ORIGINAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HEARING

IN RE: HOUSE RESOLUTION 100, PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS (POST PUC) RATES, SERVICES AND OPERATIONS

KNOWLTON MANSION 8001 VERREE ROAD PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

THURSDAY, JANUARY 31, 2002, 10:55 A.M.

BEFORE:

HON. THOMAS GANNON, CHAIRMAN

HON. KEVIN BLAUM

HON. PATRICK BROWNE

HON. JOHN PALLONE

HON. JAMES ROEBUCK

ALSO PRESENT:

HON. GEORGE KENNEY HON. JOHN PERZEL

JEAN M. DAVIS, REPORTER NOTARY PUBLIC



ARCHIVE REPORTING SERVICE

2336 N. Second Street (717) 234-5922 Harrisburg, PA 17110 FAX (717) 234-6190

	I N D E X
WITNESS	PAGE
John Perzel	3
Thomas Knudsen	11
Craig White	37
Carol Pennington	9 2
Phillip Bertocci	9 9
Francis Redding	113
Betty-Ann Workman	126
Nancy Houston	140
Maria Dirkson	148
Michael DeVincent	150
James Royal	162
	John Perzel Thomas Knudsen Craig White Carol Pennington Phillip Bertocci Francis Redding Betty-Ann Workman Nancy Houston Maria Dirkson Michael DeVincent

CHAIRMAN GANNON: House Judiciary

Committee will come to order, please. Our witnesses will be speaking to you and the House of Representatives about House Resolution 100 to investigate energy cost in Pennsylvania as well as the operations of the Philadelphia Gas Works with respect to rates, services and operations.

Our first witness for today's hearing is the Honorable John Perzel, State Representative from the 172nd Legislative District, Philadelphia County, and the Majority Leader of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives.

Welcome, Representative Perzel. You may proceed when you are ready.

REPRESENTATIVE PERZEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to welcome you to the new 172nd Legislative District here in the great northeast. I would like to thank the committee for traveling to Philadelphia for this hearing. And thank you for allowing me and other citizens of the city of Philadelphia the opportunity to speak to you about the ongoing concerns with the Philadelphia Gas Works.

The high natural gas rates we experienced in Philadelphia have abated somewhat

since House Resolution 100 passed in March of last year. In fact, many of the things about the national natural gas market and about Philadelphia Gas Works have changed in recent months. At one PUC hearing I attended, one of the testifiers suggested that the Philadelphia Gas Works should change its customer service number to dial-a-prayer. At the time, it seemed like a reasonable solution to an overwhelming number of complaints about PGW service and its rates.

That no longer seems necessary, Mr.

Chairman. My district office staff reports that the number of complaints received about PGW and its operations have dropped significantly since last year. Customers now seem to be billed in a timely fashion and in a reasonably accurate manner. I am still getting complaints from customers who have specific problems with the Philadelphia Gas Works, but the volume of complaints about inaccurate or missing bills and the inability to directly contact PGW by telephone has decreased.

I want to commend PGW's management and the Public Utility Commission for working together to achieve improvements in customer service and responsiveness.

It required a change in the regulatory

structure for these improvements to occur.

1.5

Regulation is not a substitute for management, but regulation can set standards that management needs to meet. Placing the PGW under the Pennsylvania Utility Commission has meant that Philadelphia Gas Works is held to comparable standards with other utility companies across this state. It seems that the Philadelphia Gas Works' management and workforce has begun to respond positively to these challenges.

I want to recognize the improvement that has occurred, but I want the improvement to continue, and I continue to be concerned about the Philadelphia Gas Works. The PGW was not content to receive substantial increases in its gas cost rate last year. It filed and received an increase in the base rates. And, now, it is possible that PGW will be filing for another base rate increase.

Works' customers are still being asked to pay for the organization's mistakes. That's wrong. And it's time for PGW to become more accountable. I have supported and even led efforts to increase the accountability of the Philadelphia Gas Works.

Shifting PGW to state regulation and away from the

Philadelphia Gas Commission has made a big difference.

I pushed the PUC to perform a management audit of the Philadelphia Gas Works.

That audit identified many potential cost savings and efficiency improvements. I am concerned the progress that has been made remains at risk. That risk comes from the Philadelphia Gas Works' management being politically based rather than based on true accountability to its customers.

