

CONSUMER SERVICES
ACTIVITY REPORT: 1983

JUNE 1984

PA Public Utility Commission
Bureau of Consumer Services
Joseph W. Farrell, Director

Consumer Services Activity Report - 1983

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	
I. OVERALL ACTIVITY	1
II. NATURE OF BCS CONSUMER COMPLAINTS	2
TABLE 1 - NATURE OF CALL FOR CONSUMER COMPLAINTS: 1983	2
III. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF BUREAU ACTIVITY	3
IV. TYPE OF UTILITIES INVOLVED	4
V. MAJOR COMPANIES	5
TABLE 2 - RESIDENTIAL CONSUMER COMPLAINTS - MAJOR GAS COMPANIES	6
TABLE 3 - RESIDENTIAL CONSUMER COMPLAINTS - MAJOR ELECTRIC COMPANIES	7
TABLE 4 - RESIDENTIAL CONSUMER COMPLAINTS - MAJOR TELEPHONE COMPANIES	8
TABLE 5 - RESIDENTIAL MEDIATION REQUESTS - MAJOR GAS COMPANIES	10
TABLE 6 - RESIDENTIAL MEDIATION REQUESTS - MAJOR ELECTRIC COMPANIES	11
VI. COLLECTIONS STATISTICS	
TABLE 7 - PERCENTAGE OF CUSTOMERS OVERDUE	13
TABLE 8 - AVERAGE MONTHLY RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMER BILLS	15
TABLE 9 - AVERAGE CUSTOMER ARREARAGES	16
TABLE 10 - NUMBER OF TERMINATION NOTICES	17
TABLE 11 - NUMBER OF SERVICE TERMINATIONS	18
TABLE 12 - WRITE-OFFS AS A PROPORTION OF REVENUES	20
VII. CONCLUSION	21

Contents (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX A - BUREAU STRUCTURE/CSIS/BCS-PSU	22
APPENDIX B - DISTRIBUTION OF COMMERCIAL CASES MAJOR ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANIES	23
APPENDIX C - MONTHLY VOLUME - MEDIATIONS REQUESTS AND CONSUMER COMPLAINTS	24
APPENDIX D - INQUIRIES AND OPINIONS: MAJOR COMPANIES MAJOR PROBLEM CATEGORIES FOR INQUIRIES AND OPINIONS	25 26
APPENDIX E - MEDIATIONS REQUESTS - PA. COUNTIES CONSUMER COMPLAINTS - PA. COUNTIES	27 28
APPENDIX F - TYPE OF INDUSTRY	29
APPENDIX G - FORMULAS FOR MEDIATION AND COMPLAINT RATES	30
APPENDIX H - BCS COMPLAINTS-RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL	31
APPENDIX I - CONSUMER COMPLAINTS BY ELECTRIC COMPANIES 1980-1983	32
CONSUMER COMPLAINTS BY GAS COMPANIES 1980-1983	33
CONSUMER COMPLAINTS BY TELEPHONE COMPANIES 1980-1983	34
MEDIATION REQUESTS BY ELECTRIC COMPANIES 1980-1983	35
MEDIATION REQUESTS BY GAS COMPANIES 1980-1983	36
APPENDIX J - COMMERCIAL CONSUMER COMPLAINTS - MAJOR TELEPHONE COMPANIES	37
APPENDIX K - WRITE-OFFS RATIOS: 1970-1983 MAJOR GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANIES	38
APPENDIX L - WRITE-OFFS RATIOS FOR RESIDENTIAL ACCOUNTS 1980-1983	39
APPENDIX M - AVERAGE MONTHLY CUSTOMER USAGE - KWH/MCF	40

THE CONSUMER SERVICES ACTIVITY REPORT FOR 1983

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS) was mandated under Act 216 of 1976 to provide responsive, efficient, and accountable management of consumer complaints. The Bureau began investigating utility customer complaints and mediating service termination cases in April 1977. (See Appendix A for additional details.) As of the end of 1983 the Bureau has investigated over 143,300 cases and has handled an additional 128,600 information requests and opinions. Its experience shows that unsolicited complaints can provide error signals because they provide information about utilities' effectiveness at meeting consumers' needs and complying with Commission standards. The Bureau maintains a computer based consumer information system through a contract with Penn State University which permits complaints to be aggregated and analyzed. Information from this system is used to identify patterns and trends in utility consumer problems. This report highlights BCS activity for the year 1983 and is the sixth annual overview of basic problem indicators. Future reports will continue to focus on specific functional areas and industries and will also provide a detailed comparative evaluation of companies' performance.

The data in this report have been aggregated in a similar manner as the 1982 report using the Bureau's Consumer Services Information System (CSIS). Cases involving termination of service are distinctly different than consumer complaints and should not be jointly analyzed. In recognition of this, all termination cases handled in the regional offices and involving electric, gas or water service have been classified as mediation cases. In addition, this report aggregates data from the Bureau's Collections Reporting System (CRS). This data base is used in Section VI, Collections Statistics. Please note that most of the tables in this section are an expansion of similar tables that appear in the Bureau's October 1983 Report "Utility Payment Problems: The Measurement and Evaluation of Responses to Customer Nonpayment." The CRS provides a valuable resource for measuring company performance in collections from year to year.

In emphasizing the Bureau's policy of focusing on residential accounts, investigatory¹ cases that involved commercial accounts are deleted from Tables 2 thru 8. The BCS has done this because the potential for analysis is strengthened when dissimilar types of service are separated. Appendix B lists the distribution of commercial cases by company for the electric and gas industries. Future reporting will continue to focus on BCS cases involving residential accounts.

1 The term investigatory includes both mediations and consumer complaints when used in this report.

I. OVERALL ACTIVITY

The Bureau's cases fall into 3 basic categories: consumer complaints, mediation requests, and inquiries. The Bureau received 22,459 contacts which required investigation from utility customers in 1983. The 6,563 consumer complaints involved complaints about utilities' actions related to billing, service delivery, repairs, etc. Mediation requests, of which there were 15,896, came from customers who needed help in negotiating payment arrangements with their utility companies in order to avoid termination of service or to have service reconnected. The Bureau also received 20,128 inquiries and information requests which did not require investigation.

Mediation Requests

Mediation requests decreased by approximately 19% from 19,603 in 1982 to 15,896 in 1983. This decrease is favorable in view of the 31% increase from 1980 to 1982. The Bureau hopes that this reversal of trend will continue in 1984. It is important to note that telephone service termination cases are not under the jurisdiction of the mediation unit and are treated as consumer complaints. There is a typical seasonal pattern in which the bulk of mediations are received in the spring. This prevailed in 1983 as in past years. This pattern can be attributed to the surge in termination activity which follows the restraints on service termination during the winter heating season (December through March). Approximately 47% of the annual volume of mediation cases were received between April and July and about 53% during the remaining eight months. (See Appendix C). This pattern is consistent with past years and is helpful in planning, training and the allocation of staff.

Consumer Complaints

Consumer complaints decreased by 7% from 7,084 in 1982 to 6,563 in 1983. This is the fourth decline in the past five years and the total decline since 1978 is 42%. Commission regulations require that customers seek to resolve problems directly with their utilities prior to registering a complaint with the Commission. In view of this, the Bureau's goal is to experience a steady decline in the number of consumer complaints. This would be indicative of utility improvements in their complaint handling operations. The Bureau will continue to concentrate its efforts on reaching its goal in 1984. Although the number of complaints was lowest in November and December, as has been the case in past years, there are no other identifiable seasonal patterns. (See Appendix C).

