

# **CONSUMER SERVICES**

## **ACTIVITY REPORT: 1984**

**JUNE 1985**

**PA Public Utility Commission**

**Bureau of Consumer Services**

**Joseph W. Farrell, Director**

# Consumer Services Activity Report - 1984

## Contents

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	
I. OVERALL ACTIVITY	1
II. NATURE OF BCS CONSUMER COMPLAINTS	3
TABLE 1 - NATURE OF CALL FOR CONSUMER COMPLAINTS: 1984	3
III. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF BUREAU ACTIVITY	4
IV. TYPE OF UTILITIES INVOLVED	5
V. MAJOR COMPANIES	6
TABLE 2 - RESIDENTIAL CONSUMER COMPLAINTS - MAJOR GAS COMPANIES	7
TABLE 3 - RESIDENTIAL CONSUMER COMPLAINTS - MAJOR ELECTRIC COMPANIES	8
TABLE 4 - RESIDENTIAL CONSUMER COMPLAINTS - MAJOR TELEPHONE COMPANIES	10
TABLE 5 - RESIDENTIAL MEDIATION REQUESTS - MAJOR GAS COMPANIES	11
TABLE 6 - RESIDENTIAL MEDIATION REQUESTS - MAJOR ELECTRIC COMPANIES	13
VI. COLLECTIONS STATISTICS	15
TABLE 7 - PERCENTAGE OF CUSTOMERS OVERDUE	15
TABLE 8 - AVERAGE MONTHLY RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMER BILLS	17
TABLE 9 - AVERAGE CUSTOMER ARREARAGES	18
TABLE 10 - NUMBER OF TERMINATION NOTICES	19
TABLE 11 - NUMBER OF SERVICE TERMINATIONS	20
TABLE 12 - RESIDENTIAL WRITE-OFFS RATIOS 1983-1984	22
VII. CONCLUSION	23

Contents (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX A - BUREAU STRUCTURE/CSIS/BCS-PSU	24
APPENDIX B - DISTRIBUTION OF COMMERCIAL CASES MAJOR ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANIES	25
APPENDIX C - MONTHLY VOLUME - MEDIATION REQUESTS AND CONSUMER COMPLAINTS	26
APPENDIX D - INQUIRIES AND OPINIONS: MAJOR COMPANIES MAJOR PROBLEM CATEGORIES FOR INQUIRIES AND OPINIONS	27 28
APPENDIX E - MEDIATION REQUESTS - PA. COUNTIES CONSUMER COMPLAINTS - PA. COUNTIES	29 30
APPENDIX F - TYPE OF INDUSTRY	31
APPENDIX G - FORMULAS FOR MEDIATION AND COMPLAINT RATES	32
APPENDIX H - BCS COMPLAINTS-RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL	33
APPENDIX I - CONSUMER COMPLAINTS BY ELECTRIC COMPANIES 1981-1984 CONSUMER COMPLAINTS BY GAS COMPANIES 1981-1984 CONSUMER COMPLAINTS BY TELEPHONE COMPANIES 1981-1984 MEDIATION REQUESTS BY ELECTRIC COMPANIES 1981-1984 MEDIATION REQUESTS BY GAS COMPANIES 1981-1984	34 35 36 37 38
APPENDIX J - COMMERCIAL CONSUMER COMPLAINTS - MAJOR TELEPHONE COMPANIES	39
APPENDIX K - WRITE-OFFS RATIOS: 1982-1984 MAJOR GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANIES	40
APPENDIX L - AVERAGE MONTHLY CUSTOMER USAGE - KWH/MCF - 1982-1984	41

## THE CONSUMER SERVICES ACTIVITY REPORT FOR 1984

### INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS) was mandated under Act 216 of 1976 to provide responsive, efficient and accountable management of consumer complaints. In order to fulfill this mandate, 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 1984 the Bureau has investigated 165,957 cases and has received an additional 147,449 information requests and opinions. To handle all of this complaint data, the Bureau maintains a computer based consumer information system through a contract with Penn State University which permits complaints to be aggregated and analyzed.

A number of studies have found that only a minority, often a small minority, of dissatisfied persons complain about unsatisfactory products or services. The Bureau's experience reflects this fact as it has often been found that a seemingly small number of individual complaints from utility customers represent management failures or systematic problems in companies. This information is secured by aggregating data from thousands of complaints to provide information about the effectiveness of utilities at meeting consumers' needs and complying with Commission standards. The results of this are periodically communicated to companies so that they can act independently to resolve problems before a formal Commission reaction becomes necessary. In many cases, companies which have taken advantage of this have been able to resolve problems and improve service to customers. Companies which fail to act responsively to resolve problems have been subjected to fines and rate case adjustments of expenses or revenues.

This report highlights BCS activity for the year 1984 and is the seventh 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 in the past two Annual Activity reports 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 appeared 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, investigatory<sup>1</sup> cases that involved commercial accounts are deleted from Tables 2 thru 12. 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 three basic categories: consumer complaints, mediation requests, and inquiries. The Bureau received 22,617 contacts which required investigation from utility customers in 1984. In nearly 800 of these contacts the Bureau saved the customers money in billing adjustments. The total amount of money saved for these customers was almost \$150,000. The 6,603 consumer complaints involved complaints about utilities' actions related to billing, service delivery, repairs, etc. Mediation requests, of which there were 16,014, 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 18,808 inquiries and information requests which did not require investigation.

### Mediation Requests

Mediation requests increased by less than 1% from 15,896 in 1983 to 16,014 in 1984. The Bureau is concerned because this is the third increase in mediation requests in the past four years. Improved negotiation techniques have been developed and when they are properly implemented by companies, it is expected that the number of mediation requests should decline. 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 1984 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 44% of the annual volume of mediation cases were received between April and July and about 56% 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 increased by less than 1% from 6,563 in 1983 to 6,603 in 1984. This is only the second year that complaints did not decrease in the past six years. 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 1985. 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 18,808 cases which required no follow-up beyond the initial contact during 1984. 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 (22%). (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: 1984

	N	%
Billing/Payment	2690	40.7
Credit/Deposits	579	8.8
Rates/Tariffs	322	4.9
Service	1481	22.4
People Delivered Service (Repairs)	229	3.5
Termination	937	14.2
Other	365	5.5
	6603	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 mediation and complaint rates.