As PGW is currently structured, the mayor appoints all the members of the Board of Directors, which hires the management team for the gas works. City council approves the capital budget of the gas works, while the Philadelphia Gas Commission is responsible for approving the operating budget and reviewing the capital budget. No matter how much they mean well, they are set up in a prescription for disaster, a disaster that led us to put Philadelphia Gas Works under the PUC's Jurisdiction. The mayor's office knows this.

The report of the current mayor's transition team stated, and this is a quote, diffusion of responsibility has contributed to inaction in the face of poor decision-making at the

Philadelphia Gas Works and an obvious need for changes in the PGW management. That's the end of the quote.

The PUC understands that we need a different ownership and management structure for the Philadelphia Gas Works. That is clear from the management audit from a recent State Senate report. The Senate report went on to say: The current situation shifts responsibility and accountability, and it fails to provide clear direction of the expectations placed upon the Philadelphia Gas Works by both the city and the Philadelphia Gas Works' customers.

The PUC believed that the PGW should have retained independent, professional and experienced management for PGW by September 30, 2001. That still has not been done. It isn't that I have a personal quarrel or issues with the current management team who I believe are trying. But the system is wrong. It is the root cause for much of PGW's problems. It must be changed.

The system leads to crisis management, to short-term decision-making, to bad trade-offs that have political benefit for players within city government, to shifting responsibility and

eventually cover-ups. That cannot be fixed until fundamental changes are made in how the PGW functions and is governed.

I urge you to develop a strategy which will lead to a system that guarantees that the PGW customers come first. My constituents know that, for many years, they have not come first or second or third. We can't let this happen again.

At this point, thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

1 4

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,
Representative Perzel. Any questions?

Representative Perzel, I appreciate you giving us the insight and the views of the people you represent in this part of Philadelphia.

I'm sure its representative of the views of every citizen of Philadelphia with respect to some of the past history of Philadelphia Gas Works.

I can't help but comment that after

House Resolution 100 was produced that there were

some improvements. I would like to attribute that

to the resolution, but I believe there were some

things in the works prior to the introduction of the

resolution. And the members of the committee had an

opportunity to tour some of the gas works

1 facilities.

My observation, although I had not seen the facility prior to House Resolution 100, what was going on there, when the problems you referred to were at their height, but from an observation and speaking with some of the people down there, they informed me there seems to be an effort to make improvements. And the members from Philadelphia were at the tour and did indicate that the number of complaints that they were receiving were declining.

But, as you said, there is much, much more to be done. And the environment in which it's been operating from the start may not be the best for the type of progress that we would like to see and would like to see for the people of the city of Philadelphia. Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE PERZEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative Perzel, Representative Roebuck has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE ROEBUCK: I just want to ask one question if I could.

REPRESENTATIVE PERZEL: Sure. Go ahead.

REPRESENTATIVE ROEBUCK: Do you have 1 2 any specific kinds of suggestions? You talked about 3 the need for change. Do you have any specific suggestions in mind that might give us some guidance 4 5 as to where you see the process going? 6 REPRESENTATIVE PERZEL: Really, if you 7 think about the Philadelphia Gas Works, it is a function that should have been separated from the 8 9 city a long time ago. It is something that really 10 should have been run by private enterprise. 11 Right now their collections are 12 seriously backed up. Their income is not where it 13 should be because they've allowed collections to get 14 out of hand. A private enterprise would have never 15 allowed that to occur. 16 There were a number of management 17 audit programs identified that could save money, but 18 in the end the bottom line is it has to be run more 19 like a business. 20 REPRESENTATIVE ROEBUCK: Thank you. 21 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: 22 Representative Perzel, is the Philadelphia Gas Works 23 managed as an authority? 24 REPRESENTATIVE PERZEL: Basically, 25

