephone companies which led to the statewide implementation of telephone companies' Lifeline programs in 1998.

Lifeline and Lifeline 135 Service

The Commission's 2005 Final Lifeline Order (Final Order), at Docket No. M-00051871t expanded the Lifeline program eligibility to be consistent with the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) programs.⁵ It added the National School Free Lunch Program and an income-only based criterion (income at or below 135 percent of the federal poverty

³ With the exception of UTAP, these programs are supported fully or in part by federal universal service funds.

⁴ The Link-Up America Program was the first universal service program. The FCC eliminated this program in 2012.

⁵ FCC Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the Matter of Lifeline and Link-Up, at CC Docket No. 04-87, WC Docket No. 03-109.

guidelines) as new criteria for Pennsylvania's Lifeline program eligibility. Second, the Final Order directed all jurisdictional ETCs⁶ to implement the Lifeline provisions contained in Chapter 30. Under these provisions⁷, ETCs are to inform new and existing customers about the availability of Lifeline services. They also must permit eligible Lifeline service customers to purchase any number of optional services (i.e. call waiting) at the tariffed rates for these services.

On Dec. 18, 2008, the Commission adopted the initial decision of a PUC administrative law judge ordering Verizon PA and Verizon North to revise their tariffs to permit their Lifeline 135 customers the opportunity to subscribe to three types of bundled service plans.⁸ Those customers may subscribe to a bundled service package plan that offers 1) local service with three optional services; 2) local service with three optional services plus regional toll service; or 3) local service with three optional services plus regional toll service and long-distance service at a single monthly rate.

In August 2010, the Commission adopted the final Policy Statement on the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Guidelines for Designation and Annual Recertification as an Eligible Telecommunication Carrier (ETC) for purposes of Federal Universal Service Support (ETC Guidelines).⁹ Designation as an ETC for provision of Lifeline service would permit the wire-line and wireless providers to participate in the Universal Service Fund's (USF) Lifeline program in order to receive universal service support for these services. Currently, there are 12 wireless telephone companies providing Lifeline services in Pennsylvania. As of November 2013, there are 12 wireless telephone company ETC petitions pending.

On March 2, 2012, the FCC issued a Final Rule¹⁰ which reformed and begins to modernize the Universal Service Fund's Lifeline program. The reforms substantially strengthen protections against waste, fraud and abuse; improve program administration and accountability; improve enrollment and consumer disclosures; initiate modernization of the program for broadband; and constrain the growth of the program in order to reduce the burden of all who contribute to the Universal Service Fund. In addition, the FCC has identified numerous unserved census block groups in Pennsylvania where wireless eligible telecommunications carriers (ETCs) may bid to receive Mobility Fund Phase 1 support to build infrastructure over which to deliver 3G or better broadband and voice service.

The following table shows enrollment activity for the major telephone companies' Lifeline programs in 2011 and 2012.

⁶ To provide Lifeline services, telephone companies must be designated Eligible Telecommunications Carriers (ETC) by their state commission or the FCC. ETCs may receive universal service funding.

⁷ 66 Pa. C.S. §§ 30 (f)(1-4). These rules apply to all Pennsylvania incumbent local exchange carriers and three competitive local exchange carriers.

⁸ See Dockets C-20077916 and C-20077917.

⁹ Docket No. M-2010-2164741 which codifies the guidelines at 52 Pa. Code § 69.2501.

¹⁰ 47 CFR Part 54 – Universal Service

Lifeline Service Activity 2011-12

Company	Total Number of Customers Who Received Lifeline Service		Total Number of Customers Enrolled as of December	
	2011	2012	2011	2012
CenturyLink	4,685	4,176	3,384	1,891
Frontier Commonwealth	5,865	5,441	4,861	4,618
Verizon North*	15,942	14,232	10,548	6,563
Verizon PA*	130,389	109,150	85,102	45,579
Windstream	6,046	5,783	5,011	3,718
Total	162,927	138,782	108,906	62,369

* The figures for Verizon PA and Verizon North include customers enrolled in both the Lifeline and Lifeline 135 programs.

As of July 1, 2013, the monthly credit¹¹ is \$9.25 for the Lifeline 135 program, and \$11.75 for the Verizon companies' Lifeline program.

Universal Telephone Assistance Program

Verizon PA implemented a Universal Telephone Assistance Program (UTAP) along with its Lifeline service program as part of a settlement agreement that was approved by the Commission in 1995. Verizon PA is the only company that offers a financial assistance program that helps existing Lifeline customers and qualified Lifeline applicants (with a pre-existing basic service arrearage) to restore their basic telephone service. The Dollar Energy Fund manages UTAP and distributes funds to qualified customers and Lifeline applicants. The average UTAP assistance grant given to customers in 2012 was \$78. Overall, UTAP distributed \$45,740 in financial assistance to 587 of Verizon PA's qualified customers in 2012.

Automatic Notification Program

The Lifeline service automatic notification provision at 66 Pa.C.S. § 3019(f)(5) requires that all jurisdictional ETCs provide the Department of Public Welfare (DPW) with service descriptions, subscription forms, contact telephone numbers and service area information so DPW can notify its clients about the availability of Lifeline service. In 2005, a working group consisting of representatives of the PUC, Pennsylvania Telephone Association, the Office of Consumer Advocate and the Pennsylvania Utility Law Project worked with DPW to implement this provision. Commission staff coordinated with members of the working group to develop subscription forms and listings of company contacts by county. Commission staff

¹¹ The monthly credit is subject to change due to the Federal Subscriber Line Cost rate changes.

continues to provide DPW with copies of informational brochures and a link to the Commission's website for information about companies that offer Lifeline programs.

Wireless ETC Designation

Virgin Mobile USA, LP is the first wireless carrier designated by the Commission to be an ETC. On Dec. 22, 2010, the Commission approved Virgin Mobile's petition (Docket No. P-2010-2155915) for limited designation as an ETC. In January 2011, Virgin Mobile filed a petition for reconsideration to lift the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) certification requirements since the FCC no longer required facilities-based carriers seeking ETC status to comply with the PSAP certification obligations. The Commission approved Virgin Mobile's petition for reconsideration on Feb. 10, 2011. Effective Feb. 14, 2011, Virgin Mobile could operate its Lifeline program, Assurance Wireless, in Pennsylvania.