#### Mediation

The average state-wide mediation rate was 26.1 per 10,000 households in 1984. The number of mediation requests in 1984 ranged from zero in Sullivan county to 4,159 in Allegheny County. (See Appendix E, Table 1). Lawrence County had the highest rate of mediation requests at 115.2 per 10,000 households. Other counties with high mediation rates were Dauphin (81.7), Allegheny (72.8) and Beaver (69.8). 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 15.0 per 10,000 households in 1984. Consumer complaints varied from a low of 3 in Sullivan County to a high of 1,348 in Allegheny County. (See Appendix E, Table 2). Complaint rates were the highest in Dauphin (44.0), Erie (35.3), Greene (29.3), Cumberland (24.3) and Perry (23.7). 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 1984 involved electric (59%) or gas companies (36%). (See Appendix F). Only 5% (838 cases) of mediation cases stemmed from threatened termination of water service. This is the second year in a row for the industry proportions listed above. Telephone companies were not covered by the Commission termination regulations in 1984, so there are no telephone termination mediation cases included in this section.

Telephone companies were involved in 36% of the consumer complaints. Electric and gas companies accounted for 29% and 25% of all complaints, respectively. The electric industry's number of consumer complaints increased by 11% from 1983 to 1984 and is a matter of concern to the Bureau. Also, the electric industry's proportion of consumer complaints increased from 27% in 1983 to 29% in 1984. Water companies accounted for 10% 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 among 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 in the following sections of this report contain 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) illustrates the number of residential consumer complaints, complaint rates, number of mediations, mediation rates and percentage changes for the years 1981 to 1984. 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 4% decrease in complaints against the major gas utilities from 1983 to 1984 (See Table 2). This is the second consecutive annual decline in complaints. The BCS hopes that this trend will continue in 1985.

Table 2

Residential  
Consumer Complaints  
Major Gas Companies

(1983-1984)

Company	1983		1984		1983-1984
	N	Complaint Rate	N	Complaint Rate	Percent Change in N
Columbia	286	.94	242	.80	- 15%
Equitable	392	1.73	470	2.07	20%
NFG	190	1.03	199	1.08	5%
P.G.&W.-Gas	99	.94	59	.56	- 40%
Peoples	322	1.08	208	.70	- 35%
UGI-Gas	201	1.07	259	1.38	29%
Total (average rate)	1490	(1.13)	1437	(1.10)	(- 4%)

Among the highlights of the past year:

- \* PG&W's 40% decrease in complaints was the largest in the gas industry from 1983 to 1984. Consequently, PG&W continues to have the lowest complaint rate in the industry for the third year in a row.
- \* People's 35% decrease in complaints caused its complaint rate to drop to the second lowest in the industry. In fact, People's complaint rate has been better than the industry average since 1980.
- \* Although Columbia experienced a 15% decrease in complaints, its complaint rate ranking dropped from first to third in the industry. Columbia's complaint rate has been below the industry average since 1979.
- \* Despite a 5% increase in consumer complaints, NFG continues to have a complaint rate that is better than the industry average for the second year in a row.
- \* UGI's 29% increase in complaints was the largest in the industry causing its complaint rate to be worse than the industry average for the second time in the last three years.
- \* Equitable experienced a 20% increase in complaints from 1983 to 1984. As a result, Equitable's complaint rate continues to be the worst in the gas industry for the fourth year in a row. The Bureau is concerned about this trend and will continue to encourage Equitable to review its customer services program in order to make improvements.

## Electric Utilities

There were 11% more consumer complaints against major electric companies in 1984 than in 1983. This is the second increase in the past three years for the major electric companies. In fact, the electric industry is responsible for the slight overall increase in the Bureau's consumer complaints from 1983 to 1984. Once again 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  
(1983-1984)

Company	1983		1984		1983-1984
	N	Complaint Rate	N	Complaint Rate	Percent Change in N
Duquesne	303	.61	244	.50	- 19%
Met. Ed.	133	.41	164	.49	23%
Penelec	262	.56	240	.51	- 8%
Penn Power	50	.45	37	.33	- 26%
P.P.&L.	249	.27	331	.36	33%
P.E. Co.	259	.22	427	.36	65%
UGI-Luzerne	26	.53	33	.67	27%
West Penn	223	.43	200	.38	- 10%
Total (average rate)	1505	(.44)	1676	(.45)	( 11%)

Among the preliminary findings:

- \* Penn Power's 26% decrease was the largest in the electric industry from 1983 to 1984 and this enabled its complaint rate to become the best in the industry for the second time in the last four years.
- \* Duquesne's complaints decreased by 19% causing its complaint rate ranking within the electric industry to improve. Although Duquesne's complaint rate is no longer the worst in the industry, it continues to be above the industry average for the sixth year in a row.
- \* Consumer complaints for West Penn showed a decline (10%) for the second year in a row. Also, West Penn's complaint rate was better than the industry average for the fifth time in the last six years.

- \* PECO's 65% increase in complaints was the largest in the industry. Consequently, for the first time in three years PECO no longer has the best complaint rate in the industry.
- \* PP&L experienced a significant increase (33%) in consumer complaints from 1983 to 1984. The Bureau is particularly concerned with this year's increase since PP&L was a subject of its review program in 1983. Despite the increase in complaints, PP&L's complaint rate continues to be better than the industry average.
- \* As a result of a 23% increase in complaints, Met.Ed's complaint rate has risen above the industry average for the first time in the past three years.
- \* Penelec's consumer complaints decreased for the fourth time in the past five years. Nevertheless, Penelec's complaint rate has been worse than the industry average since 1979.
- \* UGI-Luzerne's 27% increase in complaints has caused them to have the worst complaint rate in the electric industry. UGI's complaint rate has been worse than the industry average in each of the past two years.

#### Telephone Utilities

Complaints against major telephone companies decreased by 3% from 1983 to 1984 (See Table 4). This is the third decline in the past four years. The Bureau will pay close attention to the telephone industry in 1985 because of the new regulations in areas such as billing, credit and deposits and collections. BCS cases involving non-residential telephone accounts for 1983 and 1984 appear in Appendix J. A commercial complaint rate is also included. It is important to note that 17% of BCS telephone complaints involve non-residential service in 1984. The telephone industry has the highest incidence of non-residential complaints.