like an authority, yes.

```
1
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: So it's the
     only authority in the Commonwealth that falls under
 2
     the PUC?
 3
 4
                   REPRESENTATIVE PERZEL: I don't know
                   It's the only gas company that didn't
 5
     that answer.
 6
     fall under the PUC the way it was priorly done.
 7
     we put it under the PUC. But if you look at as an
     authority, you're right.
 8
 9
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Do you know
10
     if there are other gas companies that are managed by
11
     government?
12
                   REPRESENTATIVE PERZEL:
                                            To my
13
     knowledge, no.
1 4
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Thank you.
15
                   REPRESENTATIVE PERZEL:
                                            Thank you.
16
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Our next witness is
17
     Mr. Craig White, Interim Chief Operating Officer,
     Philadelphia Gas Works; and Thomas Knudsen, Interim
18
19
     President and CEO, Philadelphia Gas Works.
20
                   Both Mr. White and Mr. Knudsen, you
2.1
     may proceed.
22
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
23
                 I want to thank you and the members of
     very much.
24
     the committee for having us today. I also want to
25
     thank you and several of you who had visited us
```

yesterday. We felt and feel that we have a story of progress to tell. And if you will bear with me, I'm not going to read from my testimony but I do want to summarize it for you. And then whatever questions you have, we'd be happy to answer.

2.0

PGW is a large enterprise. It's the largest municipally-owned gas utility in the country. It is the largest local distribution company in the state of Pennsylvania. We have over 6,000 miles of mains and services, services being the pipe from the street to the house. And it represents about 25 percent of the mains and services in the state. So this is an important facility for Philadelphia, and it's a very important facility for the region as well.

May I start off by saying that there is no question that we all acknowledge that PGW's history over the last decade has not been a great one. The deterioration in service is obviously that to which Representative Perzel referred. We had incorrect bills. We didn't answer appointments. People couldn't get through to us on the phone. All of those things have contributed to a reputation that the company now enjoys that we are desperately trying to change, and we hope that we are doing so.

Where there were issues that were operational in nature, we have done everything we can to fix them. Representative Perzel made reference to the management audit. We took that very seriously. I was very pleased with participation of the firm. It was a terrifically professional group, and I think we benefitted largely. We are implementing those recommendations at present.

Where we have had problems with issues of law and culpability, we have taken every appropriate action that this company can and that the administration can to make sure that there is regress where people have misappropriated things or misrepresented things. And, for those people, there is criminal action pending. We are seeking regress from them as well.

That to me, though, is the history. We have moved beyond that, and I think that's the story for today.

When I came in March of 2000, the mayor was adamant in his instructions that PGW be reformed. The first responsibility I had was to give him a six-point program of reform, and we immediately started to act on those points. They

were such things as correcting the billing system, getting the financial position of the company strengthened. We had questions obviously of customer service. All of those I have enumerated in my testimony for you to read.

In July of 2000, the oversight for PGW shifted from the city council and the Philadelphia Gas Commission to the Public Utility Commission in three particular areas. One is in customer service, the second is in safety, and the third is in rates or prices charged for our services. Very clear and very important to understand that the budgeting was specifically left in the law as being the responsibility of the Gas Commission and the city council. So we are in the position we are because that is what the law requires us to do.

With regard to our rates, there are two components. There's the gas cost rate which is strictly the commodity portion of our effort, and the other is called the base rate. I'm sure you are all aware that gas costs themselves, the commodity portion, went up 70 to 80 percent across the state last year. We were not exempt. We had three increments of increases last winter -- December.

January, February -- that raised our prices

substantially. We have had two reductions thus far and we are looking at a potential third reduction.

So there were three steps up and three steps down.

Now, I will grant that the steps down do not take us to the premarket conditions prior to last winter, but they are substantially lower than they were last year.

The base rate is really the different issue. Our base rate is what controls the fate of the company. The gas costs are passed through on a dollar-for-dollar basis. We make no money on the commodity itself. We do make our money on the base rate portion, and that's the portion that covers labor, it covers the interest, it covers depreciation it covers the normal cost of doing business.

The customers of Philadelphia had no base rate increase for ten years, from 1991 -- from 1992 to 2001. This is really quite extraordinary. In my prior professional life, I represented customer interests in public utility proceedings against the utilities. I have testified in proceedings almost for every utility in Pennsylvania. And the reason I'm here is because I represented the consumer advocate of Philadelphia in

proceedings against PGW.

2.4

The fact that there were no increases is one contributing aspect to the problem that we have right now. We needed to offset inflation, we needed to offset health care costs, we needed to offset labor costs, and that help did not come. There were no increases, as I say, over that period of time.

When I got there, it was very clear that we needed to raise the base rate. But the mayor was insistent, in fact adamant, that we fully justify whatever we were going to do and that he wanted to see the program.