On Oct. 14, 2011, the Commission approved YourTel America's petition to become an ETC in Pennsylvania. On May 24, 2012, the Commission approved the ETC petitions for Cricket Communications, Inc.; Keystone Wireless, LLC d/b/a Immix Wireless; T-Mobile Northeast, LLC; T-Mobile Central, LLC and Voicestream Pittsburgh, LP. Keystone and T-Mobile each petitioned for both low-income and high-cost support and are seeking Mobility Fund Phase 1 support. The Mobility Fund Phase 1 support will accelerate delivery of advanced mobile services to tens of thousands of road miles that currently lack 3G or 4G service. Winning bidders must deploy either 3G service within two years or 4G service within three years of the award. T-Mobile was approved for the Mobility Fund Phase 1 support in Pennsylvania. T-Mobile was awarded \$1,772,094, equaling 74.93 road miles.

The Commission approved the ETC petitions of Budget Prepay, Inc., Global Connections Inc. of America and TAG Mobile, LLC during the remainder of 2012 and the ETC petitions of Q Link Wireless, LLC; Blue Jay Wireless, LLC; Nexus Communications, Inc. and Telrite Corporation in 2013.

For more information about the telephone universal service programs, contact Sandra Johnson-Gumby in BCS at (717) 772-0806 or by email at sjohnson-g@pa.gov.

Glossary of Terms

Competitive Local Exchange Carrier (CLEC) - A telecommunications provider that competes with other already established telecommunications providers to provide local telephone service.

Consumer Complaint Rate - The number of consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers.

Consumer Complaints - Cases to BCS involving billing, service, rates and other issues not related to requests for payment terms.

Cramming - The submission or inclusion of unauthorized, misleading or deceptive charges for products or services on an end-user customer's local telephone bill.

Customer Assistance Programs (CAPs) - Alternative collection programs set up between a utility company and a customer that allow low-income, payment-troubled customers to pay utility bills that are based on household size and gross household income. CAP participants agree to make regular monthly payments, which are usually less than the current bill, in exchange for continued utility service.

Electric Distribution Company (EDC) - Owner of the power lines and equipment necessary to deliver purchased electricity to the customer.

Electric Generation Supplier (EGS) - A person or corporation, generator, broker, marketer, aggregator or other entity that sells electricity, using the transmission or distribution facilities of an EDC.

Hardship Funds - Utility-sponsored funds that provide cash assistance to low-income utility customers to help them pay their utility bills.

Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier (ILEC) - A telecommunications company that was providing local telephone service in 1996 to customers in a specific geographic area designated by the Federal Communications Commission and held a certificate from the PUC.

Infraction - A misapplication or infringement of a Commission regulation, particularly the standards and billing practices for residential utility service.

Infraction Rate - The number of informally verified infractions per 1,000 residential customers (includes infractions drawn from both consumer complaints and PARs).

Inquiries - Consumer contacts to BCS that, for the most part, require no follow-up investigation beyond the initial contact.

Justified Consumer Complaint Rate - The number of justified consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers.

Justified Payment Agreement Request Rate - The number of justified PARs per 1,000 residential customers.

Local Exchange Carrier (LEC) - A public utility that provides basic telephone service either exclusively or in addition to toll service.

Natural Gas Distribution Company (NGDC) - A natural gas utility regulated by the PUC that owns the gas lines and equipment necessary to deliver natural gas to the consumer.

Natural Gas Supplier (NGS) - An entity other than an NGDC that sells, or arranges to sell, natural gas to customers using the distribution lines of an NGDC.

Payment Agreement Request Rate - The number of PARs per 1,000 residential customers.

Payment Agreement Requests (PARs) - Consumer requests for payment agreements principally include contacts to BCS involving a request for payment terms in one of the following situations: suspension/termination of service is pending; service has been suspended/terminated and the customer needs payment terms to have service restored; or the customer wants to retire an arrearage.

Problem Categories - A breakdown of residential consumer complaints by specific problem categories such as billing, credit and deposits, service quality, rates, etc.

Response Time in Days - Response time is the time span in days from the date of BCS's first contact with the company regarding a complaint to the date on which the utility provides BCS with its report regarding the complaint. Response time quantifies the speed of a utility's response to BCS consumer complaints and PARs.

Slamming - The unauthorized switching of a customer's service provider. In telecommunications, slamming refers to changing a customer's local exchange carrier or primary long-distance service provider without the customer's consent. In electric and gas, slamming refers to changing the customer's supply provider without customer authorization.

Termination Rate - For the electric and gas industries, termination rate is the number of service terminations divided by the number of residential customers. For the telephone industry, termination rate is the number of service terminations per 1,000 residential customers.

Appendices

Appendix A

Consumer Ratings of BCS Service

How quickly did the PUC handle your request?		
	2011	2012
Very quickly	59%	57%
Fairly quickly	28%	26%
Not very quickly	5%	6%
Not at all quickly	3%	4%
Don't recall	1%	2%
Have not heard from PUC	3%	4%
How easy to understand was the information the PUC gave you about the outcome of the problem?		
	2011	2012
Very easy	50%	51%
Fairly easy	16%	19%
Not very easy	3%	4%
Not at all easy	2%	1%
Don't recall	3%	2%
Did not receive any information	26%	22%
How polite was the first person you talked with at the PUC?		
	2011	2012
Very polite	74%	79%
Fairly polite	19%	15%
Not very polite	3%	2%
Not at all polite	1%	<1%
Don't recall	1%	2%
Did not speak to anyone	2%	2%
How interested in helping you was the first person you talked with at the PUC?		
	2011	2012
Very interested	67%	70%
Fairly interested	23%	23%
Not very interested	6%	4%
Not at all interested	2%	1%
Don't recall	1%	1%
Did not speak to anyone	1%	1%
If you had another problem with a utility, would you contact the PUC again?		
	2011	2012
Yes	85%	85%
No	7%	5%
Not sure	8%	10%