Table 4

Residential  
Consumer Complaints  
Major Telephone Companies

(1983-1984)

Company	1983		1984		1983-1984
	N	Complaint Rate	N	Complaint Rate	Percent Change in N
Bell	1151	.35	1072	.33	- 7%
Commonwealth	44	.36	56	.45	27%
Continental#	51	.95	60	1.11	18%
General	255	.84	269	.89	5%
Alltel	103	1.02	121	1.19	17%
United	136	.66	114	.54	- 16%
Total (average rate)	1740	(.70)	1692	(.75)	(- 3%)

# includes Quaker State

Among the highlights of the past year:

- \* Bell's 7% decrease in consumer complaints from 1983 to 1984 continues a downward trend that began in 1979. Bell's complaint rate has been the industry's best since 1979.
- \* Commonwealth's complaints increased for the second year in a row. However, Commonwealth's complaint rate has been the second best in the industry since 1980 and has been better than the industry average since 1979.
- \* United's 16% decrease in complaints was the most favorable change in the telephone industry from 1983 to 1984. Since 1979, United's complaint rate has been better than the industry average.
- \* General's 5% increase in complaints has caused its complaint rate to be worse than the industry average for the second year in a row.
- \* Because of an 18% increase in complaints, Continental continues to have a complaint rate that is worse than the industry average.
- \* Alltel's complaints increased for the second time in the past three years. Thus, since 1982 Alltel has maintained the worst complaint rate in the industry.

## 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 1985. The number of mediation requests per 1,000 overdue residential customers - the mediation rate - is used to permit comparisons across companies. 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 the number 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 less than 1% from 1983 to 1984. This is the third annual decline in a row for the gas industry. In fact, only Columbia, Equitable and NFG showed increases in mediation requests. Peoples experienced the largest reduction in mediations. (See Table 5).

Table 5

### Residential Mediation Requests Major Gas Companies

(1983-1984)

Company	1983		1984		1983-1984
	N	Mediation Rate	N	Mediation Rate	Percent Change in N
Columbia	1612	3.69	1662	4.20	3%
Equitable	376	1.00	682	1.97	81%
National Fuel	470	1.66	681	2.52	45%
G.&W.-Gas	310	1.89	297	1.84	- 4%
Peoples	1777	4.59	1300	3.24	- 27%
UGI-Gas#	910	2.17	813	2.87	- 11%
Total (average rate)	5455	(2.50)	5435	(2.77)	( 0%)

The 1983 mediation rate of UGI reported in Table 5 is lower than what it should be. The number of overdue customers that was reported to BCS by this company was artificially inflated, which caused its mediation rate to appear low. 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 this company.



Among the preliminary findings:

- \* PG&W's number of mediation requests decreased (4%) for the second year in a row. In 1984, PG&W's mediation rate was the best in the gas industry for the first time. Also, PG&W's mediation rate has been better than the industry average since 1979.
- \* Despite experiencing the largest increase (81%) in mediations in the gas industry from 1983 to 1984, Equitable has the second best mediation rate in the industry.
- \* Even though NFG's mediations increased by 45% from 1983 to 1984, its mediation rate remained better than the industry average for the third year in a row. Only Equitable and PG&W had better mediation rates in 1984.
- \* Although UGI's number of mediations decreased from 1983 to 1984, its mediation rate increased. UGI's number of overdue customers had been artificially inflated in past years, and as such, caused its mediation rate to be artificially low. The 1984 data is an accurate picture of UGI's mediation activity.
- \* Peoples' 27% decrease in mediations was the best in the gas industry. This is the second annual decline in a row and has resulted in Peoples' mediation rate not being the industry's worst for the first time in three years.
- \* Columbia's 3% increase in mediation requests was its third increase in the past four years. In fact, Columbia now has the worst mediation rate in the gas industry and as such is of concern to the Bureau.

#### Electric Utilities

The electric industry experienced a 2% increase in mediation requests from 1983 to 1984. This is the second annual increase in the past three years for the major electric companies. Met. Ed. and PP&L shared the largest increase (38%) while Penelec enjoyed the largest decrease (25%) in the industry. The mediation rate for the electric industry (1.10) continues to be less than half of that for the gas industry (2.77). 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.

16,014

Table 6

Residential  
Mediation Requests  
Major Electric Companies

(1983-1984)

Company	1983		1984		1983-1984
	N	Mediation Rate	N	Mediation Rate	Percent Change in N
Duquesne Light	2054	2.29	1621	1.96	- 21%
Met. Ed.	483	.81	666	1.07	38%
Penelec	809	.82	610	.56	- 25%
Penn Power	356	1.32	319	1.14	- 10%
P.P.&L.	1196	.86	1654	1.16	38%
P.E.Co.	2918	.80	3258	.88	12%
UGI-Luzerne	76	.75	90	1.21	18%
West Penn	947	1.07	753	.78	- 20%
Total (average rate)	8839	(1.10)	8971	(1.10)	( 2%)

Among the highlights of the past year:

- \* Penelec's mediations decreased (25%) by more than any other major electric utility for the second consecutive year. Penelec's mediation rate has gone from the next to worst to the best in the industry since 1982. The Bureau has been working closely with Penelec through its review program and these preliminary results are encouraging.
- \* West Penn's 20% decline in mediations was the company's first reduction in the past four years. West Penn's mediation rate is now the second best in the industry and has been better than the industry average since 1979.
- \* PECO's number of mediations increased (12%) for the third year in a row. PECO's mediation rate has been better than the industry average since 1980 and is now only the third best in the industry. PECO's rate was the industry's best in 1981 and 1982.
- \* Met. Ed. shared the largest increase (38%) in mediation requests in the industry with PP&L. Met. Ed.'s mediation rate continues to be better than the industry average for the sixth year in a row.
- \* PP&L's 38% increase in mediations caused its mediation rate to become worse than the industry average for the first time since 1981. The Bureau will be paying close attention to PP&L's mediation activity in 1985.

- \* Penn Power's 10% decrease in mediations was its first decline in the past five years. Penn Power's mediation rate continues to be worse than the industry average for the second year in a row. The Bureau will be seeking the reasons for this high mediation rate.
- \* UGI-Luzerne's increase (18%) was its third in the past four years. UGI's mediation rate went from the industry's best in 1983 to the next to worst in 1984.
- \* Duquesne's 21% decrease in mediations continues a favorable trend for the second year in a row. Nevertheless, Duquesne continues to have the industry's worst mediation rate since 1981.