The management committed to a \$25 million cost reduction program over a two and a half year period, and that represented about 25 percent of what I will call the discretionary or nonfixed cost portion of our base rate, which is about \$100 million. We have that underway. Part of the management audit benefits are tied in with that, and we are on schedule to meet that goal next year.

That cost reduction notwithstanding, we also had to then ask for the \$65 million of rate relief last year. Reluctantly so, I will tell you. The problem that we have -- let me come back to

1 | that.

We got about half of what we needed from the PUC. They saw fit to give us \$33.6 million. A lot of issues were raised as to whether we should have gotten even that. Some of the parties said, what have you done for customer service. Your customer service is lousy. You shouldn't get any money until you improve that.

I've prepared a series of exhibits for you. I hope you can see them. The first is what we call grade of service, which is the ability that PGW has to answer the phones and the PUC standard that's been assigned to us. Now, there are different standards for different companies as I now understand, which I didn't originally, is that we must answer 80 percent of our calls in 30 seconds.

Coming out of fixing the computer system last year, this was a priority that moved to the top of the heap. And, as you can tell, after a spring of developing systems and efforts, by July we implemented the program and by October we were consistently and remain consistently about the 80/30 level.

We are very pleased with this. I think the response -- or the comments of

Representative Perzel earlier indicated that his office and, as the chairman indicated, other offices are not getting the kind of problem calls that they did before, largely because people can get through.

And we now have a fully-trained staff, it's called a supervised staff, and fully-motivated staff to continue this program going forward.

What was most interesting is when we got into this, it was very clear that when you answer phone calls, you don't get more phone calls and that the volumes that we are dealing with are really about half of what they were last year. The rule of thumb that we developed and also determined was that for every missed call or every postponed call or lost call, you get three. So that we are now averaging about 4,000 calls a day. That still translates into almost 800 thousand to a million calls a year, but we are on top of that and able to respond.

And the inverse of the grade of service is what we call the abandonment rate. And as you can tell -- I'm sorry. The star up there is for the month of January. We abandoned 1.5 percent of the calls. That's well within the requirements of the PUC standard. I would only note, and I said

in my testimony, that we have a sister utility whose standard is only 70 percent of the calls in 30 seconds. So we have been challenged, and I think we have met that challenge.

1.5

The second criticism we got was on billing; too many incorrect bills, too many problems that weren't being answered. I will report here that our computer system is fixed. The software works. And we were not alone with the problems of the billing system. There were a number of very large utilities around us and in other states that put in billing systems who had equally the number of problems that we did. Somehow after a period of time we have stumbled forward and we are where we are. And I think we are in good shape to continue.

That is not to say that all of the billing problems are behind us. We have a number of unique aspects to our operation that other utilities don't. We have the highest percentage of customers who have the meters in the basement of their homes. Suburban systems have them outside. You realize what that constitutes in terms of an operational expense and an operational difficulty. We can't get into those homes to read meters because people aren't there anymore. The culture has changed, and

women are working. No one is home.

automatic meter reading system, and that involves trucks riding up and down the streets. The representatives who were with us yesterday saw an example of that. And they read the meters automatically, but that's not a fail-safe system either. We have people who don't want this device in their homes and essentially don't let us in. We are making every effort to get there.

But to the extent that they don't let us in and we have to estimate their bills, the computer system ultimately says we ain't going to estimate anymore. You've got to go out and read these meters. That's what the software requires from us. That's a phone call. That's a problem. We have 150,000 of our customers who live at or below 150 percent of the federal poverty level for a family of four. That is larger than the city of Harrisburg.

People have problems paying their bills. We then have to negotiate with them, get a payment agreement, keep them on that payment agreement. And when they fall off that payment agreement, that's a phone call, that's a problem.

That's a billing concern that we have.

2.0

We can have the software working. We can have everything working in our own shop, and yet there are a number of problems that come to us as a result of some of these other factors. We received \$31 million in LIHEAP and Crisis grants last year. It's a phenomenal number for us. We have 66,000 people who qualified for grants. We received 80,000 grants. But the information for those grants wasn't necessarily put in by PGW personnel. It was put in by social service agencies. It might have been put in by the state itself. We didn't have control over a lot of the data that was in the computer. Those generated errors, those generated phone calls and so forth.

