

Mark Bickerton
346 Tennis Ave
Glenside, PA 19038
(267) 975-4929
bick421@gmail.com

July 27, 2017

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA, 17120

Re: Mark Bickerton v. Philadelphia Gas Works, Docket No. C-2016-2550007

Dear Secretary Chiavetta,

I submit this response to the "Answer of the Philadelphia Gas Works" dated June 29, 2016. As stated in my prior correspondence dated July 26, 2017, I have not received a copy of this response by mail, personal, electronic or facsimile which appears to be in violation of 52 PA CODE § 1.52.(b). Since time is of the essence, I have obtained a copy of this "Answer" directly from the Commission and prepared this response. My signature below also certifies that I have provided this document to the parties of record in accordance with 52 PA CODE § 1.54 and § 1.54.(b).(1).

Very Truly Yours,



Mark Bickerton

Enclosure (2 sheets)

Cc: Danielle Leva
Wendy Vacca
Laureto Farinas

✓ **Recommended for Call of the Docket**

RECEIVED
2016 JUL 29 AM 11:00
PA.P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Mark Bickerton

v.

Philadelphia Gas Works

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2016-255007

Mark Bickerton Response to "Answer of the Philadelphia Gas Works"

In response to PGW's answer, I hereby state the following for the record:

1. No response necessary.
2. No response necessary.
3. No response necessary.
4. Response is Invalid. **The charges are incorrect.** PGW has not provided any proof whatsoever that the charges are correct. PGW should provide proof that the AMR was accurately programmed to match the manual meter reading during the initial installation. By PGW's own admission, "Actual" actual charges were read (and paid) on a routine basis. **The only way this error could have occurred was a clerical error where the AMR was incorrectly calibrated, or a physical equipment error, where the AMR and/or the physical meter are incorrectly documenting usage.** Accurate maintenance of the metering equipment is the Defendant's responsibility, and the Defendant is not allowed under law to profit off their failure to do so. I have requested multiple times that PGW provide proof that the calibration occurred correctly and that physical meter be subjected to testing to certify it is correctly functioning. PGW has not responded to or complied with this request to date. If PGW is unwilling or unable to provide proof that this calibration occurred correctly and that the components of the physical meter are functioning correctly, then I respectfully request that the Commission find against the Defendant.

Also in the "Answer," reference is made to Exhibit A which was also included in the "Answer" which states in part: "...PGW COMPLETED A GAS USAGE ANALYSIS WHICH VERIFIED THAT THE ACCT CURRENBTLY BILLED IS CORRECT AS RENDERED..." **I deny and dispute this analysis and make reference to excerpts provided previously in the Complaint Exhibit B.III:**

—begin excerpt—

III. "A gas usage analysis has been completed and verifies, the account as currently billed, is consistent with the prior historical consumption at the property which verifies that the bill is accurate."

Response: This analysis is in error. It indicates the historic average was 19.3 CFDD, and our usage as currently billed is 21.7 CFDD. This makes no sense as it represents a significant increase from the historic average, especially considering that numerous energy efficient improvements were made over the life of ownership (discussed in 2b below) and our lifestyle which is very different from the elderly couple living in this home before us.

"1. A Statement of account"

(continued from above)

Response: This statement of account clearly indicates that the meter was read and "Actual" readings were billed, month after month and that the account was maintained in good standing. The statement of account also indicates that there are seasonal fluctuations in the natural gas consumption of the property.

"2. A gas usage analysis"

Response: The gas usage analysis compared the account under the new meter from December 2007 to July of 2015 with historic data of the property dated October 1999 to October 2003. This analysis should be dismissed for the following reasons:

a) Owner habit conditions have changed

Prior to purchase, when I visited the house, I was startled that the house was kept very warm by the previous owners (between 75-80°F) in January and February. The temperature was also set very high on the day of closing (I actually turned the dial down during the final walkthrough, before heading to the closing table). The previous owners were elderly and home most of the time. We, the new owners, were young, active and working outside of the home most of the time. This coupled with the changes in property conditions discussed below resulted in the house being maintained at a lower temperature, which resulted in less natural gas consumption.

b) Property conditions have changed – energy upgrades

The first improvement I made to the house was to thoroughly seal the exterior doors. All of the doors were drafty and light could be seen through seams. We made this improvement about 4 hours after we purchased the property in March of 2007. A few hours later, I removed the old, inefficient mercury thermostat and replaced it with a 7 day programmable (4 periods per day). We maintained the following schedule for the duration of ownership: 62°F when we were sleeping (10pm-6:30am), 60°F when we were working (9am-5pm). The brief morning and evening occupied periods were set to 68°F. This same thermostat was in the house and functioning perfectly on the day we sold the house, 6/29/2015.

We also made many other energy efficiency improvements to the house, including several new windows, a new exterior door, extensive insulation and supplementary electric heat in one wing. The assumption by PGW that our natural gas consumption should have equaled the previous tenant's is erroneous.

---end excerpt---

The gas use analysis provided has no actual, scientific or legal basis and should be excluded, in its entirety, from the subject matter.

5. Response is Invalid. The requested relief is valid since the charges are incorrect.
6. No response necessary.
7. No response necessary.

Mark Bickerton respectfully requests that the Commission find against the Defendant.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Bickerton

B

Mark Bickerton

346 Tennis Ave.
Glenside, PA 19038-1216



Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary

PA PUC

400 North St, 2nd Floor

Harrisburg PA 17120

Docket No. C-2016-250007

1712030202 0000

1712030202 0000