Appendix B

Total Volume of Consumer Complaints and Payment Agreement Requests to the BCS in 2011 and 2012

Industry	Consumer Complaints						Payment Agreement Requests					
	Residential			Commercial			Residential			Commercial		
	2011	2012	Percent Change	2011	2012	Percent Change	2011	2012	Percent Change	2011	2012	Percent Change
Electric	6,615	7,742	17%	786	778	-1%	42,603	36,158	-15%	223	183	-18%
Gas	2,311	2,543	10%	239	190	-21%	11,162	11,585	4%	92	78	-15%
Water	787	724	-8%	73	91	25%	4,568	4,607	1%	11	21	91%
Telephone	3,412	2,443	-28%	489	314	-36%	460	394	-14%	9	10	11%
Other	5	5	0%	1	0	-100%	4	6	50%	0	0	0%
Total	13,130	13,457	2%	1,588	1,373	-14%	58,797	52,750	-10%	335	292	-13%

Appendix C

2012 Residential Consumer Complaints for Companies Not Included in Industry Chapters

Company*	Number of Complaints	Total Number of Complaints Includes Secondary Company Complaints **
ELECTRIC		
Non-Major Electric Distribution Companies (EDCs)***	14	16
Ambit Energy (EGS)	10	10
AP Gas and Electric (EGS)	30	38
Champion Energy Services (EGS)	5	5
Clearview Electric (EGS)	25	25
Commerce Energy (EGS)	50	56
Con Edison Solutions (EGS)	7	16
Constellation Energy Power Choice (EGS)	12	12
Direct Energy (EGS)	41	46
Dominion Energy Solutions (EGS)	39	54
Energetix (EGS)	6	6
Energy Plus Holdings (EGS)	19	19
First Energy Solutions (EGS)	278	342
Gateway Energy (EGS)	11	11
Great American Power (EGS)	16	16
Hop Energy (EGS)	13	13
IDT Energy (EGS)	195	211

* Only those non-major companies having five or more residential consumer complaints in 2012 are listed individually. Non-major companies having fewer than five residential consumer complaints in 2012 are included in the appropriate general category for their industry, i.e. "Other Non-Major Electric Distribution Companies" or "Other CLECs," etc.

** Includes consumer complaints where the non-major company is listed as the secondary company.

*** Total number of complaints for those companies having fewer than five residential consumer complaints.

Appendix C (Continued)

2012 Residential Consumer Complaints for Companies Not Included in Industry Chapters

Company*	Number of Complaints	Total Number of Complaints Includes Secondary Company Complaints **
ELECTRIC (continued)		
Interstate Gas Supply (EGS)	15	20
Just Energy (EGS)	8	8
Liberty Power (EGS)	102	110
New Energy Ventured - Mid Atlantic (EGS)	14	19
North American Power (EGS)	52	52
Oasis Energy (EGS)	35	40
Palmco Power PA (EGS)	75	82
Pennsylvania Gas and Electric (EGS)	43	52
Planet Energy PA (EGS)	9	9
Plymouth Rock Energy (EGS)	6	6
PPL Plus (EGS)	0	5
Public Power (EGS)	28	33
Reliant Energy (EGS)	11	18
Rescom Energy (EGS)	50	50
Respond Power (EGS)	34	34
Sperian Energy (EGS)	16	16

* Only those non-major companies having five or more residential consumer complaints in 2012 are listed individually. Non-major companies having fewer than five residential consumer complaints in 2012 are included in the appropriate general category for their industry, i.e. "Other Non-Major Electric Distribution Companies" or "Other CLECs," etc.

** Includes consumer complaints where the non-major company is listed as the secondary company.

*** Total number of complaints for those companies having fewer than five residential consumer complaints.

Appendix C (Continued)

2012 Residential Consumer Complaints for Companies Not Included in Industry Chapters

Company*	Number of Complaints	Total Number of Complaints Includes Secondary Company Complaints **
ELECTRIC (continued)		
Starion Energy of PA (EGS)	0	6
Stream Energy (EGS)	20	27
Superior Plus Energy Services (EGS)	6	6
TriEagle Energy (EGS)	9	9
Verde Energy USA (EGS)	62	72
Washington Gas Energy Services (EGS)	26	31
Other Electric Generation Suppliers (EGSs)***	32	73
Total Non-Major Electric	1,424	1,674
GAS		
Peoples TWP (f.k.a TW Phillips (NGDC)	19	19
UGI Central Penn Gas (NGDC)	49	49
Other Non-Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies (NGDCs)***	8	8
Dominion Energy Solutions (NGS)	10	10
Major Energy (NGS)	9	9
Shiple Energy (NGS)	0	6

* Only those non-major companies having five or more residential consumer complaints in 2012 are listed individually. Non-major companies having fewer than five residential consumer complaints in 2012 are included in the appropriate general category for their industry, i.e. "Other Non-Major Electric Distribution Companies" or "Other CLECs," etc.

** Includes consumer complaints where the non-major company is listed as the secondary company.

*** Total number of complaints for those companies having fewer than five residential consumer complaints.

Appendix C (Continued)

2012 Residential Consumer Complaints for Companies Not Included in Industry Chapters

Company*	Number of Complaints	Total Number of Complaints Includes Secondary Company Complaints **
GAS (continued)		
Titan Gas and Power (NGS)	9	9
Volunteer Energy (NGS)	5	5
Other Natural Gas Suppliers (NGSs)***	24	32
Total Non-Major Gas	133	147
Company*	Number of Complaints	
WATER		
Other Private Water***	16	
Municipal Water***	13	
Total Non-Major Water	29	
TELEPHONE		
Denver & Ephrata Telephone (ILEC)	6	
Other Non-Major Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (ILECs)***	20	
AT&T Local (CLEC)	12	
Cavalier Telephone Mid-Atlantic (CLEC)	33	
Comcast Digital Phone (CLEC)	15	
Cordia Communications Corp. (d/b/a CLEC)	10	
Full Service Network (CLEC)	36	

* Only those non-major companies having five or more residential consumer complaints in 2012 are listed individually. Non-major companies having fewer than five residential consumer complaints in 2012 are included in the appropriate general category for their industry, i.e. "Other Non-Major Electric Distribution Companies" or "Other CLECs," etc.