We still have a long way to go to make this absolutely flawless. And we are dedicated to doing that. But I want to report that we have made substantial progress on the question of billings.

The third area, of course, was collections. Representative Perzel referred to it as a problem for us. I would only report that I think the numbers are larger as reported out than actually exist. I know at one point this committee heard or the General Assembly heard that we had \$300

million outstanding on paper. That is not the case. As of August, which was the end of our fiscal period, that number was about \$90 million. We would normally expect to have about \$50 million of receivables at the end of the year, simply because of the way businesses work. And particularly utilities, you provide service well in advance of when you get money.

We are going after that \$40 million very seriously this year, and we are going to get it.

As I said, with the computer system being fixed, we have just finished the last module that had to be put in place, and that is the collection module. Again, our collections are a very complicated process. For the low-income customers, we must notify them, we must send out a series of mailings, and then we must go visit them; very expensive, very complicated, but we are dedicated to doing that. That is the process that our tariffs allow us, and we are going to pursue that to the extent that we can within that constraint.

Representative Perzel made reference to the fact that we are now going to file for

additional rate relief. That is correct. One can easily ask why \$33.6 million was not enough. The difficulty that PGW has right now and the picture that I'm about to paint in the next few minutes is that we have absolutely been decimated by weather. This chart shows you coming through the '90s. Now, remember, we did not get rate relief any time during this period.

It shows you the declining margins in blue. Those were the profit margins, the surpluses. We were fine basically through the middle of the decade. Then the weather starts to turn against us. In '97/'98, '98/'99, '99/2000, last year was somewhat normal, and this year is the warmest winter season on record in Philadelphia. We have lost \$20 million since the middle of November, and we have to figure out how we are going to fill that hole in the meantime.

The combination of those red lines down there are the losses, and we had to finance those losses from our line of credit, our short-term debt, out credit card. As you can tell, with each successive year we borrowed more to stay alive.

Last year because of the runup in gas costs, we had to go to the city council and borrow an additional

 $1 \mid $45 \text{ million}.$

The \$33.6 million we've gotten makes us whole relative to the inflation, the cost increases and so forth during the 1990s. The additional amount that we asked for was to take care of this problem.

It was to help us dig ourselves out from the debt, not as a result of inefficiencies particularly. Yes, that was an element of that, but largely because of the weather patterns in the last four out of the five years.

What we plan to do is to request of the PUC -- and this is a mechanism that is accepted in other jurisdictions; New York and New Jersey specifically -- is a weather adjustment clause. What that allows us to do is to share the risks of warmer than normal weather with the customers when we're losing money, but also give it back to them when the weather is colder than normal, when we're making profits and we have more surplus.

That's our answer to this weather problem. We have got to stabilize the company, and this is really the only way. Without investors we have no equity. Without the ability to have a deep pocket to go to, this is our answer to that issue.

The first requirement then is that we get out of short-term debt. The difficulty is that over these last few years, we also have not had any money to finance our capital investments long term.

Now, we have an average capital requirement of about \$50 million. Year in, year out, that's the pipe in the ground. We have, as I say, 6,000 miles of pipe.

A lot of that is cast iron. A lot of that is 100-150 years old that has to be replaced. That budget and that capital requirement is relatively stable.

The problem is, as you see in the lower left-hand corner, in 1993, that was the last time we financed any of that capital from our own money. No one can do that. We all have to put a down payment on a house. We have to share in that burden in some way. We haven't been able to do that.

So, consequently, the last slide shows you -- and this is the reference that Representative Perzel made to our billion dollar debt -- between 1990 or so and 2000, our long-term debt went from \$600 million to tipping a billion dollars, for the reason that we had no money to contribute to the capital program. It was all funded from long-term

debt.

So this combination -- yes, there were inefficiencies, there's no question about that. But what really sunk PGW financially was this weather pattern four out of the last five years. That is why I'm going back to the PUC and ask for their indulgence and the indulgence of the customers to get us back on some reasonable plane.

I think that's necessary for the other purposes that Representative Perzel raised, and that is the administration is actively studying the sale of this company. It's pretty hard to sell this company given the economics of what you've just seen, in addition to which fact there is a 165-year history of PGW. We used to manufacture our gas in 22 sites around the city. That is what's called an unfunded liability. It adds to the billion dollars in terms of someone buying it, because someone is going to have to pay for the cleanup of some of those sites.