## 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). The CRS is a unique system that gives the Bureau the ability to compare similar activities both between companies and over time. The BCS can chart an individual company's performance over a period of years as well as compare the individual company to others in its respective industry.

In an average month in 1984 there were 906,126 residential accounts of major gas and electric companies in arrears. This aggregate figure represents less than a 1% increase over 1983. The total amount owed by residential gas and electric customers in an average month in 1984 was nearly \$102 million. This is a 19% increase from 1983 (\$86 million). Much of this money will eventually be recovered, but delayed payments affect cash flow and have a direct impact on customers' rates. For these reasons, these problem indicators are a source of concern to the Commission.

There was a 5% decrease in the percentage of overdue customers for the major gas and electric companies from 1982 to 1984. (See Table 7).

Table 7

### Percentage of Customers Overdue\*

Company	1982	1983	1984	Percent Change 1982-1984
Duquesne	15.9%	15.1%	14.1%	-11%
Met. Ed.	15.4	15.1	15.7	2%
Penelec	17.3	17.7	19.7	14%
Penn Power	21.1	20.1	20.8	- 1%
P.P.&L.	12.6	12.7	13.0	3%
P.E.Co.#	25.9	25.7	25.8	0%
UGI-Luzerne	18.7	17.1	12.6	-33%
West Penn	14.1	14.3	15.3	9%
Columbia	12.3	12.0	10.9	-11%
Equitable	18.1	13.8	12.7	-30%
N.F.G.	15.8	12.7	12.2	-23%
P.G.&W.	24.5X	13.0	12.7	**
Peoples	13.9X	10.8	11.2	**
UGI-Gas	19.7X	18.6X	12.6	**
Overall Avg.	17.7%	16.8%	16.8%	
Percent Change				- 5%

\* Overdue customers/total customer

\*\* Reporting change from 1982 to 1984 not appropriate

X Artificially inflated because of inaccurate reporting by company and excluded in overall average

# Combined electric and gas

- \* The major gas and electric companies show a substantial range in the percentage of overdue customers, from 26% for PECO to 11% for Columbia.
- \* Philadelphia Electric's percentage of customers who are overdue has remained relatively constant for three consecutive years. However, PECO continues to have the largest proportion of overdue customers.
- \* Columbia, Equitable and NFG experienced substantial decreases in overdue customers from 1982 to 1984.
- \* Duquesne, Penn Power and UGI-Luzerne were the major electric companies to show a decrease in their proportions of customers in arrears from 1982 to 1984.

#### Customer Bills

Customers pay, or fail to pay, bills for service actually used. The common practice of using "typical" customer bills, i.e., bills for a given amount of service, is inappropriate where the analysis of collections is concerned. 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, there are indications that 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 L for average monthly customer usage).

Table 8  
Average Monthly Residential Customer Bills

	1982	1983	1984	Percent Change 1982-1984
Duquesne	\$39.50	\$44.50	\$46.84	19%
Met. Ed.	49.96	51.69	58.09	16%
Penelec	41.82	39.36	43.37	4%
Penn Power	46.04	47.51	50.99	11%
P.P.&L.	47.24	49.15	54.17	15%
P.E.Co.#	57.68	63.48	72.25	25%
UGI-Luzerne	43.97	48.27	48.26	10%
West Penn	34.34	36.39	37.84	10%
Columbia	57.90	64.08	72.49	25%
Equitable	58.48	65.23	77.04	32%
NFG	58.66	64.76	66.00	13%
P.G.&W.	58.69	67.08	72.07	23%
Peoples	55.51	66.56	70.59	27%
UGI-Gas	42.28	48.42	56.97	35%
Overall	\$49.67	\$53.26	\$60.64	22%

# Combined electric and gas

Among the findings:

- \* Due to the prevalence of gas as a heating fuel, average monthly residential gas bills are approximately \$20/month more than electric bills.
- \* Penelec and NFG had the smallest increase in customer bills in their respective industries from 1982 to 1984.
- \* Because of a 32% increase in customer bills from 1982 to 1984, Equitable's average monthly residential bill is the largest in the gas industry in 1984.

#### 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 1984 ranged from .5 million for UGI-Luzerne to more than 35.7 million for PECO. 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. Table 9 presents individual company variations in this statistic.

Table 9

## Average Customer Arrearages\*

Company	1982	1983	1984	Percent Change 1982-1984
Duquesne	\$115	\$103	\$115	0%
Met. Ed.	92	91	106	15%
Penelec	85	85	97	14%
Penn Power	56	53	65	16%
P.P.&L.	74	70	83	12%
P.E.Co.#	91	97	115	26%
UGI-Luzerne	62	69	86	39%
West Penn	59	58	60	2%
Columbia	122	106	144	18%
Equitable	172	202	277	61%
N.F.G.	107	116	143	34%
P.G.&W.	134X	116	138	**
Peoples	203X	170	213	**
UGI-Gas	81X	83X	96	**
State-wide Ave.	\$ 92	\$ 92	\$108	
Percent Change				17%

\* Total money owed in overdue residential accounts divided by the number of overdue accounts.

\*\* Reporting change from 1982 to 1984 not appropriate

X Inaccurate reporting by company and company excluded in state-wide average in each year

# Combined electric and gas

## Among the findings:

- \* Average customer arrearages are \$75/month more for gas customers than for electric customers.
- \* Penn Power, PP&L, UGI-Luzerne, West Penn, Columbia, NFG, PG&W and UGI-Gas each have below average customer arrearages in their respective industries in 1984.
- \* Duquesne is the only major company which didn't show an increase in average customer arrearages from 1982 to 1984. However, Duquesne shares the largest average arrearage in the electric industry in 1984 with PECO.
- \* UGI-Gas has the lowest average arrearage (\$96) in the industry in 1984.
- \* Equitable Gas has the largest average arrearage (\$277) in the gas industry and its increase from 1982 to 1984 was 61%.