** Includes consumer complaints where the non-major company is listed as the secondary company.

*** Total number of complaints for those companies having fewer than five residential consumer complaints.

Appendix C (Continued)

2012 Residential Consumer Complaints for Companies Not Included in Industry Chapters

Company*	Number of Complaints
TELEPHONE (continued)	
RCN (CLEC)	10
Selectel Inc. (CLEC)	7
Service Electric Telephone, Inc. (CLEC)	6
Other Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs)**	28
AT&T (IXC)	7
Other Providers of Telecommunications Services***	16
Total Non-Major Telephone	206

* Only those non-major companies having five or more residential consumer complaints in 2012 are listed individually. Non-major companies having fewer than five residential consumer complaints in 2012 are included in the appropriate general category for their industry, i.e. "Other Non-Major Electric Distribution Companies" or "Other CLECs," etc.

** Includes consumer complaints where the non-major company is listed as the secondary company.

*** Total number of complaints for those companies having fewer than five residential consumer complaints.

Appendix D-1

Classification of Consumer Complaints

Electric, Gas & Water

Billing Disputes - Complaints about bills from the utility: high bills; inaccurate bills or balances; installation charges; customer charges; service charges; repair charges; late payment charges; frequency of bills; and the misapplication of payment on bills.

Competition - Complaints about issues that are directly related to competition: enrollment/eligibility; application and licensing; supplier selection; changing/switching suppliers, which includes slamming; advertising and sales; billing; contracts; and credit and deposits. This category also includes any complaints about more general competition issues such as consumer education, pilot programs and restructuring.

Credit & Deposits - Complaints about a company's requirements to provide service: applicant must pay another person's bill, applicant must complete an application, applicant must provide identification, or applicant must pay a security deposit. This category also includes complaints about the amount of or the amortization of a deposit, the payment of interest on a deposit or the failure of a company to return a deposit to the customer.

Damages - Complaints about a company's lack of payment or lack of restored property related to damages to equipment, appliances or property due to service outages, company construction or repair, and improperly delivered or transferred service.

Discontinuance/Transfer - Complaints related to the responsibility for or the amount of bills after discontinuance or transfer of service: The customer requested discontinuance of service, and the company failed to finalize the account as requested or transferred a balance to a new or existing account from the account of another person or location.

Metering - Billing complaints directly related to the reading of or the failure to read the customer's meter and the accuracy of the meter readings (company reading, customer supplied reading or misreading).

Other Payment Issues - Complaints about the amount of budget bills or the transfer of a customer's debt to a collection agency.

Personnel Problems - Complaints about performance by company personnel: a company representative did not finish the job correctly; a meter reader entered a customer's home to read the meter without knocking; company personnel will not perform a requested service; business office personnel treated the customer rudely; and overall mismanagement of a utility. This category also includes any complaints about sales such as appliance sales by the utility, as well as complaints about a company's CAP program or procedures.

Rates - General or specific complaints about a utility's rates: general or specific rates are too high, the company's rates are being used to recover advertising costs, or the customer is being billed on the incorrect rate.

Scheduling Delays - Complaints about problems with a company's scheduling: delays in scheduling or repairing service or relocating poles, failures to keep scheduled meetings or appointments, and lack of accessibility to customers.

Service Extensions - Complaints about line extensions or installation of service: the responsibility for line extensions; the cost and payment for line extensions; inspection requirements; delay in installation; connection or disconnection of service; and denial of service extensions.

Service Interruptions - Complaints about service interruptions: the frequency of service interruptions, the duration of interruptions or the lack of prior notice regarding interruptions.

Service Quality - Complaints about a utility's product: the quality of the product is poor (water quality, voltage or pressure); the company's equipment is unsatisfactory or unsafe; the company fails to act on a complaint about safety; the company plans to abandon service; the company does not offer needed service; the company wants to change location of equipment; or the company providing service is not certified by the Commission (defactos).

All Other Problems - All other complaints that do not fit into the above categories, including, but not limited to, complaints about termination procedures when there is a need for payment agreements.

Appendix D-2

Classification of Consumer Complaints Telephone

Annoyance Calls - Complaints about the company's failure to resolve problems related to receiving unsolicited sales calls or harassing calls. This includes the company's failure to change the phone number or initiate an investigation, and problems with auto dialers and fax machines.

Audiotex - Complaints about the company's failure to resolve billing problems related to special phone entertainment or information services. In 2012, BCS evaluated no residential consumer complaints about audiotex.

Billing Disputes - Complaints about bills from the utility: high bills; inaccurate bills or balances; installation charges; customer charges; service charges; repair charges; late payment charges; frequency of bills; and the misapplication of payment on bills.

Competition - Complaints about changing/switching service providers, slamming, cramming, competition-related billing problems, contracts, competition-related service problems and all other problems associated with competition in the telecommunications marketplace.

Credit & Deposits - Complaints about a company's requirements to provide service: applicant payment of another person's bill; completion of an application; provision of identification; or payment of a security deposit. This category also includes complaints about the amount of or the amortization of a deposit, the payment of interest on a deposit or the failure of a company to return a deposit to the customer.

Discontinuance/Transfer - Complaints related to responsibility for or the amount of bills after discontinuance or transfer of service; company failure to finalize the account as requested; or the company's transfer of a balance to a new or existing account from the account of another person or location.

Extended Area of Service (EAS) - Complaints about a limited local calling area. In 2012, BCS evaluated no residential consumer complaints about EAS.

Non-Recurring Charges - Complaints about one-time charges for installation of basic and/or non-basic services.

Rates - General or specific complaints about a utility's rates: general or specific rates are too high or the customer is being billed on the incorrect rate. In 2012, BCS evaluated two residential consumer complaints about rates.