Inquiries and Opinions

There were 20,128 cases which required no follow-up beyond the initial contact during 1983. These cases tend to involve requests for information which were handled at the time of contact, protests or questions related to rates, and referrals to other Commission offices and to appropriate agencies outside the P.U.C. See Appendix D for the distribution of inquiries and opinions by major utility and by major problem.

II. NATURE OF BCS CONSUMER COMPLAINTS

The consumer complaints received by BCS most frequently involved billing problems (41%) and service complaints (23%). (See Table 1) Billing problems include confusing estimation methods, disputed usage, inaccurately estimated bills, etc. Service and people delivered service complaints relate to utility unresponsiveness, poor quality of service, delays in repairs, etc. The remaining complaints are distributed among credit and deposits, telephone service termination and rates and tariff complaints.

Table 1

NATURE OF CALL FOR CONSUMER COMPLAINTS: 1983

	N	%
Billing/Payment	2701	41.2
Credit/Deposits	534	8.1
Rates/Tariffs	332	5.1
Service	1538	23.4
People Delivered Service (Repairs)	231	3.5
Termination	582	8.9
Other	645	9.8
	6563	100.0

III. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF BUREAU ACTIVITY

Geographic variations in mediation requests and consumer complaints are depicted in Appendix E, Tables 1 and 2. The calculation of cases per 10,000 households represents an improvement in the accuracy of geographic comparisons. This statistic is intended to prevent bias due to variations in household size. Appendix E, Tables 1 and 2, indicates which counties have average, well above average, or well below average rates.

Mediation

The average state-wide mediation rate was 26.7 per 10,000 households in 1983. The number of mediation requests in 1983 ranged from zero in Fulton and Sullivan counties to 4,426 in Allegheny County. (See Appendix E, Table 1). Lawrence County had the highest rate of mediation requests 108.9 per 10,000 households. Other counties with high mediation rates were Beaver (89.6), Dauphin (81.5), and Allegheny (77.5). The extent of regulated utility service, the degree of urbanization, the quality of company negotiations and relative economic well-being may be factors which affect mediation requests.

Consumer Complaints

The average state-wide consumer complaint rate was 14.7 per 10,000 households in 1983. Consumer complaints varied from a low of zero in Sullivan County to a high of 1,536 in Allegheny County. (See Appendix E, Table 2). Complaint rates were the highest in Perry County (35.8), Dauphin (35.3), Erie (33.9), Allegheny County (26.9) and Monroe (26.3). As in past years, some of the highest complaint rates were in those counties where the Bureau has regional offices. More detailed analyses will be necessary in order to explain geographical variations in complaint rates.

IV. TYPE OF UTILITIES INVOLVED

As in past years, almost all mediation cases in 1983 involved electric (59%) or gas companies (36%). (See Appendix F). Only about 5% (770 cases) of mediation cases stemmed from threatened termination of water service. The electric industry increased from a 55% to a 59% share of mediation requests. This is the second consecutive annual percentage increase for this industry. Telephone companies are not presently covered by the Commission termination regulations, so there are no telephone termination mediation cases included in this section.

Telephone companies were involved in 38% of the consumer complaints. Electric and gas companies accounted for 27% and 25% of all complaints respectively. The telephone industry's complaints increased by 7% from 1982 to 1983 and is a matter of concern to the Bureau. In addition, the telephone industry's proportion of consumer complaints increased from 32% in 1982 to 38% in 1983. Water companies accounted for 9% of complaints. There were only a handful of complaints against steam heat and sewage companies.

V. MAJOR COMPANIES

The calculation of cases per thousand residential customers permits comparisons to be made between utility companies. Some variations may be attributed to dissimilar customer populations, geographic locations and utility rates. However, unusually high mediation and complaint rates have been shown to be reliable indicators of situations which require investigation. See Appendix G for the formulas used to calculate the mediation and complaint rates. The discussion below provides an overview of Bureau activity along with some preliminary findings.

It is important to note that all of the tables, except Table 12, in the following sections of this report indicate residential data. Commercial accounts have been excluded. See Appendix H for an industry percentage of BCS cases defined by residential and commercial.

Appendix I (Tables 1 thru 5) has been prepared to illustrate the number of residential consumer complaints, complaint rates, number of mediations, mediation rates and percentage changes for the years 1980 to 1983. This data is presented by company and by industry. Most importantly, this data is used to expose patterns and trends.

Consumer Complaints

The Commission has established a dispute process in which the companies play the primary role in handling consumer complaints. The Bureau normally does not become involved in consumer complaints until negotiations between the customer and the company fail. Thus high rates of complaints to the Bureau can indicate a company's failure to resolve consumer problems and this is a source of concern. In addition, significant increases over time may also indicate a need for company investigation.

Gas Utilities

There was a 2% decrease in complaints against the major gas utilities from 1982 to 1983 (See Table 2). This decrease contrasts favorably with the 24% increase in complaints from 1981 to 1982. The BCS hopes that this decrease will continue as a trend in 1984.

Table 2

Residential
Consumer Complaints
Major Gas Companies

(1982-1983)

Company	1982		1983		1982-1983
	N	Complaint Rate	N	Complaint Rate	Percent Change in N
Columbia	282	.93	286	.94	1%
Equitable	326	1.44	392	1.73	20%
NFG	261	1.42	190	1.03	- 27%
P.G.&W.-Gas	94	.92	99	.94	5%
Peoples	340	1.15	322	1.08	- 5%
UGI-Gas	225	1.19	201	1.07	- 11%
Total (average rate)	1528	(1.18)	1490	(1.13)	(- 2%)

Among the highlights of the past year:

- * Columbia and PG&W both experienced small increases in customer complaints (1% and 5%). However, both companies continue to have the lowest complaint rate in the gas industry (.94).
- * NFG showed the largest decrease in complaints (-27%) and now has a complaint rate that is below the industry average for the first time since 1979.
- * UGI's 11% decrease in the number of complaints caused its complaint rate to drop below the industry average once again.
- * Peoples continues to have a complaint rate below the industry average. The 5% decrease in complaints is favorable in view of the 44% increase from 1981 to 1982.
- * Complaints for Equitable increased by the highest percent in the industry (20%). Consequently, Equitable continues to have the highest complaint rate in the industry for the third consecutive year. Equitable should review its customer service program to determine if changes can be made to reverse this undesirable trend.

Electric Utilities

There were 27% fewer consumer complaints against major electric companies in 1983 than in 1982. This contrasts favorably with the increase of 9% that occurred from 1981 to 1982. However, the rate of change varied within the industry from Penn Power (4%) and UGI-Luzerne (13%) to Penelec (-40%) and PP&L (-43%). (See Table 3). The complaint

rate for major electric companies continues to be less than half of that for major gas companies. No clear explanation for this difference is available.

Table 3

Residential
Consumer Complaints
Major Electric Companies
(1982-1983)

Company	1982		1983		1982-1983
	N	Complaint Rate	N	Complaint Rate	Percent Change in N
Duquesne	330	.67	303	.61	- 8%
Met. Ed.	173	.53	133	.41	- 23%
Penelec	436	.94	262	.56	- 40%
Penn Power	48	.43	50	.45	4%
P.P.&L.	434	.48	249	.27	- 43%
P.E. Co.	325	.28	259	.22	- 20%
UGI-Luzerne	23	.47	26	.53	13%
West Penn	281	.55	223	.43	- 21%
Total (average rate)	2050	(.54)	1505	(.44)	(- 27%)

Among the preliminary findings:

- * PP&L consumer complaints experienced the largest decrease (-43) in the electric industry and thus its complaint rate is now the second lowest in the industry.
- * PECO experienced a decrease (-20%) in complaints for the fourth consecutive year and continues to have the lowest complaint rate in the industry (.22).
- * Penelec complaints decreased significantly (-40%) when considering the 29% increase from 1981 to 1982. Nevertheless, Penelec's complaint rate continues to be above the industry average.
- * Met.Ed. (-23%) and West Penn (-21) complaints decreased slightly below the industry average (-27). Both companies have complaint rates comparable to the industry average.
- * Penn Power's complaints increased by 4% causing its complaint rate to rise above the industry average for the first time since records were maintained by BCS.
- * Although Duquesne Light's complaints decreased by 8%, its complaint rate (.61) has become the highest in the industry.