## 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

	1982	1983	1984	Percent Change 1982-1984
Duquesne	189,614	182,714	168,586	-11%
Met. Ed.	55,126	33,863	40,129	-27%
Penelec	78,458	65,462	69,362	-12%
Penn Power	82,785	103,926	85,517	3%
P.P.&L.	549,818	582,548	365,371	-34%
P.E.Co.#	1,047,604	951,717	981,132	- 6%
UGI-Luzerne	62,292	50,839	30,617	-51%
West Penn	273,713	284,470	304,834	11%
Columbia	179,191	189,902	174,172	- 3%
Equitable	23,464	14,337	41,907	79%
NFG	141,041	90,842	94,100	-33%
P.G.&W.	110,950	118,713	139,085	25%
Peoples	148,403	175,481	216,260	46%
UGI-Gas	144,184	141,437	185,537	29%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,086,643</b>	<b>2,986,251</b>	<b>2,896,609</b>	<b>- 6%</b>

# Combined electric and gas

Among the preliminary findings:

- \* There was a 13% decrease in the number of termination notices by the electric industry from 1982 to 1984. This contrasts favorably with the 14% increase experienced by the gas industry during this time.
- \* Only Penn Power and West Penn sent more termination notices in 1984 than in 1982 in the electric industry.



- \* Columbia and NFG were the only major gas companies to send fewer termination notices in 1984 than in 1982.
- \* UGI-Luzerne sent approximately half as many termination notices to customers in 1984 than in 1982.
- \* Equitable's 79% increase in termination notices sent to customers was the largest increase in the gas industry from 1982 to 1984.

#### 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

	1982	1983	1984	Percent Change 1982-1984
Duquesne	6,006	5,171	4,692	- 22%
Met. Ed.	3,143	2,581	2,757	- 12%
Penelec	5,013	4,193	2,885	- 42%
Penn Power	1,011	1,260	991	- 2%
P.P.&L.	8,307	6,203	6,709	- 19%
P.E.Co.#	28,050	40,936	33,649	20%
UGI-Luzerne	662	578	757	14%
West Penn	7,785	7,469	6,068	- 22%
Columbia	5,428	4,813	5,693	5%
Equitable	1,028	2,885	4,449	333%
NFG	4,559	4,057	4,915	8%
P.G.&W.	2,089	1,946	2,155	3%
Peoples	4,708	4,344	3,697	- 21%
UGI-Gas	4,703	5,242	5,373	14%
<b>Total</b>	<b>82,492</b>	<b>91,678</b>	<b>84,790</b>	<b>3%</b>

# Combined electric and gas

Among the preliminary findings:

- \* The overall trend for the major electric and gas companies in the number of service terminations from 1982 to 1984 showed a

3% increase. This is a fairly optimistic indication given the 22% increase in bills and the 17% increase in average arrearages over the same period.

- \* Only PECO and UGI-Luzerne terminated more customers in 1984 than in 1982 in the electric industry.
- \* Peoples was the only major gas company to terminate fewer customers in 1984 than in both 1982 and 1983.
- \* PECO's number of terminations decreased by 18% from 1983 to 1984 and the Bureau hopes that PECO will continue this pattern in 1985.
- \* Only Met.Ed., PP&L and UGI-Luzerne's number of terminations increased from 1983 to 1984 in the electric industry.
- \* Equitable gas terminated 21% more customers in 1984 than in 1983. The Bureau is concerned about this increase.

#### 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 residential gross write-offs. 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 is 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 is done from 1983 to 1984. There was an 8% increase in residential gross-write-offs for the major electric and gas companies from 1983 to 1984. (Appendix K provides a listing of net total write-off ratios from 1982 to 1984. 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").

Table 12

## Write-offs Ratios for Residential Accounts

Company	1983	1984	1983-1984
Duquesne	.015024	.014386	- 4%
Met. Ed.	.009388	.009068	- 3%
Penelec	.013108	.011440	- 13%
Penn Power	.006182	.004628	- 25%
P.P.&L.	.008251	.009702	18%
P.E.Co. X	.014844	.016332	10%
UGI-Luzerne	.004354	.006735	55%
West Penn	.005022	.005297	5%
Columbia	.008304	.013359	61%
Equitable#	.019497	.022431	15%
N.F.G.	.013542	.014153	5%
P.G.&W.	.010304	.015270	48%
Peoples	.012213	.011211	- 8%
UGI-Gas	.013500	.017863	32%
State-wide Ave.	.012414	.013400	
Percent Change			8%

X Combined electric and gas

#Residential and commercial figures are combined.

- \* Gas companies had higher write-off scores than electric companies in both 1983 and 1984.
- \* Penn Power had the lowest ratio in 1984 and its decline from 1983 to 1984 was the largest in the electric industry.
- \* PECO's write-offs ratio was the worst in the electric industry in 1984.
- \* UGI-Luzerne's increase (55%) in write-offs was the largest among the major electric companies from 1983 to 1984.
- \* Peoples's write-offs score was the lowest among the major gas companies in 1984 and the company was the only one to show a decrease in residential gross write-offs from 1983 to 1984 in the industry.
- \* Equitable's write-offs ratio was the worst among the major electric and gas companies in each of the past two years.
- \* Columbia's 61% increase in write-offs was the largest in the gas industry from 1983 to 1984.

## VII. CONCLUSION

This report has provided an overview and a preliminary analysis of BCS activity during 1984. 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. However, the Bureau did not meet this goal in 1984. Consumer complaints increased for the second time in the past three years while mediation requests increased for the fifth time in the past six years. Although the increase for both types of activity was slight from 1983 to 1984, the Bureau is nonetheless concerned. The 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 and high complaint rates in 1985.

The utility collections picture in Pennsylvania would be a source of optimism were it not for events in the public arena. First, net write-offs of uncollectibles did not change from 1983 to 1984 despite substantial increases in rates. As a result the overall average ratio of write-offs to revenues declined to the lowest level since 1981. In addition, the substantial increase in gross residential write-offs was balanced by a corresponding increase in residential revenues such that the residential write-offs ratio increased only slightly from 1983 to 1984. This increase is, in fact, consistent with rate increases across the state during the same period. Unfortunately, receipt of 24% less money (from \$52.5 to \$40 million) from LIHEAP by utility customers and the reduction of 37% in the number of utility customers receiving LIHEAP grants bodes ill for collections performance in the future. This shortfall in funding will have a cumulative effect as the unanticipated arrearages from the past winter will tend to grow as the total federal appropriation for LIHEAP declines next year and the Welfare Department continues to slant the program away from utility customers.