Sales Nonbasic Services - Complaints related to the sale of nonbasic services, including the availability of certain services. In 2012, BCS evaluated no residential consumer complaints about sales of nonbasic services.

Service Delivery - Complaints about delays in service installations or disconnections of service and failures to keep scheduled appointments; lack of facilities to provide service; unauthorized transfer of service; unavailability of special services; and the rudeness of business office personnel.

Service Terminations - Complaints about suspension or termination procedures when there is no need for a payment agreement.

Toll Services - Complaints about charges for local toll and/or long-distance toll services.

Unsatisfactory Service - Complaints about poor service quality, problems with the assignment of phone numbers, incorrect information in phone directories, lack of directories, equal access to toll network, and service interruptions and outages.

All Other Problems - All other complaints that do not fit into the above categories, including complaints about excessive coin-phone rates. Also included are complaints that were taken in by BCS, but closed before they could be investigated because the consumer called back and resolved the complaint with the company or because the consumer changed their mind about filing the complaint. In addition, some complaints, during investigation, were found to not fall under the PUC's jurisdiction.

Appendix E - Table 1

Consumer Complaint Categories: 2012*

Major Electric Distribution Companies

Categories**	Duquesne	Met-Ed	PECO***+	Penelec	Penn Power	PPL***	UGI-Electric	West Penn	Electric Majors
Personnel Problems	173	124	59	80	19	45	11	100	611
Metering	11	231	10	105	12	22	1	115	507
Billing Disputes	51	78	59	65	18	44	3	42	360
Service Interruptions	9	126	11	36	5	19	1	85	292
Discontinuance/ Transfer	43	40	34	33	10	61	4	18	243
Credit and Deposits	36	32	40	25	6	7	12	35	193
Other Payment Issues	36	29	25	17	7	18	2	24	158
Damages	12	28	8	23	5	8	0	52	136
Service Extensions	5	25	7	13	1	7	1	56	115
Scheduling Delays	11	21	6	8	3	9	1	41	100
Service Quality	10	32	8	15	3	14	1	17	100
Rates	0	7	4	3	1	5	0	2	22
All Other Problems	181	74	85	88	19	111	20	53	631
Total*	578	847	356	511	109	370	57	640	3,468

* Categories are for residential complaints evaluated by BCS as of July 12, 2013, whether the case outcome was found to be "justified."

** An explanation of the various complaint categories appears in Appendix D-1.

*** Statistics are based on a probability sample of cases.

+ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

Appendix E - Table 2

Consumer Complaint Categories: 2012*

Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies

Categories**	Columbia	Equitable	NFG	Peoples	PGW	UGI-Gas	UGI Penn Natural	Gas Majors
Personnel Problems	44	51	11	45	85	34	13	283
Billing Disputes	15	18	8	40	103	18	14	216
Metering	11	2	9	30	85	2	3	142
Discontinuance/ Transfer	5	8	11	12	75	15	9	135
Other Payment Issues	10	6	3	24	37	4	8	92
Credit and Deposits	10	8	2	2	5	19	15	61
Damages	10	5	3	25	7	5	1	56
Service Extensions	10	5	2	4	1	13	9	44
Service Quality	9	10	2	11	8	1	1	42
Scheduling Delays	6	6	5	10	11	2	0	40
Rates	10	0	0	2	0	0	1	13
Service Interruptions	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	4
All Other Problems	18	22	18	17	57	19	16	167
Total*	159	141	74	225	474	132	90	1,295

* Categories are for residential complaints evaluated by BCS as of July 12, 2013, whether the case outcome was found to be "justified."

** An explanation of the various complaint categories appears in Appendix D-1.

Appendix E - Table 3
Consumer Complaint Categories: 2012*
Major Water Companies

Categories**	Aqua	PAWC	“Other Class A” Water	All “Class A” Water
Billing Disputes	67	136	2	205
Personnel Problems	18	52	7	77
Service Quality	13	26	6	45
Damages	8	21	3	32
Scheduling Delays	15	9	2	26
Metering	8	10	1	19
Discontinuance/Transfer	1	12	0	13
Credit and Deposits	8	2	0	10
Service Extensions	3	6	0	9
Service Interruptions	2	4	0	6
Other Payment Issues	2	0	0	2
Rates	0	1	1	2
All Other Problems	63	59	7	129
Total*	208	338	29	575

* Categories are for residential complaints evaluated by BCS as of July 5, 2013, whether the case outcome was found to be “justified.”

** An explanation of the various complaint categories appears in Appendix D-1.

Appendix E - Table 4

Consumer Complaint Categories: 2012* Major Local Telephone Companies

Categories**	CenturyLink	Frontier Common- wealth	Verizon North	Verizon PA	Windstream	Telephone Majors
Unsatisfactory Service	7	19	24	292	17	359
Service Delivery	15	10	26	231	19	301
Billing Disputes	24	26	19	194	11	274
Service Terminations	13	9	4	48	2	76
Competition	0	0	0	26	4	30
Credit and Deposits	2	0	1	15	1	19
Toll Services	4	0	0	11	0	15
Discontinuance/ Transfer	0	1	0	8	0	9
Non-Recurring Charges	0	0	0	9	0	9
Annoyance Calls	1	0	1	5	0	7
All Other Problems	10	7	7	120	3	147
Total*	76	72	82	959	57	1,246

79

* Categories are for residential complaints evaluated by BCS as of April 19, 2013, whether the case outcome was found to be "justified."