Now, they aren't as bad as some of the other utilities, because interestingly enough in the early years when gas was being manufactured, the by-products were sold so that nothing accumulated and a lot didn't sink into the ground, but we still

have the problem to deal with.

The other problem is that we have an unfunded liability with regard to what's called post-retirement benefits. A lot of private industries dealt with these years ago. We still have them. Those are health care benefits that are promised to people who are retired. We made no provision and had made no provision over the years to take care of that problem.

That's our story. I think we have done as much as I think this group of managers and employees could have done in the last 18 months since the PUC took over the regulation of the company. We are not stopping. We are continuing. I've got a list of ten major projects that have to be completed between now and the fall, culminating I hope in additional rate relief from the PUC.

We will continue to drive costs out of the company and out of the operations as best we can. But no matter what we do, our problems aren't in the millions. Our problems are in the tens of millions, and that's why another 5 percent increase in addition to the 5 percent we already got in terms of overall rates is what we require. Ten percent over a 12-year period, it seems to me, is not

```
unfair. It's well below the rate of inflation.
1
                   So thank you very much for listening
2
 3
     to my tale. And Craig and I are certainly available
     to answer whatever questions you may have.
 4
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      Thank you very much.
 5
     Ouestions from the committee members?
 6
 7
     Representative Kenney.
 8
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY:
                                            Thank you,
 9
     Chairman Gannon. Thank you for coming to
10
     Philadelphia.
11
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: He isn't a committee
12
     member, but we let him sit up here.
13
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: I have a list
14
     of questions. Mr. Knudsen, can you explain to the
15
     committee the management structure?
16
                                  The governance
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
17
     structure?
1.8
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: The governance
19
     structure.
20
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Yes. About six or eight
21
     months ago, CBS did a piece on the governance
22
     structure and me particularly. And they showed a V,
23
     and I was at the bottom of the V. And above there
24
     were about 30 or 35 people who literally in one way
25
     or another could pick up the phone and call me.
                                                       And
```

that included our own board, the PUC, the Gas

Commission, members of city council, the mayor's

staff. So that's the universe of folks who one way

or another have a concern and/or a voice in PGW.

2.4

The Gas Commission clearly oversees our budgeting. City council approves our capital budget. The mayor obviously is what we call the owner, so we respond to them very quickly. Who else did I leave out there? Oh, the PUC. Obviously, we now are dealing with the commissioners, their staffs and the various bureaus in Harrisburg.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: So if I understand it, we have all these players involved. So since 1992, the PGW doesn't ask for any rate increase until --

MR. KNUDSEN: 2001.

PUC steps in because some of us in the Legislature believe this company was driven into oblivion and destroyed the -- not you, but the structure has been driven -- you know, customer service and uncollected debt. You look at these numbers, so since 1992 this debt is rising.

MR. KNUDSEN: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: The same

structure exists today that existed in 1992, the governance issue?

1 4

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ KNUDSEN: Well, the governance other than the PUC was not in that structure at that time.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Well, I want to say thank God the PUC finally stepped in and did something.

MR. KNUDSEN: Let me respond.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: So you now come to the PUC and ask the same governance structure when you sat and watched this company -- I don't mean you, but they sat and watched this company go downhill. And now all of a sudden when the PUC takes over, they now come and ask for all these increases. I mean, is that accurate?

MR. KNUDSEN: It is accurate in its fact, but I don't think it's accurate necessarily in its interpretation. The issue I'll come back to.

You can't run an organization like this without some cost increases. The fact that they are postponed, that is regrettable. Frankly, my partner here and I use to fight opposite sides because I was a witness against the company for all of this time until 2000. I did, in fact, recommend rate increases during that

period of time.

1.5

The judgments were made not to do that, but the fact now that we are at the end of the decade and we need to do something I don't think is necessarily overly onerous to ratepayers, because I don't think it represents all that much of an increase in terms of the inflationary effect of the request.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: As a condition of receiving the \$20 million base rate increase, PUC management audit, which PGW agreed to hire an independent and experienced manager to run the gas works by September 30th, 2001?

MR. KNUDSEN: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: That hasn't been done?