## 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 165,957 investigated cases and over 147,449 inquiries and opinions from 1978 to 1984. 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	1983		1984	
	Mediations	Consumer Complaints	Mediations	Consumer Complaints
Duquesne	249	67	183	45
Met. Ed.	21	18	24	23
Penelec	68	47	31	29
Penn Power	3	3	6	3
PP&L	41	35	66	50
PECO	59	39	80	75
UGI-Luz.	2	3	2	5
West Penn	64	44	43	32
Columbia	17	4	13	25
Equitable	31	27	22	43
NFG	10	9	6	10
PG&W-Gas	4	5	1	9
Peoples	33	21	20	15
UGI-Gas	11	11	10	16

APPENDIX C

Monthly Volume

	Mediation Requests		Consumer Complaints	
	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>
January	658	370	598	574
February	657	402	573	616
March	1,007	790	693	680
April	2,014	1,589	554	585
May	2,068	2,097	567	599
June	1,830	1,696	541	565
July	1,568	1,673	501	536
August	1,728	1,844	549	563
September	1,502	1,752	557	479
October	1,376	1,828	506	547
November	1,103	1,374	447	416
December	385	599	477	443
TOTAL	15,896	16,014	6,563	6,603

## APPENDIX D

Table 1

## Inquiries and Opinions: Major Companies in 1984

Company Name	Number of Contacts	Percent of Industry	Industry Total	Percent of Total
Electric			6,018	32.0
Duquesne	1,945	32.3		
Met. Ed.	289	4.8		
Penelec	503	8.4		
Penn Power	174	2.9		
PP&L	886	14.7		
PECO	1,291	21.5		
UGI-Luz.	14	.2		
West Penn	640	10.61		
Others or no Company	276	4.6		
Gas			5,750	30.6
Columbia	1,075	18.7		
Equitable	1,893	32.9		
NFG	425	7.4		
PG&W-Gas	171	3.0		
Peoples	1,062	18.4		
UGI-Gas	447	7.8		
Others or no Company	677	11.8		
Telephone			2,613	13.9
Bell	1,508	57.7		
Others	1,105	42.3		
Water			1,458	7.8
Sewage			103	.5
Others (No Specific Company or Industry)			2,866	15.2
Total			18,808	



Table 2

Major Problem Categories  
for Inquiries and Opinions

1984

Category	Number	Percent
Referral to Company	4,772	25.4
Referral to Other BCS/ Other Bureau	5,571	29.6
Referral to Other Agency	2,673	14.2
Specific Information Request	4,265	22.7
Rate Protests and Opinions	761	4.0
Opinions - General	206	1.1
Other	560	3.0
	18,808	100.0

16,014

APPENDIX E

Table 1

MEDIATION REQUESTS  
1984

PENNSYLVANIA COUNTIES

	<u>N</u>	<u>C/10,000</u>			<u>N</u>	<u>C/10,000</u>	
01. ADAMS	48	19.6	0	35. LACKAWANNA	211	23.6	0
02. ALLEGHENY	4,159	72.8	+	36. LANCASTER	273	21.1	0
03. ARMSTRONG	67	21.6	0	37. LAWRENCE	456	115.2	+
04. BEAVER	524	69.8	+	38. LEBANON	70	17.3	0
05. BEDFORD	15	7.6	0	39. LEHIGH	278	26.1	0
06. BERKS	242	20.2	0	40. LUZERNE	394	28.9	0
07. BLAIR	237	45.5	0	41. LYCOMING	147	30.9	0
08. BRADFORD	49	19.5	0	42. MCKEAN	51	23.6	0
09. BUCKS	590	35.7	0	43. MERCER	258	54.1	+
10. BUTLER	117	22.1	0	44. MIFFLIN	35	18.9	0
11. CAMBRIA	204	30.4	0	45. MONROE	85	22.8	0
12. CAMERON	3	6.8	0	46. MONTGOMERY	513	22.1	0
13. CARBON	46	19.8	0	47. MONTOUR	15	25.1	0
14. CENTRE	56	14.2	0	48. NORTHAMPTON	233	27.7	0
15. CHESTER	319	29.0	0	49. NORTHUMBERLAND	116	28.4	0
16. CLARION	15	8.7	0	50. PERRY	33	22.3	0
17. CLEARFIELD	56	16.9	0	51. PHILADELPHIA	1,478	21.6	0
18. CLINTON	47	29.3	0	52. PIKE	21	11.8	0
19. COLUMBIA	84	35.2	0	53. POTTER	5	4.6	-
20. CRAWFORD	67	17.0	0	54. SCHUYLKILL	74	11.4	0
21. CUMBERLAND	183	27.9	0	55. SNYDER	19	16.3	0
22. DAUPHIN	782	81.7	+	56. SOMERSET	20	6.0	-
23. DELAWARE	663	32.9	0	57. SULLIVAN	0	0	-
24. ELK	12	7.3	0	58. SUSQUEHANNA	14	8.1	0
25. ERIE	530	51.1	+	59. TIOGA	21	12.4	0
26. FAYETTE	280	45.6	0	60. UNION	17	15.2	0
27. FOREST	6	6.9	0	61. VENANGO	134	50.3	+
28. FRANKLIN	18	4.2	-	62. WARREN	28	12.8	0
29. FULTON	1	1.9	-	63. WASHINGTON	344	42.4	0
30. GREENE	58	38.7	0	64. WAYNE	51	26.0	0
31. HUNTINGDON	17	10.1	0	65. WESTMORELAND	514	34.7	0
32. INDIANA	61	18.8	0	66. WYOMING	15	14.1	0
33. JEFFERSON	44	21.3	0	67. YORK	463	39.4	0
34. JUNIATA	18	23.1	0				