- * UGI-Luzerne complaints increased (13%) for the second year in a row raising its complaint rate above the industry average for the first time.

Telephone Utilities

Complaints against major telephone companies increased by 7% from 1982 to 1983 (See Table 4). This increase follows two consecutive annual decreases. This increase is significant in view of the fact that the telephone industry may soon be faced with a new set of regulations in areas such as billing, credit and deposits and collections. BCS cases involving non-residential telephone accounts for 1982 and 1983 appear in Appendix J. A commercial complaint rate is also included. It is important to note that 21% of BCS telephone complaints involve non-residential service in 1983. The telephone industry has the highest incidence of non-residential complaints.

Table 4

Residential Consumer Complaints Major Telephone Companies

(1982-1983)

Company	1982		1983		1982-1983
	N	Complaint Rate	N	Complaint Rate	Percent Change in N
Bell	1156	.35	1151	.35	0%
Commonwealth	43	.35	44	.36	2%
Continental	30	.94	27	.85	- 10%
General	131	.44	255	.84	95%
Mid-Penn	121	1.15	103	1.02	- 15%
United	125	.62	136	.66	9%
Total (average rate)	1606	(.64)	1716	(.68)	(7%)

Among the highlights of the past year:

- * Bell Telephone complaints decreased by less than 1% from 1982 to 1983. Bell's complaint rate (.35) continues to be the best in the telephone industry, a position that the company has maintained since 1979.
- * Commonwealth's number of complaints increased by 2% causing its complaint rate to rise slightly above Bell's. Both companies shared the industry complaint rate lead in 1982.
- * United's number of complaints increased by 9%, which is slightly above the industry average (7%). United's complaint rate continues to be below the industry average.

- * Mid-Penn's complaints decreased by more than any other major telephone company. However, Mid-Penn continues to have the highest complaint rate (1.02) in the industry for the second year in a row.
- * Continental consumer complaints decreased by 10% but its complaint rate continues to be above the industry average, which has been the case since 1979. However, its complaint rate has decreased by more than 50% since 1981.
- * General experienced the largest increase (95%) in complaints in the industry from 1982 to 1983 causing its complaint rate to be above the industry average for the first time since 1979.

Mediation Requests

The Commission's service termination procedures protect utility customers' rights and provide companies with an effective collections tool. The Bureau normally intervenes at the customer's request after direct negotiations between the customer and the company have failed. The Bureau has once again targeted the area of improvement in negotiations as a major point of emphasis in 1984. The number of mediation requests per 1,000 overdue residential customers - the mediation rate - is used to permit cross company comparisons. The mediation rate can be used as a preliminary evaluation of companies' effectiveness at making payment arrangements. Unusually high or low rates, or sizeable changes in rates can reflect company performance. Increases in numbers of overdue customers can provide a partial explanation for changes in mediation statistics because a company's mediation rate can drop when its overdue customers increase in number. However, significant increases in the number of mediation cases and/or high mediation rates are major Bureau concerns.

Gas Utilities

Mediation requests from gas customers decreased by 30% from 1982 to 1983. This is the second annual decline in a row for the gas industry. In fact, only UGI Gas showed an increase (42%) in mediation requests. Equitable experienced the largest reduction (-82%) in mediations, which is better than the industry average (-30%). It is important to note that Equitable's decrease is the largest annual decrease by a major company since BCS began reporting this data. (See Table 5).

The 1982 mediation rates of PG&W, Peoples and UGI that are reported in Table 5 are lower than what they should be. The number of overdue customers that was reported to BCS by these companies was artificially inflated, which caused their mediation rates to appear low. PG&W and Peoples corrected their reports as of 01/01/83, whereas UGI did not correct its reports until 11/01/83. Thus, only UGI's mediation rate is not accurate in 1983. This problem also affects data in Tables 7 and 9 for these companies.

Table 5

Residential
Mediation Requests
Major Gas Companies

(1982-1983)

Company	1982		1983		1982-1983
	N	Mediation Rate	N	Mediation Rate	Percent Change in N
Columbia	1664	3.72	1612	3.69	- 3%
Equitable	2066	4.19	376	1.00	- 82%
National Fuel	650	1.86	470	1.66	- 28%
P.G.&W.-Gas	463	1.54	310	1.89	- 33%
Peoples	2329	4.72	1777	4.59	- 24%
UGI-Gas	640	1.44	910	2.17	42%
Total (average rate)	7812	(2.91)	5455	(2.50)	(- 30%)

- * The mediation rates in the gas industry vary widely from a low of 1.00 for Equitable to a high of 4.59 for Peoples.
- * Equitable's 82% decrease in mediations has enabled them to obtain the lowest mediation rate (1.00) in the industry. This is the second consecutive annual decrease. During the two-year period Equitable has gone from having the highest to the lowest mediation rate. Equitable's mediation requests have decreased from 3,051 in 1981 to 376 in 1983. Equitable should be commended for its efforts and other companies should examine what Equitable has done and see what can be adapted to their own needs.
- * PG&W had the second largest decrease (-33%) in the industry and continues to have a mediation rate (1.89) below the industry average (2.51).
- * NFG mediation requests decreased by 28% and its mediation rate (1.66) continues to be below the industry average for the second year in a row.
- * UGI Gas mediation requests increased (42%) for the third year in a row. Despite this fact, UGI's mediation rate (2.17) continued to be below the industry average. However, UGI should examine its mediation policies with the goal of reversing this trend.
- * Although Peoples' number of mediations decreased by 24%, the company continues to have the highest mediation rate (4.59) in the industry for the second consecutive year.

- * Columbia Gas mediation requests decreased (-3%) for the first time since 1980. However, Columbia's complaint rate (3.69) remains significantly above the industry average.

Electric Utilities

The electric industry experienced a 14% decrease in mediation requests from 1982 to 1983. This contrasts sharply with the 38% increase from 1981 to 1982. Only Penn Power (37%), PECO (10%), and West Penn (1%) experienced increases in the number of mediations. This compares favorably to the previous year when all eight major electric companies showed increases. The mediation rate for the electric industry (1.10) continues to be less than half of that for the gas industry (2.50). Heating customers have higher arrearages than non-heating customers. Since the gas industry has a greater saturation of heating customers than the electric industry, its customers have more serious payment problems. Consequently, the mediation rate is expected to be greater for the gas industry.

Table 6
Residential
Mediation Requests
Major Electric Companies
(1982-1983)

Company	1982		1983		1982-1983
	N	Mediation Rate	N	Mediation Rate	Percent Change in N
Duquesne Light	2673	2.84	2054	2.29	- 23%
Met. Ed.	639	1.06	483	.81	- 24%
Penelec	1442	1.49	809	.82	- 44%
Penn Power	260	.93	356	1.32	37%
P.P.&L.	1643	1.22	1196	.86	- 27%
P.E.Co.	2651	.72	2918	.80	10%
UGI-Luzerne	80	.72	76	.75	- 5%
West Penn	942	1.09	947	1.07	1%
Total (average rate)	10330	(1.26)	8839	(1.10)	(- 14%)

Among the preliminary findings:

- * Penelec had the largest decrease (-44%) in the industry, which is well-above the industry average. Penelec's mediation rate (.82) is now below the industry average for the first time since 1980.