** An explanation of the various complaint categories appears in Appendix D-2.

Appendix F - Table 1

2011-12 Residential Consumer Complaint Statistics Major Electric Distribution Companies

Company Name	2012 Residential Customers	Residential Consumer Complaints to BCS			Consumer Complaint Rates ¹		Justified Consumer Complaints			
		2011	2012	% Change in #	2011	2012	Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2011		Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2012	
Duquesne	525,683	777	815	5%	1.48	1.55	94	0.18	82	0.16
Met-Ed	487,312	970	1,173	21%	1.99	2.41	56	0.12	166	0.34
PECO ⁵	1,431,969	1,729	1,564	-10%	1.21	1.09	283*	0.20*	220*	0.15*
Penelec	505,013	559	702	26%	1.11	1.39	45	0.09	62	0.12
Penn Power	140,666	139	153	10%	0.99	1.09	6	0.04	20	0.14
PPL	1,215,950	1,235	936	-24%	1.02	0.77	100*	0.08*	126*	0.10*
UGI-Electric	55,953	76	81	7%	1.37	1.45	7	0.13	4	0.07
West Penn	618,033	465	894	92%	0.76	1.45	65	0.11	187	0.30
Major Electric	4,980,579	5,950	6,318	6%			656		867	
Average of Rates					1.22⁴	1.39⁴		0.12⁴		0.19⁴

¹ Consumer complaint rate = consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers.

² Estimated based on the number of cases on CSIS as of July 12, 2013.

³ Justified consumer complaint rate = justified consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers.

⁴ Does not include UGI-Electric.

⁵ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

* Based on a probability sample of cases.

Appendix F - Table 2

2011-12 Residential Consumer Complaint Statistics Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies

Company Name	2012 Residential Customers	Residential Consumer Complaints to BCS			Consumer Complaint Rates ¹		Justified Consumer Complaints			
		2011	2012	% Change in #	2011	2012	Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2011		Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2012	
Columbia	382,677	229	220	-4%	0.61	0.57	24	0.06	18	0.05
Equitable	241,778	168	175	4%	0.70	0.72	15	0.06	10	0.04
NFG	198,663	115	100	-13%	0.58	0.50	7	0.04	14	0.07
Peoples	329,809	214	304	42%	0.65	0.92	46	0.14	62	0.19
PGW	479,889	1,120	1,307	17%	2.34	2.72	139*	0.29*	328*	0.68*
UGI-Gas	317,170	175	187	7%	0.56	0.59	10	0.03	17	0.05
UGI Penn Natural	147,046	132	117	-11%	0.91	0.80	16	0.11	13	0.09
Major Gas	2,097,032	2,153	2,410	12%			257		462	
Average of Rates					0.91	0.98		0.10		0.17

¹ Consumer complaint rate = consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers.

² Estimated based on the number of cases on CSIS as of July 12, 2013.

³ Justified consumer complaint rate = justified consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers.

* Based on a probability sample of cases.

Appendix F - Table 3

2011-12 Residential Consumer Complaint Statistics Major Water Companies

Company Name	2012 Residential Customers	Residential Consumer Complaints to BCS			Consumer Complaint Rates ¹		Justified Consumer Complaints			
		2011	2012	% Change in #	2011	2012	Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2011		Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2012	
Aqua	384,716	294	258	-12%	0.77	0.67	74	0.19	79	0.21
PAWC	589,738	441	403	-9%	0.75	0.68	86	0.15	85	0.14
"Other Class A" Water	135,066	22	34	55%	0.16	0.25	6	0.04	2	0.01
Major Water	1,109,520	757	695	-8%			166		166	
Average of Rates					0.56	0.54		0.13		0.12

¹ Consumer complaint rate = consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers.

² Estimated based on the number of cases on CSIS as of July 5, 2013.

³ Justified consumer complaint rate = justified consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers.

Appendix F - Table 4

2011-12 Residential Consumer Complaint Statistics Major Local Telephone Companies

Company Name	2012 Residential Customers	Residential Consumer Complaints to BCS			Consumer Complaint Rates ¹		Justified Consumer Complaints			
		2011	2012	% Change in #	2011	2012	Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2011		Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2012	
CenturyLink	159,132	93	87	-6%	0.55	0.55	43	0.25	22	0.14
Frontier Commonwealth	118,454	86	86	0%	0.63	0.73	55	0.41	32	0.27
Verizon North**	232,839	121	96	-21%	0.47	0.41	65	0.25	42	0.18
Verizon PA**	1,418,587	2,763	1,906	-31%	1.64	1.34	1,554*	0.92*	967*	0.68*
Windstream	112,497	66	62	-6%	0.56	0.55	32	0.27	11	0.10
Major Telephone	2,041,509	3,129	2,237	-29%			1,749		1,074	
Average of Rates					0.77	0.72		0.42		0.27

¹ Consumer complaint rate = consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers.

² Estimated based on the number of cases on CSIS as of May 31, 2013.

³ Justified consumer complaint rate = justified consumer complaints per 1,000 residential customers.

* Based on a probability sample of cases.

** BCS is currently offering all Verizon customers who call with a service issue the voluntary option of being transferred to a special Verizon team that immediately begins working to resolve the customer's complaint. If a customer chooses the voluntary transfer, BCS categorizes the contact as an "inquiry" rather than as a "consumer complaint." BCS categorized 435 of these contacts regarding Verizon service issues as inquiries during 2012.

Appendix G - Table 1

2011-12 Residential Payment Agreement Request (PAR) Statistics Major Electric Distribution Companies

Company Name	2012 Residential Customers	Residential PARs to BCS			PAR Rates ¹		Justified PARs			
		2011	2012	% Change In #	2011	2012	Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2011		Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2012	
Duquesne	525,683	5,616	6,025	7%	10.70	11.46	67	0.13	67	0.13
Met-Ed	487,312	2,120	2,380	12%	4.36	4.88	28	0.06	53	0.11
PECO ⁵	1,431,969	9,056	7,911	-13%	6.35	5.52	143	0.10	66	0.05
Penelec	505,013	1,860	2,110	13%	3.68	4.18	32	0.06	41	0.08
Penn Power	140,666	663	607	-8%	4.72	4.32	17	0.12	12	0.09
PPL	1,215,950	19,823	14,897	-25%	16.33	12.25	1,088	0.90	542	0.45
UGI-Electric	55,953	797	698	-12%	14.34	12.47	7	0.13	9	0.16
West Penn	618,033	2,616	1,437	-45%	4.25	2.33	145	0.24	48	0.08
Major Electric	4,980,579	42,551	36,065	-15%			1,527		838	
Average of Rates					7.20⁴	6.42⁴		0.23⁴		0.14⁴

¹ PAR rate = PARs per 1,000 residential customers.