Mean = 26.1

Standard Deviation = 19.6

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  
1984

PENNSYLVANIA COUNTIES

	<u>N</u>	<u>C/10,000</u>			<u>N</u>	<u>C/10,000</u>	
01. ADAMS	39	15.9	0	35. LACKAWANNA	185	20.7	0
02. ALLEGHENY	1,348	23.6	+	36. LANCASTER	144	11.1	0
03. ARMSTRONG	54	17.4	0	37. LAWRENCE	68	17.2	0
04. BEAVER	99	13.2	0	38. LEBANON	40	9.9	0
05. BEDFORD	16	8.1	-	39. LEHIGH	70	6.6	-
06. BERKS	81	6.8	-	40. LUZERNE	174	12.8	0
07. BLAIR	108	20.7	0	41. LYCOMING	62	13.0	0
08. BRADFORD	29	11.5	0	42. MCKEAN	41	19.0	0
09. BUCKS	140	8.5	0	43. MERCER	69	14.5	0
10. BUTLER	77	14.5	0	44. MIFFLIN	32	17.2	0
11. CAMBRIA	73	10.9	0	45. MONROE	88	23.6	+
12. CAMERON	9	20.3	0	46. MONTGOMERY	173	7.4	-
13. CARBON	23	9.9	0	47. MONTOUR	7	11.7	0
14. CENTRE	65	16.4	0	48. NORTHAMPTON	58	6.9	-
15. CHESTER	80	7.3	-	49. NORTHUMBERLAND	59	14.4	0
16. CLARION	37	21.5	0	50. PERRY	35	23.7	+
17. CLEARFIELD	44	13.2	0	51. PHILADELPHIA	525	7.7	-
18. CLINTON	15	9.3	0	52. PIKE	41	23.1	+
19. COLUMBIA	37	15.5	0	53. POTTER	11	10.1	0
20. CRAWFORD	79	20.1	0	54. SCHUYLKILL	60	9.3	0
21. CUMBERLAND	159	24.3	+	55. SNYDER	17	14.6	0
22. DAUPHIN	421	44.0	+	56. SOMERSET	48	14.4	0
23. DELAWARE	153	7.6	-	57. SULLIVAN	3	6.2	-
24. ELK	29	17.7	0	58. SUSQUEHANNA	20	11.6	0
25. ERIE	366	35.3	+	59. TIOGA	20	11.8	0
26. FAYETTE	101	16.4	0	60. UNION	26	23.2	+
27. FOREST	6	6.9	-	61. VENANGO	44	16.5	0
28. FRANKLIN	25	5.9	-	62. WARREN	25	11.4	0
29. FULTON	6	11.3	0	63. WASHINGTON	137	16.9	0
30. GREENE	44	29.3	+	64. WAYNE	39	19.9	0
31. HUNTINGDON	15	8.9	0	65. WESTMORELAND	159	10.7	0
32. INDIANA	36	11.1	0	66. WYOMING	12	11.3	0
33. JEFFERSON	33	16.0	0	67. YORK	215	18.3	0
34. JUNIATA	16	20.5	0				

Mean = 15.0

Standard Deviation = 6.6

N = Number Of Cases

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

+ = > 1 S.D. Above Mean

0 =  $\pm$  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>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>
Electric	59%	59%	27%	29%
Gas	36%	36%	25%	25%
Telephone	-	-	38%	36%
Other	5%	5%	10%	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 - 1984  
Residential-Commercial

<u>MEDIATIONS</u> <u>INDUSTRY</u>	Total Mediations	Residential Mediations	% Residential Mediations	Commercial Mediations	% Commercial Mediations
Electric	9,418	8,982	95%	436	5%
Gas	5,751	5,674	99%	77	1%
Water	838	829	99%	9	1%
Other	7	7	100%	0	0%
Total (%)	16,014	15,492	(97%)	522	(3%)

<u>CONSUMER COMPLAINTS</u> <u>INDUSTRY</u>	Total c.c.	Residential c.c.	% Residential c.c.	Commercial c.c.	% Commercial c.c.
Electric	1,948	1,686	87%	262	13%
Gas	1,644	1,519	92%	125	8%
Telephone	2,366	1,974	83%	392	17%
Water	599	553	92%	46	8%
Other	46	38	83%	8	17%
Total (%)	6,603	5,770	(87%)	833	(13%)

APPENDIX I

TABLE I

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS BY ELECTRIC COMPANIES 1981 - 1984

	NUMBER OF CASES				COMPLAINT RATE			PERCENT CHANGES IN N			PERCENT CHANGE IN N 1981 - 1984	
	1981	1982	1983	1984	1981	1982	1983	1984	1981 - 1982	1982 - 1983		1983 - 1984
DUQUESNE	311	330	303	244	.63	.67	.61	.50	6	- 8	-19	- 22
MET. ED.	241	173	133	164	.74	.53	.41	.49	-28	-23	23	- 32
PENELEC	339	436	262	240	.73	.94	.56	.51	29	-40	- 8	- 29
PENN POWER	29	48	50	37	.26	.43	.45	.33	66	4	-26	28
P.P.&L.	297	434	249	331	.33	.48	.27	.36	46	-43	33	11
PECO	408	325	259	427	.35	.28	.22	.36	-20	-20	65	5
UGI - LUZ.	14	23	26	33	.28	.47	.53	.67	-64	13	27	136
WEST PENN	244	281	223	200	.46	.55	.43	.38	15	-21	-10	- 18
TOTAL	1,883	2,050	1,505	1,676								
RATE/%					.47	.54	.44	.45	9	-27	11	- 11

.48

1981 - 1984 (AVE. RATE)

APPENDIX I

TABLE 2

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS BY GAS COMPANIES 1981 - 1984

	NUMBER OF CASES				COMPLAINT RATE				PERCENT CHANGES IN N			PERCENT CHANGE IN N 1981 - 1984
	1981	1982	1983	1984	1981	1982	1983	1984	1981 - 1982	1982 - 1983	1983 - 1984	
COLUMBIA	200	282	286	242	.67	.93	.94	.80	41	1	-15	21
EQUITABLE	320	326	392	470	1.41	1.44	1.73	2.07	2	20	20	47
NFG	223	261	190	199	1.21	1.42	1.03	1.08	17	-27	5	-11
PG&W - GAS	80	94	99	59	.79	.92	.94	.56	18	5	-40	-26
PEOPLES	236	340	322	208	.80	1.15	1.08	.70	44	-5	-35	-12
UGI - GAS	175	225	201	259	.94	1.19	1.07	1.38	29	-11	29	48
TOTAL	1,234	1,528	1,490	1,437								
RATE/%					.97	1.18	1.13	1.10	24	-2	-4	16
1981 - 1984 (AVE. RATE)							1.10					



APPENDIX I

TABLE 3

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS BY TELEPHONE COMPANIES 1981 - 1984