- * PP&L showed a significant decrease (-27%) in mediation requests and continues to have a below average mediation rate for the second year in a row. The Bureau has been working closely with PP&L through its review program. These preliminary results are encouraging.
- * Met.Ed. experienced a decrease(-24%) in mediations for the first time since 1979. As a result of this year's decrease, Met.Ed. continues to have a mediation rate that is below the industry average for the fourth year in a row.
- * UGI-Luzerne (-5%) and West Penn (1%) had only a slight change in the number of mediation requests. Both companies continue to have mediation rates below the industry average. In fact, UGI-Luzerne's mediation rate is the lowest in the industry.
- * Duquesne Light experienced a decrease (-23%) in mediations for the first time since 1979. However, Duquesne continues to have the highest mediation rate (2.29) for the third year in a row. In fact, Duquesne's mediation rate is more than twice the industry average and is a primary concern of the Bureau.
- * PECO mediations increased by 10% from 1982 to 1983. This second consecutive annual increase has dropped PECO out of its number one ranking in mediation rate for the first time since 1981.
- * Penn Power had the largest increase (37%) in mediations in the electric industry. The number of Penn Power mediations has risen every year since 1979. Consequently, the mediation rate (1.32) is now above the industry average for the first time.

VI. COLLECTIONS STATISTICS

All regulated electric and gas companies must submit monthly residential service termination reports to the Bureau. These reports list the number of customers, number of overdue customers, amount of money overdue and various statistics related to service termination. The data from these reports form the Bureau's Collections Reporting System (CRS).

In an average month in 1983 903,790 residential accounts of major gas and electric companies were in arrears. This aggregate figure represents a 4% decrease over 1982. The total amount owed by residential gas and electric customers in an average month in 1983 was \$86 million. This is a 7% decrease from 1982 (\$92 million). Much of this money will eventually be recovered, but delayed payments affect cash flow and have a direct impact on customers' rates. Even so, in light of the economic and employment patterns in Pennsylvania in 1983, these improved problem indicators should be a source of optimism.

Table 7

Percentage of Customers Overdue*

Company	1981	1982	1983	Percent Change 1981-1983
Duquesne	16.6%	15.9%	15.1%	- 9%
Met. Ed.	14.1	15.4	15.1	7%
Penelec	16.5	17.3	17.7	7%
Penn Power	19.8	21.1	20.1	2%
P.P.&L.	11.2	12.6	12.7	13%
P.E.Co.	27.1	25.9	25.7	- 5%
UGI-Luzerne	17.9	18.7	17.1	- 4%
West Penn	12.2	14.1	14.3	17%
Columbia	11.2	12.3	12.0	7%
Equitable	16.9	18.1	13.8	-18%
N.F.G.	16.5	15.8	12.7	-23%
P.G.&W.	24.3	24.5	13.0	***
Peoples	15.9	13.9	10.8	***
UGI-Gas	17.8	19.7	18.6	4%
Overall Avg.**	17.0%	17.6%	16.8%	- 1%

*Overdue customers/total customer

**Excluding P.G.&W. and Peoples

***Reporting change from 1981 to 1983 not appropriate

The major gas and electric companies show a substantial range of overdue customer proportions; over two to one for the largest (PECO) to smallest (Peoples).

- * Philadelphia Electric (both electric and gas service) has reduced its percentage of customers who are overdue for two consecutive years. However, PECO continues to have the largest proportion of overdue customers.
- * Equitable and NFG experienced substantial decreases in overdue customers from 1982 to 1983.
- * Duquesne, PECO and UGI-Luzerne were the only major electric companies to show a decrease in their proportions of customers in arrears.

Customer Bills

Customers pay, or fail to pay, bills for service used. The common practice of using "typical" customer bills, i.e., bills for a given amount of service, is inappropriate for this analysis. Thus, the bills represented here are actual "average" bills for service. These are calculated by taking the total amount billed for service that month including all taxes and charges, divided by the number of customers in the class.

There is little indication that the size of average bills is related to the extent of payment problems. In other words, companies with large bills do not have a greater percentage of overdue accounts than do companies with relatively small bills. However, the level of payment problems, as measured by the frequency of nonpayment, that can be expected from one year to the next appears to depend upon the rate of change in the dollar amount of bills. In other words, the greater the increase in bills the greater will be the increase in payment problems. (See Table 8 for individual company customer bills and see Appendix M for average monthly customer usage).

Table 8

Average Monthly Residential Customer Bills

	1981	1982	1983	Percent Change 1981-1983
Duquesne	\$37.08	\$39.50	\$44.50	20%
Met. Ed.	43.89	49.96	51.69	18%
Penelec	34.29	41.82	39.36	15%
Penn Power	39.75	46.04	47.51	20%
P.P.&L.	38.84	47.24	49.15	27%
P.E.Co.	53.38	57.68	63.48	19%
UGI-Luzerne	37.06	43.97	48.27	30%
West Penn	32.19	34.34	36.39	13%
Columbia	51.95	57.90	64.08	23%
Equitable	52.52	58.48	65.23	24%
NFG	54.11	58.66	64.76	20%
P.G.&W.	52.61	58.69	67.08	28%
Peoples	52.36	55.51	66.56	27%
UGI-Gas	35.03	42.28	48.42	38%
Overall	\$43.97	\$49.67	\$53.26	21%

Among the findings:

- * Average residential monthly gas bills are approximately \$15/month more than electric bills.
- * West Penn and Penelec's customer bills are the smallest among the major companies and their rate of change in bills from 1981 to 1983 is the lowest.
- * Although Met. Ed. and PECO customer average bills are the highest in the electric industry, their rate of change from 1981 to 1983 is below the industry average.
- * PP&L and UGI-Luzerne experienced the highest rate of change in the electric industry which could lead to an increase in payment problems in 1984.
- * Although UGI-Gas's customer bills are the smallest in the gas industry, its rate of change from 1981 to 1983 was the highest.

Customer Arrearages

The amount of money owed by overdue residential customers is illustrative of the payment problems faced by individual companies. These amounts varied substantially from company to company. For example, the amount of money owed in an average month of 1983 ranged from 29.5 million for PECO to less than .6 million for UGI-Luzerne. However, the total dollars figure explains little about the role of individual customers in determining total amounts owed. It is the average arrearage

that provides information on the impact which individuals have on the total payment problem. See Table 9 for individual company variations.

Table 9

Average Customer Arrearages*

Company	1981	1982	1983	Percent Change 1981-1983
Duquesne	\$112	\$115	\$103	- 8%
Met. Ed.	82	92	91	11%
Penelec	78	85	85	9%
Penn Power	51	56	53	4%
P.P.&L.	56	74	70	25%
P.E.Co.	92	91	97	5%
UGI-Luzerne	53	62	69	30%
West Penn	50	59	58	16%
Columbia	104	122	106	2%
Equitable	148	172	202	36%
N.F.G.	110	107	116	5%
P.G.&W.	112	134	116	***
Peoples	195	203	170	***
UGI-Gas	63	81	83	32%
State-wide**	\$ 86	\$ 92	\$ 92	7%

*Total money owed in overdue residential accounts ÷ number of overdue accounts.

