

RECEIVED

EXCEPTIONS of Danielle Douglas-Complainant . MAR 10 2012

Docket # F-2020-2164009

**PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU**

Please clarify Section 59.22(a) of the Commission's regulations entitled, "Adjustment of bills for meter error." Under (a) Fast meters, it states, if the meter has not been tested under 59.21 (relating to meter tests), the period for which it has been in service beyond the regular test period shall be included in computing the refund. (Pg 7 of Administrative Law Judge's Initial Decision)

Ms. Douglas is disputing that the adjustment must be based upon what the meter would have registered had it not been fast or slow for a period equal to ½ the time elapsed since the last previous test, but not to exceed 12 months or ½ the period of occupancy of the premises by the customer whichever is less. (Pg. 8 of Administrative Law Judge's Initial Decision)

Ms. Douglas would like to ensure that when the refund is computed, the periods from 2007 through date of meter exchange. Although she did not request a meter test, she believes that the period for which it has been in service beyond the regular test period should be included in computing the refund.

In addition, Ms. Douglas paid \$1,124.00 under a payment plan in 2007 and \$679.15 which was paid under tenant's name by Ms. Douglas on 3/29/2010. (Exhibit 3, pg 1)

Under the circumstances, Ms. Douglas has clearly demonstrated that she has been persistent in trying to rectify this issue since April of 2007.

Ms. Douglas was not aware that a meter test could be done. Although PGW visited the premises in the 2007, 2008, and 2009, no meter test was suggested or performed during that time.

Ms. Douglas first initial call regarding the high bill was made on April 4th, 2007. In June of 2007, a high bill field visit was made. No problems were identified. No meter test was performed. (Pg 4 of Administrative Law Judge's Initial Decision)

In February of 2008, Ms. Douglas again contacted PGW to complain of high gas bills. No high bill field investigation was done at this time. (Pg 4 of Administrative Law Judge's Initial Decision)

As of September 10th, 2009, a meter test was not suggested to Ms. Douglas. The appointment was cancelled because as of 8/20/2009, Ms. Douglas was told the case was still open, no decision had been rendered. (PGW Exhibit 3, Pg 8)

On November 24th, 2009, a meter test was suggested. Ms. Douglas relayed this information to tenant to have meter tested since she was also in correspondence with PGW on an ongoing basis since the bill was in her name and was physically present during PGW visit on December 4th. (PGW, Exhibit 3, Pg 8)

On December 4th 2009, a third visit was made to the premises and bill was considered correct. Although, it was stated a meter test was suggested. A meter test was not conducted.

It is stated, "Ms. Douglas and PGW did not reschedule a meter exchange to test the second floor meter prior to the initial telephonic hearing on May 10, 2011. (Pg. 6)

Ms. Douglas attempted to reschedule meter test on May 13th, 2010. It was stated by Call Center Rep, Adam, who deferred to Ms. Higgins in CRU that a meter test was not required at that time since a formal complaint was issued. Therefore, it is in legal hands and Ms. Douglas must wait. (Exhibit 3, Pg. 1)

Thank you in advance for considering Ms. Douglas' request to have the period from 2007 through meter exchange date considered in computation of refund.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Danielle Douglas", with a large, stylized flourish at the end.

Danielle Douglas

Ms. Danielle T. Douglas
11648 218th St
Cambria Hts. NY 11411



Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Secretary of the Commission, 2nd FL
Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA

17120