² With the exception of Penn Power and UGI-Electric, each company's number of justified PARs is estimated based on a probability sample of cases. The number of justified PARs for all EDCs is based on the number of cases on CSIS as of July 12, 2013.

³ Justified PAR rate = justified PARs per 1,000 residential customers.

⁴ Does not include UGI-Electric.

⁵ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

Appendix G - Table 2

2011-12 Residential Payment Agreement Request (PAR) Statistics Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies

Company Name	2012 Residential Customers	Residential PARs to BCS			PAR Rates ¹		Justified PARs			
		2011	2012	% Change in #	2011	2012	Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2011		Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2012	
Columbia	382,677	841	849	1%	2.25	2.22	2	0.01	12	0.03
Equitable	241,778	1,222	1,062	-13%	5.09	4.39	13	0.05	15	0.06
NFG	198,663	559	676	21%	2.82	3.40	16	0.08	4	0.02
Peoples	329,809	374	520	39%	1.13	1.58	18	0.05	35	0.11
PGW	479,889	3,253	4,038	24%	6.79	8.41	87	0.18	73	0.15
UGI-Gas	317,170	2,717	2,366	-13%	8.75	7.46	58	0.19	139	0.44
UGI Penn Natural	147,046	1,814	1,528	-16%	12.48	10.39	28	0.19	95	0.65
Major Gas	2,097,032	10,780	11,039	2%			222		373	
Average of Rates					5.62	5.41		0.11		0.21

¹ PAR rate = PARs per 1,000 residential customers.

² With the exception of Columbia and Peoples, each company's number of justified PARs is estimated based on a probability sample of cases. The number of justified PARs for all NGDCs is based on the number of cases on CSIS as of July 12, 2013.

³ Justified PAR rate = justified PARs per 1,000 residential customers.

Appendix G - Table 3

2011-12 Residential Payment Agreement Request (PAR) Statistics Major Water Companies

Company Name	2012 Residential Customers	Residential PARs to BCS			PAR Rates ¹		Justified PARs			
		2011	2012	% Change in #	2011	2012	Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2011		Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2012	
Aqua	384,716	1,501	1,627	8%	3.92	4.23	60*	0.16*	73*	0.19*
PAWC	589,738	2,844	2,690	-5%	4.83	4.56	241*	0.41*	138*	0.23*
"Other Class A" Water	135,066	176	229	30%	1.31	1.70	0	0.00	0	0.00
Major Water	1,109,520	4,521	4,546	1%			301		211	
Average of Rates					3.35	3.50		0.19		0.14

¹ PAR rate = PARs per 1,000 residential customers.

² Estimated based on a probability sample of cases and the number of cases on CSIS as of July 5, 2013.

³ Justified PAR rate = justified PARs per 1,000 residential customers.

* Based on a probability sample of cases.

Appendix G - Table 4

2011-12 Residential Payment Agreement Request (PAR) Statistics Major Local Telephone Companies

Company Name	2012 Residential Customers	Residential PARs to BCS			PAR Rates ¹		Justified PARs			
		2011	2012	% Change in #	2011	2012	Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2011		Numbers ² / Rates ³ 2012	
CenturyLink	159,132	25	30	20%	0.15	0.19	3	0.02	8	0.05
Frontier Commonwealth	118,454	8	11	38%	0.06	0.09	1	0.01	3	0.03
Verizon North	232,839	17	8	-53%	0.07	0.03	2	0.01	0	0.00
Verizon PA	1,418,587	336	303	-10%	0.20	0.21	19*	0.01*	9*	0.01*
Windstream	112,497	8	6	-25%	0.07	0.05	2	0.02	0	0.00
Major Telephone	2,041,509	394	358	-9%			27		20	
Average of Rates					0.11	0.12		0.01		0.02

- 1 PAR rate = PARs per 1,000 residential customers.
 2 Estimated based on the number of cases on CSIS as of May 31, 2013.
 3 Justified PAR rate = justified PARs per 1,000 residential customers.
 * Based on a probability sample of cases.

Appendix H – Table 1

Chapter 56, Chapter 14 and Other Infraction Categories: 2012* Major Electric Distribution Companies

Description	Duquesne		Met-Ed		PECO+		Penelec		Penn Power		PPL		UGI-Electric		West Penn	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Billing and Payment (56.2-Def. of Billing Month, 56.2-Def. of Billing Period, 56.11, 56.15, 56.21, 56.22, 56.24 and 56.25)	5	9%	6	5%	10	20%	5	14%	0	0%	6	10%	1	50%	8	14%
Meter Reading (56.12)	0	0%	83	75%	0	0%	13	37%	1	11%	5	8%	0	0%	16	27%
Make-Up Bills (56.14, 57.24, 59.22 and 65.9 (C))	2	4%	1	1%	1	2%	1	3%	0	0%	2	3%	0	0%	7	12%
Transfer of Accounts (56.16 and Secretarial Letter re: third-party request for service)	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%
Credit Standards and Deposits (56.31-37, 56.41, 56.42, 56.51 and 56.53)	16	30%	1	1%	6	12%	1	3%	1	11%	4	7%	0	0%	2	3%
Termination Grounds (56.2-Def. of Delinquent Acct. and 56.81-83)	2	4%	2	2%	2	4%	0	0%	1	11%	2	3%	0	0%	2	3%
Termination Procedures (56.91-97 and 56.114)	12	23%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	1	2%	1	50%	2	3%
Reconnection of Service (56.191(a)-(c))	1	2%	2	2%	1	2%	0	0%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%
Liability - Responsibility for Bills (56.2-Def. of Applicant, 56.2-Def. of Customer and 56.191(d)-(e))	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%
Landlord/Ratepayer (1521-1533)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%
Dispute Handling (56.2-Def. of Dispute, 56.141-152 and 56.181)	11	21%	16	14%	27	53%	12	34%	4	44%	33	56%	0	0%	19	32%
Other (56.1, 56.202 and 1501)	1	2%	0	0%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	53		111		51		35		9		59		2		59	

* # equals the number of verified infractions identified by BCS as of November 14, 2013.