**Excluding P.G.&W. and Peoples

***Reporting change from 1981 to 1983 not appropriate

Among the findings:

- * Average customer arrearages are approximately \$50/month more for gas customers than for electric customers.
- * Columbia, NFG and Penn Power each have below average customer arrearages in their respective industries and also have a below average rate of change in arrearages from 1981 to 1983.
- * Duquesne is the only major company to show a decrease in customer arrearages from 1981 to 1983. However, Duquesne has the largest average arrearage in the electric industry.
- * Even though UGI-Gas experienced the second largest increase in average customer arrearage in the gas industry from 1981 to 1983, the company continues to have the lowest average arrearage in the industry.
- * Equitable Gas has the largest average arrearage in the gas industry and its increase from 1981 to 1983 was the largest in the gas industry.

Termination Notices

The Bureau has encouraged vigorous collections efforts in the context of adherence to the due process requirements of Chapter 56. However, the Bureau has explicitly discouraged the sending of superfluous termination notices for two reasons. First, §56.99 forbids the use of notices solely as a collections device. Second, it has been the Bureau's experience that companies which send large numbers of superfluous notices tend to have management problems and collections failures. There appear to be two contrasting collections strategies: send blanket notices and terminate what can be reached vs. send notices selectively in order to focus on the worst accounts. The latter strategy exemplifies the dictates of Chapter 56.

Table 10
Number of Termination Notices

	1981	1982	1983	Percent Change 1981-1983
Duquesne	181,732	189,614	182,714	1%
Met. Ed.	55,939	55,126	33,863	-39%
Penelec	72,833	78,458	65,462	-10%
Penn Power	73,936	82,785	103,926	41%
P.P.&L.	427,152	549,818	582,548	36%
P.E.Co.	986,426	1,047,604	951,717	-4%
UGI-Luzerne	53,700	62,292	50,839	-5%
West Penn	244,924	273,713	284,470	16%
Columbia	163,769	179,191	189,902	16%
Equitable	54,361	23,464	14,337	-74%
NFG	204,466	141,041	90,842	-56%
P.G.&W.	89,045	110,950	118,713	33%
Peoples	92,770	148,403	175,481	89%
UGI-Gas	110,209	144,184	141,437	28%
Total	2,811,262	3,086,643	2,986,251	6%

Among the preliminary findings:

- * There were slight increases in the number of termination notices sent in both the electric and gas industries from 1981 to 1983.
- * Met. Ed. had the largest reduction in notices in the electric industry while Penelec, PECO and UGI-Luzerne also showed a decrease.
- * In the gas industry, only Equitable and NFG decreased the number of notices.

- * Penn Power and Peoples increased notices more than any other companies in their respective industries from 1981 to 1983.

Termination of Service

Service termination is expensive in many regards. It costs a great deal to negotiate payment agreements, make pre-termination contacts and to terminate service. The social costs of termination are difficult to quantify but are obvious. In view of the costs involved, service termination is the one area where some sort of carefully considered standardization from company to company should exist. The goal of companies should be to decrease the number of service terminations through non-coercive collections techniques. See Table 11 for individual company performance.

Table 11
Number of Service Terminations

	1981	1982	1983	Percent Change 1981-1983
Duquesne	3,143	6,006	5,171	65%
Met. Ed.	2,877	3,143	2,581	-10%
Penelec	4,333	5,013	4,193	-3%
Penn Power	999	1,011	1,260	26%
P.P.&L.	5,873	8,307	6,203	6%
P.E.Co.	32,495	28,050	40,936	26%
UGI-Luzerne	566	662	578	2%
West Penn	7,204	7,785	7,469	4%
Columbia	5,086	5,428	4,813	-5%
Equitable	5,602	1,028	2,885	-49%
NFG	5,235	4,559	4,057	-23%
P.G.&W.	1,843	2,089	1,946	6%
Peoples	4,251	4,708	4,344	2%
UGI-Gas	3,254	4,703	5,242	61%
Total	82,761	82,492	91,678	10%

Among the preliminary findings:

- * The overall trend for the major electric and gas companies showed a 10% increase in terminations from 1981 to 1983.
- * The electric industry terminated more customers while the gas industry terminated fewer customers in 1983 than in 1981.
- * Met. Ed. and Penelec were the only major electric companies to terminate fewer customers in 1983 than in 1981.
- * Columbia, Equitable and NFG were the only major gas companies to terminate fewer customers in 1983 than in 1981.

- * Duquesne's number of terminations increased by more than any other major electric or gas company from 1981 to 1983.
- * UGI-Gas terminated the most customers in the gas industry in 1983 and experienced the largest increase in the industry from 1981 to 1983.
- * PECO terminated 26% more customers in 1983 than in 1981. . Also, PECO accounted for 45% of all customers terminated by the major gas and electric companies in 1983.

Uncollectible Accounts

The most commonly used measure of collections system performance is the proportion of accounts written-off as uncollectible to revenues, the "write-offs ratio." The statistics in Table 12 represent net write-offs, that is, write-offs of uncollectible accounts minus recoveries of accounts already written-off. Appendix K provides a listing of write-off ratios from 1970 to 1983. (An extensive discussion of this statistic can be found in the Bureau's 1983 Report "Utility Payment Problems: The Measurement and Evaluation of Response to Customer Nonpayment").

Write-offs and revenues can be traced to both residential and non-residential service. With the focus of this report being residential accounts, a ratio of residential write-offs to residential revenues would be the better measure for our purposes. However, while revenues are commonly reported according to service class, not all companies distinguished write-offs in this way prior to 1983. Thus, it is not possible to compare companies across time. Nevertheless, a review of the available residential write-offs ratios reveals that almost all declined from 1982 to 1983. In view of present trends in utility rates, this ought to be a source of optimism regarding collections. (See Appendix L for write-offs ratios for residential accounts).

Table 12

Write-Offs As A Proportion of Revenues*

Net Write-Offs to Revenues			
Company	1982	1983	Percent Change
Duquesne	.006979	.005956	- 15%
Met. Ed.	.003663	.004272	17%
Penelec	.004293	.004995	16%
Penn Power	.002466	.002298	- 7%
P.P.&L.	.004040	.003477	- 14%
P.E. Co.#	.007294	.007538	3%
UGI-Electric	.003495	.002936	- 16%
West Penn	.001086	.004554	319%
Columbia	.005359	.004456	- 17%
Equitable	.010278	.015946	55%
National Fuel	.009161	.007264	- 21%
P.G.&W.-Gas	.005164	.005319	3%
Peoples	.008845	.007145	- 19%
UGI-Gas	.006481	.007358	14%
Average	.005710	.006101	7%

*Source: Company reported data
#electric and gas combined

There are several preliminary points which emerge from the statistics on Table 12:

- * The range of write-offs to revenue scores is quite large, on the order of seven to one from the smallest (Penn Power) to the largest (Equitable) in 1983.
- * West Penn's write-offs ratio more than tripled from 1982 to 1983. This dramatic change was the result of several very large industrial bankruptcies in 1983.
- * NFG write-offs decreased (-21%) from 1982 to 1983. This decrease is significant in view of the company's 65% increase in write-offs from 1981 to 1982.
- * Although Duquesne, Penn Power, PP&L, UGI-Electric, Columbia and NFG experienced declines in write-offs ratios, the overall trend continues to be moderately upward (7%).
- * Gas companies had higher write-off scores than electric companies, which is consistent with the pattern in recent years.

