

**PECO ENERGY COMPANY
STATEMENT NO. 1-R**

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

v.

PECO ENERGY COMPANY – ELECTRIC DIVISION

DOCKET NO. R-2010-2161575

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

WITNESS: CRAIG L. ADAMS

SUBJECT: RESPONDING TO CERTAIN PUBLIC INPUT
TESTIMONY

DATED: AUGUST 3, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1	I.	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY 1
2	II.	RESPONSE TO PUBLIC INPUT TESTIMONY 2

1
2
3

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF
CRAIG L. ADAMS**

4

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

5 **1. Q. Please state your name and business address.**

6 A. My name is Craig L. Adams. My business address is PECO Energy Company, 2301
7 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103.

8 **2. Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

9 A. I am employed by PECO Energy Company (“PECO” or the “Company”) as Senior
10 Vice President and Chief Operating Officer.

11 **3. Q. Have you previously testified in this proceeding?**

12 A. Yes. I submitted direct testimony, pre-marked as PECO Statement No. 1, in which I
13 (1) described PECO’s electric operations; (2) provided an overview of PECO’s rate
14 filing; (3) explained PECO’s capital investment process; (4) discussed measures
15 undertaken by the Company to ensure system safety and reliability and enhance its
16 quality of service; and (5) described steps taken by PECO to promote economic
17 development.

18 **4. Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?**

19 A. I wish to respond briefly to certain testimony presented at the Worcester Public Input
20 Hearing concerning PECO’s responsiveness to customer inquiries and its
21 maintenance of wooden poles.

1 **II. RESPONSE TO PUBLIC INPUT TESTIMONY**

2 **5. Q. William Kazimer of 3121 West Germantown Pike, Eagleville, expressed**
3 **frustration over his difficulty in obtaining a copy of the Company’s rate filing.**
4 **Have you looked into this incident?**

5 A. Yes, I have. PECO has in place an automated voice response system that is designed
6 to provide our customers with options that will expedite the processing of their call by
7 routing them to the appropriate customer service representative (“CSR”) based on the
8 nature of their inquiry. If a customer is unable to identify a menu option, he/she may
9 select zero and speak with a CSR.

10 When Mr. Kazimer called the Company, he should have been advised that he could
11 download a copy of PECO’s rate filing from our website www.peco.com/know or
12 that he could review a copy at PECO’s District Office at 2301 Market Street in
13 Philadelphia. Instead, he was erroneously advised that a copy of the Company’s
14 proposed rate tariff would be included with his next bill. We take responsiveness to
15 customer inquiries seriously and we addressed this issue with the CSR who handled
16 Mr. Kazimer’s call. We have also prepared and distributed a job aide in order to
17 reinforce training to all of the CSRs, to ensure they can answer this question in the
18 future.

19 **6. Q. Shirley White of 660 Chatham Lane in Blue Bell also expressed frustration**
20 **about difficulty communicating with the Company concerning its rate filing.**
21 **What is your response to her claim?**

1 A. Ms. White claimed that she had difficulty reaching a CSR, apparently referring to the
2 length of time it took for her to reach a CSR. However, it also appears from her
3 testimony that she made contact with a CSR at the beginning of her call. She also
4 claimed that she asked to speak with a supervisor and none was available or returned
5 her call. Finally, she claims she had difficulty understanding certain aspects of the
6 Company’s filing.

7 As I stated in my direct testimony, PECO has taken several steps in recent years to
8 enhance the quality of customer service it provides and our efforts have resulted in
9 improved performance as measured by several metrics. (Refer to the Direct
10 Testimony of Craig L. Adams at pp. 12-13.) While we were not able to confirm Ms.
11 White’s claim of a lengthy wait time, as I stated in my Direct testimony, our
12 percentage of calls answered within 30 seconds has significantly increased and our
13 call abandonment rate has decreased by almost half. As for Ms. White’s questions,
14 PECO personnel were on hand at the Public Input Hearing to provide her with the
15 rate case information she requested.

16 7. **Q. Mr. James Watters, who also testified at Worcester, voiced concern over**
17 **PECO’s pole maintenance practices. Please comment.**

18 A. PECO has a detailed wood pole inspection and treatment program, the purpose of
19 which is to maintain the integrity of the Company’s distribution system infrastructure
20 and to identify those poles that require replacement or reinforcement. The program,
21 which is filed with the Commission on an annual basis, includes pole construction
22 and loading standards based on National Electrical Safety Code and Institute of

1 Electrical and Electronic Engineers codes; standards which address the installation of
2 third-party equipment on our poles; and guidelines governing the location of new and
3 replacement poles. PECO's 386,588 poles are inspected on a 10-year cycle. The
4 most recent cycle started in 2001 and ended in 2010 with approximately 39,000 poles
5 inspected each year.

6 In addition, PECO has an aerial circuit patrol and thermography program which
7 identifies equipment hot spots and broken facilities such as crossarms, poles,
8 insulators, cutouts, blown lighting arresters and safety hazards. Maintaining a safe
9 and reliable distribution network is a top priority and one we take seriously.

10 **8. Q. Does that complete your rebuttal testimony?**

11 A. Yes, it does.