% equals the percent of the total number of infractions for a particular company.

+ PECO statistics include electric and gas.

Appendix H – Table 2

Chapter 56, Chapter 14 and Other Infraction Categories: 2012* Major Natural Gas Distribution Companies

Description	Columbia		Equitable		NFG		Peoples		PGW		UGI – Gas		UGI Penn Natural	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Billing and Payment (56.2-Def. of Billing Month, 56.2-Def. of Billing Period, 56.11, 56.15, 56.21, 56.22, 56.24 and 56.25)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	12%	6	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Meter Reading (56.12)	0	0%	0	0%	12	63%	14	21%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Make-Up Bills (56.14, 57.24, 59.22 and 65.9 (C))	1	11%	0	0%	1	5%	1	1%	22	16%	0	0%	0	0%
Transfer of Accounts (56.16 and Secretarial Letter re: third-party request for service)	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Credit Standards and Deposits (56.31-37, 56.41, 56.42, 56.51 and 56.53)	2	22%	3	60%	1	5%	3	4%	5	4%	2	20%	2	33%
Termination Grounds (56.2-Def. of Delinquent Acct. and 56.81-83)	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3	4%	3	2%	0	0%	0	0%
Termination Procedures (56.91-97 and 56.114)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	4%	1	1%	1	10%	1	17%
Reconnection of Service (56.191(a)-(c))	1	11%	0	0%	1	5%	1	1%	1	1%	2	20%	0	0%
Liability - Responsibility for Bills (56.2-Def. of Applicant, 56.2-Def. of Customer and 56.191(d)-(e))	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Landlord/Ratepayer (1521-1533)	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Dispute Handling (56.2-Def. of Dispute, 56.141-152 and 56.181)	2	22%	1	20%	3	16%	32	48%	65	47%	5	50%	3	50%
Other (56.285, 59.21 and 1501)	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	1	1%	26	19%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	9		5		19		67		137		10		6	

* # equals the number of verified infractions identified by BCS as of November 14, 2013.
% equals the percent of the total number of infractions for a particular company.

Appendix H - Table 3

Chapter 56, Chapter 14 and Other Infraction Categories: 2012*

Major Water Companies

Description	Aqua		PAWC		"Other Class A"	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Billing and Payment (56.2-Def. of Billing Month, 56.2-Def. of Billing Period, 56.11, 56.15, 56.21, 56.22, 56.24 and 56.25)	29	34%	14	15%	0	0%
Meter Reading (56.12)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Make-Up Bills (56.14, 57.24, 59.22 and 65.9 (C))	4	5%	2	2%	1	100%
Transfer of Accounts (56.16 and Secretarial Letter re: third-party request for service)	1	1%	2	2%	0	0%
Credit Standards and Deposits (56.31-37, 56.41, 56.42, 56.51 and 56.53)	7	8%	1	1%	0	0%
Termination Grounds (56.2-Def. of Delinquent Acct. and 56.81-83)	4	5%	2	2%	0	0%
Termination Procedures (56.91-97 and 56.114)	4	5%	8	9%	0	0%
Reconnection of Service (56.191(a)-(c))	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Liability - Responsibility for Bills (56.2-Def. of Applicant, 56.2-Def. of Customer and 56.191(d)-(e))	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Landlord/Ratepayer (1521-1533)	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Dispute Handling (56.2-Def. of Dispute, 56.141-152 and 56.181)	35	41%	63	68%	0	0%
Other (56.71 and 56.285)	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%
Total	86		93		1	

* # equals the number of verified infractions identified by BCS as of November 14, 2013.
 % equals the percent of the total number of infractions for a particular company.

Appendix H – Table 4

Chapter 63 Infraction Categories: 2012*

Major Local Telephone Companies

Description	CenturyLink		Frontier Common- wealth		Verizon North		Verizon PA		Wind- stream	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Complaint Procedures (63.15)	2	10%	2	6%	12	17%	131	8%	1	20%
Service Records (63.22)	3	14%	21	66%	1	1%	24	1%	0	0%
Customer Trouble Reports (63.57)	16	76%	9	28%	58	81%	1,502	90%	4	80%
Installation of Service (63.58)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	<1%	0	0%
Migration (63.201-221)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	18	1%	0	0%
Other (63.21, 63.53 and 63.63)	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	2	<1%	0	0%
Total	21		32		72		1,678		5	

* # equals the number of verified infractions identified by BCS as of April 4, 2013.
 % equals the percent of the total number of infractions for a particular company.

Appendix H – Table 5

Chapter 64 Infraction Categories: 2012*

Major Local Telephone Companies

92

Description	CenturyLink		Frontier Common- wealth		Verizon North		Verizon PA		Wind- stream	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Billing and Payment (64.1, 64.12-14, 64.16 and 64.18-19)	5	23%	11	27%	3	8%	146	26%	0	0%
Slamming and Cramming (64.23)	0	0%	0	0%	6	16%	23	4%	5	36%
Credit and Deposits (64.32-34 and 64.36)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	1%	0	0%
Suspension and Termination (64.63, 64.71-74, 64.81, 64.121, 64.123, 64.133 and 64.181)	0	0%	2	5%	2	5%	34	6%	1	7%
Dispute Procedures (64.141 and 64.153)	14	64%	24	59%	24	65%	310	55%	8	57%
Other (64.2, 64.52-53 and 64.192)	3	14%	4	10%	2	5%	40	7%	0	0%
Total	22		41		37		560		14	

* # equals the number of verified infractions identified by BCS as of April 4, 2013.

% equals the percent of the total number of infractions for a particular company.

Consumer Access to the Public Utility Commission

The Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PUC) provides access to consumers through the following telephone numbers:

PUC Hotline: 1-800-692-7380 (toll free)

Consumers can also reach the Commission
by mail at the following address:

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Information about the PUC is available on the Internet:

www.puc.pa.gov



Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