VII. CONCLUSION

This report has provided an overview and a preliminary analysis of BCS activity during 1983. The complaint and mediation rates are quantitative problem indicators related to utility company performance in various customer relations areas.

The Bureau's goal is to steadily reduce the number of consumer complaints and mediation requests. Consumer complaints declined for the fourth time in the last five years and continues as a favorable trend. Mediation requests decreased for the first time since BCS began reporting this data in 1978. The Bureau is optimistic that this trend will continue in 1984. The dramatic reductions by some companies should serve as an example for other companies to improve their performance. The Bureau will continue to be critical of those companies which have high mediation rates in 1984.

The basic measures in the collections section that have been added this year will become a routine part of this report. The Bureau will continue to monitor utility performances as reported in these new measures from year to year and hopes that each company will do the same. In 1983 all companies having reporting problems resolved them and the Bureau expects no problems with 1984 CRS data. Although some companies have shown improvement in collections, the overall trend was stable from 1981 to 1983. Companies with poor performance are encouraged to review the procedures of those companies with better performance. It is this Bureau's policy that terminations should be done as a last resort and not as a primary collections device. The goal of companies should be to decrease terminations by increasing the use of non-coercive collections techniques.

APPENDIX A

The Bureau of Consumer Services has 4 regional offices (Harrisburg, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia and Erie) which are responsible for investigating utility consumer complaints and recording protests regarding actions pending before the Commission. The Bureau's Service Termination Mediation Unit, located in Harrisburg, arbitrates payment agreements for customers who are threatened with termination of service. The Bureau also contains a research and information division which is responsible for evaluation of both utilities' customer service performance and their compliance with regulations. The Bureau's Consumer Services Information System (CSIS) is based on extensive coded data for each case investigated by the Bureau. The data base currently contains data on over 143,300 investigated cases and over 128,600 inquiries and opinions from 1978 to 1983. The CSIS is used to produce regular utility evaluation and management information reports. The system also provides special reports related to rate cases, legislative requests, compliance violations, consumer service reviews and generic analyses. Finally, the Bureau maintains a contractual relationship with Pennsylvania State University for the purposes of data processing, policy analysis, and research consultation.

APPENDIX B

Distribution of Commercial Cases

Company	1982		1983	
	Mediations	Consumer Complaints	Mediations	Consumer Complaints
Duquesne	270	103	249	67
Met. Ed.	34	28	21	18
Penelec	52	59	68	47
Penn Power	6	12	3	3
PP&L	55	68	41	35
PECO	55	56	59	39
UGI-Luz.	2	2	2	3
West Penn	19	39	64	44
Columbia	15	15	17	4
Equitable	11	21	31	27
NFG	11	20	10	9
PG&W-Gas	9	9	4	5
Peoples	25	26	33	21
UGI-Gas	4	11	11	11

APPENDIX C

Monthly Volume

	Mediation Requests		Consumer Complaints	
	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>
January	1,131	658	576	598
February	1,236	657	609	573
March	1,376	1,007	741	693
April	2,184	2,014	671	554
May	2,115	2,068	595	567
June	2,028	1,830	611	541
July	1,926	1,568	569	501
August	1,881	1,728	668	549
September	1,595	1,502	662	557
October	1,726	1,376	483	506
November	1,741	1,103	454	447
December	664	385	445	477
TOTAL	19,603	15,896	7,084	6,563

APPENDIX D

Table 1

Inquiries and Opinions: Major Companies in 1983

Company Name	Number of Contacts	Percent of Industry	Industry Total	Percent of Total
Electric			7,417	36.9
Duquesne	2,767	37.3		
Met. Ed.	253	3.4		
Penelec	567	7.6		
Penn Power	180	2.4		
PP&L	991	13.4		
PECO	1,614	21.8		
UGI-Luz.	23	.3		
West Penn	826	11.1		
Others or no Company	196	2.7		
Gas			6,187	30.7
Columbia	1,187	19.2		
Equitable	1,416	22.9		
NFG	391	6.3		
PG&W-Gas	223	3.6		
Peoples	1,652	26.7		
UGI-Gas	518	8.4		
Others or no Company	800	12.9		
Telephone			2,303	11.4
Bell	1,660	72.1		
Others	643	27.9		
Water			1,419	7.1
Sewage			99	.5
Others (No Specific Company or Industry)			2,703	13.4
Total			20,128	

Table 2

Major Problem Categories
for Inquiries and Opinions

Category	Number	Percent
Referral to Company	5,154	25.6
Referral to Other BCS/ Other Bureau	6,667	33.1
Referral to Other Agency	2,601	12.9
Specific Information Request	4,155	20.7
Rate Protests and Opinions	832	4.1
Opinions - General	166	.8
Other	553	2.8
	20,128	100.0

APPENDIX E

Table 1

MEDIATION REQUESTS
1983

PENNSYLVANIA COUNTIES

	<u>N</u>	<u>C/10,000</u>			<u>N</u>	<u>C/10,000</u>	
01. ADAMS	37	15.1	0	35. LACKAWANNA	261	29.1	0
02. ALLEGHENY	4,426	77.5	+	36. LANCASTER	228	17.6	0
03. ARMSTRONG	74	23.8	0	37. LAWRENCE	431	108.9	+
04. BEAVER	672	89.6	+	38. LEBANON	61	15.0	0
05. BEDFORD	34	17.2	0	39. LEHIGH	192	18.0	0
06. BERKS	187	15.6	0	40. LUZERNE	327	24.0	0
07. BLAIR	342	65.7	+	41. LYCOMING	128	26.9	0
08. BRADFORD	88	34.9	0	42. MCKEAN	50	23.2	0
09. BUCKS	631	38.1	0	43. MERCER	215	45.1	0
10. BUTLER	141	26.6	0	44. MIFFLIN	54	29.1	0
11. CAMBRIA	257	38.3	0	45. MONROE	73	19.6	0
12. CAMERON	5	11.3	0	46. MONTGOMERY	513	22.1	0
13. CARBON	31	13.4	0	47. MONTOUR	12	20.1	0
14. CENTRE	69	17.4	0	48. NORTHAMPTON	209	24.8	0
15. CHESTER	301	27.3	0	49. NORTHUMBERLAND	75	18.3	0
16. CLARION	16	9.3	0	50. PERRY	31	21.0	0
17. CLEARFIELD	80	24.1	0	51. PHILADELPHIA	1,068	15.6	0
18. CLINTON	26	16.2	0	52. PIKE	18	10.2	0
19. COLUMBIA	59	24.7	0	53. POTTER	18	16.6	0
20. CRAWFORD	57	14.5	0	54. SCHUYLKILL	59	9.1	0
21. CUMBERLAND	165	25.2	0	55. SNYDER	15	12.8	0
22. DAUPHIN	780	81.5	+	56. SOMERSET	41	12.3	0
23. DELAWARE	631	31.3	0	57. SULLIVAN	0	0	-
24. ELK	43	26.3	0	58. SUSQUEHANNA	15	8.7	0
25. ERIE	349	33.6	0	59. TIOGA	24	14.1	0
26. FAYETTE	402	65.5	+	60. UNION	10	8.9	0
27. FOREST	2	2.3	-	61. VENANGO	112	42.0	0
28. FRANKLIN	39	9.0	0	62. WARREN	36	16.4	0
29. FULTON	0	0	-	63. WASHINGTON	368	45.4	0
30. GREENE	71	47.3	+	64. WAYNE	37	18.9	0
31. HUNTINGDON	30	17.8	0	65. WESTMORELAND	613	41.4	0
32. INDIANA	76	23.4	0	66. WYOMING	25	23.4	0
33. JEFFERSON	25	12.1	0	67. YORK	407	34.6	0
34. JUNIATA	14	18.0	0				

Mean = 26.7

Standard Deviation = 20.5

N = Number Of Cases

C/10,000 = Cases Per 10,000 Housing Units

+ = 1 S.D. Above Mean

0 = ± 1 S.D.