	NUMBER OF CASES			COMPLAINT RATE			PERCENT CHANGES IN N			PERCENT CHANGE IN N 1981 - 1984		
	1981	1982	1983	1984	1981	1982	1983	1984	1981 - 1982		1982 - 1983	1983 - 1984
BELL	1,248	1,156	1,151	1,072	.38	.35	.35	.33	-7	0	-7	-14
COMMONWEALTH	59	43	44	56	.48	.35	.36	.45	-27	2	27	-5
CONTINENTAL	63	30	27	37	1.98	.94	.85	1.16	-52	-10	37	-41
GENERAL	202	131	255	269	.67	.44	.84	.89	-35	95	5	33
ALLTEL*	93	121	103	121	.88	1.15	1.02	1.19	30	-15	17	30
UNITED	133	125	136	114	.66	.62	.66	.54	-6	9	-16	-14
TOTAL	1,798	1,606	1,716	1,669								
RATE/%					.84	.64	.68	.76	-11	7	-3	-7

.73

1981 - 1984 (AVE. RATE)

\* Excludes Quaker State

APPENDIX I

TABLE 4

MEDIATIONS BY ELECTRIC COMPANIES 1981 - 1984

	NUMBER OF CASES				MEDIATION RATE				PERCENT CHANGES IN N		PERCENT CHANGE IN N 1981 - 1984	
	1981	1982	1983	1984	1981	1982	1983	1984	1981 - 1982	1982 - 1983		
DUQUESNE	1,738	2,673	2,054	1,621	1.77	2.84	2.29	1.96	54	-23	-21	-7
MET. ED.	454	639	483	666	.82	1.06	.81	1.07	41	-24	38	47
PENELEC	1,045	1,442	809	610	1.14	1.49	.82	.56	38	-44	-25	-42
PENN POWER	252	260	356	319	.96	.93	1.32	1.14	3	37	-10	27
P.P.&L.	1,555	1,643	1,196	1,654	1.30	1.22	.86	1.16	6	-27	38	6
PECO	1,759	2,651	2,918	3,258	.46	.72	.80	.88	51	10	12	85
UGI - LUZ.	58	80	76	90	.55	.72	.75	1.21	38	-5	18	55
WEST PENN	641	942	947	753	.83	1.09	1.07	.78	47	1	-20	17
TOTAL	7,502	10,330	8,839	8,971								
RATE/%					.98	1.26	1.10	1.10	38	-14	2	20

1981 - 1984 (AVE. RATE)

1.11

APPENDIX I

TABLE 5

MEDIATIONS BY GAS COMPANIES 1981 - 1984

	NUMBER OF CASES				MEDIATION RATE				PERCENT CHANGES IN N		PERCENT CHANGE IN N	
	1981	1982	1983	1984	1981	1982	1983	1984	1981 - 1982	1982 - 1983	1983 - 1984	1981 - 1984
COLUMBIA	1,120	1,664	1,612	1,662	2.79	3.72	3.69	4.20	49	-3	3	48
EQUITABLE	3,051	2,066	376	682	6.64	4.19	1.00	1.97	-32	-82	81	-78
NFG	1,123	650	470	681	3.08	1.86	1.66	2.52	-42	-28	45	-39
PG&W - GAS	414	463	310	297	1.39	1.54	1.89	1.84	12	-33	-4	-28
PEOPLES	1,810	2,329	1,777	1,300	3.22	4.72	4.59	3.24	29	-24	-27	-28
UGI - GAS	359	640	910	813	.90	1.44	2.17	2.87	78	42	-11	126
TOTAL	7,877	7,812	5,455	5,435								
RATE/%					3.00	2.91	2.50	2.77	-1	-30	0	-31

1981 - 1984 (AVE. RATE)

2.80

APPENDIX J

Commercial  
Consumer Complaints  
Major Telephone Companies

Company	1983		1984	
	N	Commercial Complaint Rate	N	Commercial Complaint Rate
Bell	366	1.06	235	.62
Commonwealth	9	.60	10	.64
Continental*	16	3.03	16	3.04
General	56	1.08	50	1.03
Alltel	19	1.24	14	.74
United	41	1.13	13	.34
Total (Average Rate)	507	(1.36)	338	(1.07)

\* Includes Quaker State

APPENDIX K

Write-Offs As A Proportion of Revenues\*

Net Write-Offs to Revenues

Company	1982	1983	1984	Percent Change 1982-1984
Duquesne	.006979	.005956	.005485	-21%
Met. Ed.	.003663	.004272	.003309	-10%
Penelec	.004293	.004995	.003885	-10%
Penn Power	.002466	.002298	.001500	-39%
P.P.&L.	.004040	.003477	.003824	- 5%
P.E. Co.#	.007294	.007538	.006866	- 6%
UGI-Electric	.003495	.002936	.003915	12%
West Penn	.001086	.004554	.001561	44%
Columbia	.005359	.004456	.006367	19%
Equitable	.010278	.015946	.015680	53%
National Fuel	.009161	.007264	.007453	-19%
P.G.&W.-Gas	.005164	.005319	.006980	35%
Peoples	.008845	.007145	.006256	-29%
UGI-Gas	.006481	.007358	.006292	- 3%
Average	.005710	.006101	.005545	- 3%

\*Source: Company reported data  
#electric and gas combined

APPENDIX L

Average Monthly Customer Usage\*

	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>Percent Change 1982-1984</u>
Duquesne	451 KWH	480 KWH	477 KWH	6%
Met. Ed.	623 KWH	639 KWH	655 KWH	5%
Penelec	567 KWH	560 KWH	578 KWH	2%
Penn Power	647 KWH	650 KWH	657 KWH	2%
PP&L	754 KWH	755 KWH	774 KWH	3%
PECo - electric	509 KWH	578 KWH	580 KWH	14%
UGI - Luzerne	641 KWH	630 KWH	648 KWH	1%
West Penn	714 KWH	708 KWH	738 KWH	3%
Columbia	11.5 MCF	10.2 MCF	10.8 MCF	- 6%
Equitable	12.0 MCF	10.9 MCF	11.8 MCF	- 2%
NFG	12.2 MCF	11.0 MCF	11.7 MCF	- 4%
PG&W	10.9 MCF	10.3 MCF	11.0 MCF	1%
Peoples	12.5 MCF	11.9 MCF	12.1 MCF	- 3%
PECo - gas	8.2 MCF	7.6 MCF	6.6 MCF	-20%
UGI - gas	6.6 MCF	6.2 MCF	8.1 MCF	23%

\* Total annual usage divided by average number of customers