MR. KNUDSEN: It has not. But that isn't to say that the administration -- the administration is actively and has been actively interviewing and recruiting top management. Here's the problem. If you have a situation like this where you have the pressures on the administration to consider a sale, when you have the issues of governance that have to get resolved relative to that sale, you don't have a lot of candidates who

are willing to step up and say I'm going to run the company. They want a contract, they want some sense of this thing is going to be around, that they're not going to be out looking for work again in a year.

So I need to be very clear that this is a terribly complex set of circumstances. The sale, the governance and the management are all linked depending upon how the thing starts to play out.

Now, I did talk with the mayor's chief of staff last night, and she is indicating to me that they are hoping that a lot of this will start to break up and get resolved in the not-too-distant future.

mentioning the sale. Let me ask you this. I represent in my district employees that work there, constituents that work there, and that's their question. Is it the intent -- I mean, from listening to you, it sounds like you are heading -- you're trying to get this company in a position to sell it. Is that your instructions?

MR. KNUDSEN: No, I don't have that instruction. My instructions are to get this

```
1
     company running well. The sale question this
 2
     management team has nothing to do with, no
     consultations as such, and that's appropriate.
 3
     charge is to get PGW working. Let me just -- the
 5
     administration has been pursuing this question for
                        They did retain Lehman Brothers
 6
     eight months now.
 7
     to do the study.
                   The issues that I referred to earlier,
 8
     the unfunded liability portions, are enormous issues
 9
10
     relative to a sale, because those represent
11
     liabilities that have to get resolved some way. And
12
     is that the city's responsibility or is it someone
13
     who takes the asset over? How does that work
14
     through? So a lot of what was anticipated to be a
1.5
     fairly simple problem has now turned quite complex.
16
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Do you know of
17
     any offers on the table to buy it?
18
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  I don't.
19
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: You mentioned
20
     the unfunded liability. Would that include the
21
     pension funds?
22
                                  The pension --
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
23
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: You mentioned
24
                The benefit package, will that be around?
     retirees.
25
                                  Another issue.
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                                  The
```

```
1
     pension was funded all along. We have 2,500
2
     retirees, and that's set aside. But that's the
     pension portion. What you also have is the health
 3
     care portion of the promises of employment. Those
 4
 5
     were never funded, so that's also part of this
 6
     financial workout that I'm struggling with right
           There's a tension here. How much can we ask
 7
     now.
     for in order to not put ourselves out of the
 8
 9
     marketplace?
10
                   Yet we need the money to address a
11
     number of these concerns in order to turn the
12
     company around either for sale, if that is
13
     ultimately what is desired, but certainly put it on
14
     an ongoing basis that's stable and we can live with.
15
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY:
                                            Let me just
16
     switch gears.
                    Those that don't pay their bills, the
17
     figure was how much?
18
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Well, you have to be --
19
     we have --
20
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Uncollectibles
     that are over, let's say, 90 days.
21
22
```

MR. KNUDSEN: We have substantial problems, there is no question. When I indicated to you we have 150,000 people, customers, at or below 150 percent of poverty, you can only imagine when

their bill went from \$700 or \$800 on an annual basis
in 2000 to \$1,300 or \$1,400 last year that they had
problems paying. That's what we are going back
after now.

People's bills have come down. Their volumes are way off this winter. We would hope to collect whatever portion of their income they have set aside for utilities, that we collect this year on that money.

More to your point, though, is that because of this confusion with the billing system and the problems that we had resolving those, we didn't have all the tools we needed last year, which was my first year of collection activity. We do have those now, and we are going to go after that money as carefully but as completely as we can.

Thas the year, we were inhibited from going after the money both by the PUC and by folks downtown, by the administration and city council, because we couldn't prove adequately and accurately enough the substance of our claim that these people owed us money. We don't have that problem this year.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: How much is

25 owed?