- = 1 S.D. Below Mean

APPENDIX E

Table 2

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS
1983

PENNSYLVANIA COUNTIES

	<u>N</u>	<u>C/10,000</u>			<u>N</u>	<u>C/10,000</u>	
01. ADAMS	47	19.2	0	35. LACKAWANNA	160	17.9	0
02. ALLEGHENY	1,536	26.9	+	36. LANCASTER	140	10.8	0
03. ARMSTRONG	69	22.2	0	37. LAWRENCE	74	18.7	0
04. BEAVER	134	17.9	0	38. LEBANON	53	13.1	0
05. BEDFORD	17	8.6	0	39. LEHIGH	63	5.9	-
06. BERKS	56	4.7	-	40. LUZERNE	189	13.9	0
07. BLAIR	135	25.9	+	41. LYCOMING	50	10.5	0
08. BRADFORD	27	10.7	0	42. McKEAN	48	22.3	+
09. BUCKS	114	6.9	-	43. MERCER	83	17.4	0
10. BUTLER	83	15.7	0	44. MIFFLIN	29	15.6	0
11. CAMBRIA	88	13.1	0	45. MONROE	98	26.3	+
12. CAMERON	3	6.8	-	46. MONTGOMERY	147	6.3	-
13. CARBON	20	8.6	0	47. MONTOUR	3	5.0	-
14. CENTRE	49	12.4	0	48. NORTHAMPTON	42	5.0	-
15. CHESTER	67	6.1	-	49. NORTHUMBERLAND	70	17.1	0
16. CLARION	38	22.1	0	50. PERRY	53	35.8	+
17. CLEARFIELD	48	14.5	0	51. PHILADELPHIA	415	6.1	-
18. CLINTON	16	10.0	0	52. PIKE	44	24.8	+
19. COLUMBIA	33	13.8	0	53. POTTER	13	12.0	0
20. CRAWFORD	58	14.7	0	54. SCHUYLKILL	56	8.6	0
21. CUMBERLAND	131	20.0	0	55. SNYDER	21	18.0	0
22. DAUPHIN	338	35.3	+	56. SOMERSET	52	15.6	0
23. DELAWARE	115	5.7	-	57. SULLIVAN	0	8.7	0
24. ELK	29	17.7	0	58. SUSQUEHANNA	15	8.7	0
25. ERIE	352	33.9	+	59. TIOGA	17	10.0	0
26. FAYETTE	91	14.8	0	60. UNION	22	19.7	0
27. FOREST	3	3.5	-	61. VENANGO	47	17.6	0
28. FRANKLIN	23	5.4	-	62. WARREN	33	15.1	0
29. FULTON	5	9.4	0	63. WASHINGTON	198	24.4	+
30. GREENE	36	24.0	+	64. WAYNE	41	20.9	0
31. HUNTINGDON	12	7.1	-	65. WESTMORELAND	195	13.2	0
32. INDIANA	58	17.9	0	66. WYOMING	9	8.4	0
33. JEFFERSON	26	12.6	0	67. YORK	192	16.3	0
34. JUNIATA	8	10.3	0				

Mean = 14.7

Standard Deviation = 7.5

N = Number Of Cases

C/10,000 = Cases Per 10,000 Housing Units

+ = 1 S.D. Above Mean

0 = + 1 S.D.

- = 1 S.D. Below Mean

APPENDIX F

Type of Industry

<u>INDUSTRY</u>	<u>MEDIATION REQUESTS</u>		<u>CONSUMER COMPLAINTS</u>	
	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>
Electric	55%	59%	34%	27%
Gas	42%	36%	25%	25%
Telephone			32%	38%
Other	3%	5%	9%	10%

APPENDIX G

Formulas for Mediation and Complaint Rates

$$\text{Mediation Rate} = \frac{\text{Total Number of Mediation Cases}/12}{\text{Monthly Average Number of Overdue Residential Customers}/1000}$$

$$\text{Complaint Rate} = \frac{\text{Total Number of Consumer Complaints}}{\text{Monthly Average Number of Residential Customers}/1000}$$

APPENDIX H

BCS Complaints - 1983
Residential-Commercial*

<u>MEDIATIONS</u> <u>INDUSTRY</u>	Total Mediations	Residential Mediations	% Residential Mediations	Commerical Mediations	% Commercial Mediations
Electric	9,353	8,846	95%	507	5%
Gas	5,773	5,657	98%	116	2%
Water	750	744	99%	6	1%
Other	20	18	90%	2	10%
Total (%)	15,896	15,265	(96%)	631	(4%)

<u>CONSUMER COMPLAINTS</u> <u>INDUSTRY</u>	Total c.c.	Residential c.c.	% Residential c.c.	Commercial c.c.	% Commercial c.c.
Electric	1,765	1,507	85%	258	15%
Gas	1,663	1,580	95%	83	5%
Telephone	2,523	1,991	79%	532	21%
Water	560	531	95%	29	5%
Other	52	44	85%	8	15%
Total (%)	6,563	5,653	(86%)	910	(14%)

APPENDIX I

TABLE 1

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS BY ELECTRIC COMPANIES 1980 - 1983

	NUMBER OF CASES				COMPLAINT RATE			PERCENT CHANGES IN N			PERCENT CHANGE IN N 1980 - 1983	
	1980	1981	1982	1983	1980	1981	1982	1983	1980 - 1981	1981 - 1982		1982 - 1983
DUQUESNE	451	311	330	303	.92	.63	.67	.61	-31	+6	-8	-33
MET. ED.	258	241	173	133	.80	.74	.53	.41	-7	-28	-23	-48
PENNELEC	452	339	436	262	1.01	.73	.94	.56	-25	+29	-40	-42
PENN POWER	65	29	48	50	.60	.26	.43	.45	-55	+66	+4	-23
P.P.&L.	365	297	434	249	.41	.33	.48	.27	-19	-46	-43	-32
PECO	588	408	325	259	.51	.35	.28	.22	-31	-20	-20	-56
UGI - IUZ.	21	14	23	26	.43	.28	.47	.53	-33	-64	+13	+24
WEST PENN	263	244	281	223	.50	.46	.55	.43	-7	+15	-21	-15
TOTAL	2,463	1,883	2,050	1,505								
RATE/%					.65	.47	.54	.44	-24	+9	-27	-39

APPENDIX I

TABLE 3

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS BY TELEPHONE COMPANIES 1980 - 1983

	NUMBER OF CASES			COMPLAINT RATE			PERCENT CHANGES IN N			PERCENT CHANGE IN N 1980 - 1983				
	1980	1981	1982	1980	1981	1982	1980	1981	1982		1983			
BELL	1,713	1,248	1,156	1,151	.52	.38	.35	.35	.35	.35	-27	-7	0	-33
COMMONWEALTH	82	59	43	44	.67	.48	.35	.36	.36	.36	-28	-27	+2	-46
CONTINENTAL	62	63	30	27	1.95	1.98	.94	.85	.85	.85	+2	-52	-10	-56
GENERAL	223	202	131	255	.74	.67	.44	.84	.84	.84	-9	-35	+95	+14
MID-PENN	139	93	121	103	1.32	.88	1.15	1.02	1.02	1.02	-33	+30	-15	-26
UNITED	187	133	125	136	.93	.66	.62	.66	.66	.66	-29	-6	+9	-27
TOTAL	2,406	1,798	1,606	1,716										
RATE/%					1.02	.84	.64	.68	.68	.68	-25	-11	+7	-29

1980 - 1983 (AVE. RATE)

.80

APPENDIX I

TABLE 5

MEDIATIONS BY GAS COMPANIES 1980 - 1983

	NUMBER OF CASES				MEDIATION RATE			PERCENT CHANGES IN N			PERCENT CHANGE IN N	
	1980	1981	1982	1983	1980	1981	1982	1983	1980 - 1981	1981 - 1982	1982 - 1983	1980 - 1983
COLUMBIA	832	1,120	1,664	1,612	2.26	2.79	3.72	3.69	+ 35	+49	- 3	+ 94
EQUITABLE	1,962	3,051	2,066	376	4.56	6.64	4.19	1.00	+ 56	-32	-82	- 81
NFG	1,202	1,123	650	470	3.77	3.08	1.86	1.66	- 7	-42	-28	- 61
PG&W - GAS	297	414	463	310	1.13	1.39	1.54	1.89	+ 39	+12	-33	+ 4
PEOPLES	1,689	1,810	2,329	1,777	3.08	3.22	4.72	4.59	+ 7	+29	-24	+ 5
UGI - GAS	292	359	640	910	.80	.90	1.44	2.17	+ 23	+78	+42	+212
TOTAL	6,274	7,877	7,812	5,455								
RATE/%					2.60	3.00	2.91	2.50	+ 26	- 1	-30	- 13

1980 - 1983 (AVE. RATE)

2.75

APPENDIX J

Commercial
Consumer Complaints
Major Telephone Companies

Company	1982		1983	
	N	Commercial Complaint Rate	N	Commercial Complaint Rate
Bell	325	.87	366	1.06
Commonwealth	9	.72	9	.60
Continental	5	1.49	4	1.13
General	39	.59	56	1.08
Mid-Penn	11	.81	19	1.24
United	28	.82	41	1.13
Total (Average Rate)	417	(.88)	495	(1.04)

APPENDIX K

WRITE-OFFS RATIOS: 1970-1983
MAJOR GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANIES

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>DUQUESNE</u>	<u>MET. ED.</u>	<u>PENELEC</u>	<u>PENN POWER</u>	<u>P.P.&L.</u>	<u>P.E.CO.</u>	<u>UGI-IJZERNE</u>
1970	0.003129	0.001253	0.001429	0.000914	0.001729	0.005069	0.001931
1971	0.002278	0.001539	0.001577	0.000687	0.003057	0.003154	0.001741
1972	0.002303	0.001409	0.001698	0.000659	0.001788	0.004083	0.001811
1973	0.002200	0.001280	0.001519	0.000669	0.002135	0.003956	0.004570
1974	0.001916	0.001530	0.001757	0.000753	0.001794	0.004186	0.003851
1975	0.002127	0.002104	0.002116	0.001224	0.003377	0.005896	0.003643
1976	0.002462	0.002716	0.002333	0.001413	0.002889	0.005853	0.004831
1977	0.002624	0.002054	0.001413	0.001658	0.003266	0.006662	0.003603
1978	0.002507	0.002931	0.002686	0.001410	0.004154	0.008328	0.003152
1979	0.003648	0.002596	0.002580	0.002040	0.003959	0.006714	0.002964
1980	0.004399	0.003065	0.002999	0.002428	0.003783	0.005931	0.002879
1981	0.005173	0.004279	0.005082	0.002325	0.004201	0.008286	0.002891
1982	0.006979	0.003663	0.004293	0.002466	0.004040	0.007294	0.003495
1983	0.005956	0.004272	0.004995	0.002298	0.003477	0.007538	0.002936

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>WEST PENN</u>	<u>COLUMBIA</u>	<u>EQUITABLE</u>	<u>N.F.G.</u>	<u>P.G.&W.</u>	<u>PEOPLES</u>	<u>UGI-GAS</u>
1970	0.000912	0.002106	0.004165	N/A	N/A	0.002406	0.003845
1971	0.000985	0.001850	0.005314	N/A	0.005988	0.002415	0.004177
1972	0.000782	0.001772	0.005006	N/A	0.002750	0.002209	0.003757
1973	0.000763	0.001610	0.006053	N/A	0.006096	0.001734	0.003396
1974	0.001013	0.001636	0.004839	N/A	0.001137	0.001671	0.002909
1975	0.001670	0.002511	0.005538	N/A	0.002606	0.002645	0.004117
1976	0.001858	0.002139	0.004055	0.002190	0.001658	0.003620	0.004205
1977	0.001672	0.002533	0.006266	0.002585	0.003642	0.004225	0.004411
1978	0.001445	0.004141	0.008796	0.003964	0.005916	0.005999	0.004174
1979	0.001584	0.003435	0.007944	0.004657	0.003083	0.005785	0.005140
1980	0.001913	0.003302	0.006038	0.005381	0.004252	0.005070	0.004381
1981	0.001561	0.003751	0.011177	0.005539	0.004535	0.007834	0.005659
1982	0.001086	0.005359	0.010278	0.009161	0.005164	0.008845	0.006481
1983	0.004554	0.004456	0.015946	0.007264	0.005319	0.007145	0.007358

APPENDIX L

Write-offs Ratios* for Residential Accounts

Company	1980	1981	1982	1983
Duquesne	.013254	.014246	.017220	.015024
Met. Ed.	N/A	.013499	.010577	.009388
Penelec	N/A	N/A	N/A	.013108
Penn Power	.007124	.007446	.006199	.006182
P.P.&L.	N/A	.006481	.008908	.008251
P.E.Co.	N/A	N/A	.017402	.014844
UGI-Luzerne	N/A	.004969	.005410	.001602
West Penn	.005409	.005651	.005800	.005022
Columbia	.007881	.009129	N/A	.008304
Equitable	N/A	N/A	N/A	.019497
N.F.G.	.010691	N/A	.018748	.013542
P.G.&W.	.008892	.009753	.010152	.010304
Peoples	.009221	.016323	.016240	.012213
UGI-Gas	.014173	N/A	.020651	.013500

*Residential gross write-offs/residential revenues

APPENDIX M

Average Monthly Customer Usage*

	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>Percent Change 1981-1983</u>
Duquesne	454 KWH	451 KWH	480 KWH	+ 6%
Met. Ed.	644 KWH	623 KWH	639 KWH	- 1%
Penelec	574 KWH	567 KWH	560 KWH	- 2%
Penn Power	649 KWH	647 KWH	650 KWH	No change
PP&L	763 KWH	754 KWH	755 KWH	- 1%
PECo - electric	521 KWH	509 KWH	578 KWH	+11%
UGI - Luzerne	647 KWH	641 KWH	630 KWH	- 3%
West Penn	721 KWH	714 KWH	708 KWH	- 2%
Columbia	12.6 MCF	11.5 MCF	10.2 MCF	-19%
Equitable	13.0 MCF	12.0 MCF	10.9 MCF	-16%
NFG	13.1 MCF	12.2 MCF	11.0 MCF	-16%
PG&W	11.1 MCF	10.9 MCF	10.3 MCF	- 7%
Peoples	13.5 MCF	12.5 MCF	11.9 MCF	-12%
PECo - gas	8.4 MCF	8.2 MCF	7.6 MCF	-10%
UGI - gas	6.8 MCF	6.6 MCF	6.2 MCF	- 9%

* Total annual usage divided by average number of customers