1 MR. KNUDSEN: Well, as I say, at the end of August about \$90 million was owed. Normally, 2 3 we would come out of August with about \$40 million 4 or \$50 million. So there was an additional \$40 5 million of receivables as a result of the weather and the runup in costs last year. All of that we're 6 7 going after this year. 8 REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: So you're 9 going after all that. Now, you had a program, I 10 guess, where your target was by zip code collection? 11 MR. KNUDSEN: I want to be real clear. 12 That was a prior manager. We do not do that. What 13 our program is, is that we try to figure out 1.4 collection programs that separate those with 15 agreements. That's a very proscribed process. 16 There are those without agreements. 17 For those without agreements, we do 18 not distinguish on a basis of income or locale. 19 print that out, and everybody gets on the phones and 2.0 attempts to collect that money. 21 REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: There is no 22 point where you did target collections? 23 MR. KNUDSEN: This management does not 24 target collections in the way you mean. 25 REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: I have no

```
1
     further questions.
 2
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      Thank you,
     Representative Kenney. Representative Browne.
 3
 4
                   REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE: Thank you, Mr.
                Thank you for your participation today.
 5
     Chairman.
 6
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  Thank you.
 7
                   REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE: Is there any
     private industrial gas utilities that you would --
 8
     of a similar size that would benchmark your
 9
10
     operation?
11
                   MR. WHITE: Washington Gas Light is an
     all gas utility. You have to be careful when you
12
13
     benchmark if you're benchmarking against a
14
     combination utility where many of the costs are
15
     dispersed and held at the corporate level, like
     PECO.
16
17
                   Years ago we used to compare ourselves
18
     to Boston Gas, Brooklyn Union which is about three
     times our size but, nevertheless, an inner city
19
20
     operation. But I would say at this juncture
21
     probably the best comparison would be against
22
     Washington Gas Light.
23
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Just identify
24
     yourself for the court reporter so it's on the
25
     record.
```

```
MR. WHITE: My name is Craig White.
1
     I'm the Acting Chief Operating Officer, Philadelphia
2
 3
     Gas Works.
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much.
 5
     Sorry for the interruption.
                   REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE: How does the
 6
     base rate that you are charging -- the rate request,
 7
     how does that compare against that?
 8
 9
                   MR. WHITE: Well, I can't give you the
10
     comparison against Washington Gas, but we have
11
     looked at other utilities in the state. And, of
12
     course, our rates are on the upper end, once we
13
     would file for this rate increase would be on the
14
     upper end of the rates in the state of Pennsylvania.
                                  That's one of the issues
15
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
16
     that this management is struggling with.
                                                It's what
17
     they elasticity, exactly how far can we drive the
18
     price up before people fall off the system or don't
19
     want to do business with us. So we're very
20
     sensitive to how this gets done now over the next
21
     little while.
22
                   REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE:
                                            Part of the
23
     reason why you are requesting the rate increase is
24
     -- partially because of issues with the product, but
25
     also partially with issues of cost structure.
```

MR. WHITE: If I could just stop you for a moment and clarify that. What we are asking for is a base rate increase. The base rate is separate and apart from the gas cost increase. Now, we are not asking for a gas cost increase. And to be more specific, last year the gas cost went up by \$230 million. We've already reduced it \$195 million.

We do have an advantage this year which should help us push rates down. We are talking about gas cost. It's not a snapshot that you have to consider. There's fixed costs associated with it, renting space and so forth, also the cost of gas that is put in storage. So we are benefiting from a lower cost, but not to the full extent because you have to buy gas at various points in time over the year.

But to get back to your point, the base rate is separate and apart, and strictly has to do with debt service labor.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE: How does that base rate -- how does that compare against a private benchmark?

MR. WHITE: Well, when I responded a moment ago, I was referring to the base rates. And

when you add in our gas costs, we have been historically one of the lowest in the state and have been applauded by both the PUC and witnesses for the public advocate for running a very good operation with respect to the purchase of natural gas and the dispatch of that gas. So the gas cost component has always been done and handled very well at PGW.

Where we are and where I answered before, where I responded before, I was responding to the fact that our base rate component, which includes impacts of this debt service, includes impacts of an inner city operating system and the costs associated with that. That was the base rate and that was the response that I was giving earlier, to the fact that we are one of the higher cost companies in the state.

MR. KNUDSEN: There are seven local distribution companies that are kind of within our -- against whom we're measured. We are close to the top on that. We understand that.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE: Other utilities that you compare yourself against that serve inner city communities?

MR. WHITE: No, we're really referring to the seven across the state of Pennsylvania.

When you compare us to Equitable Gas in Pittsburgh, they are also at the top of the range, so we are not talking about a situation where we are comparing ourselves -- when we look at those seven, we are comparing ourselves to both rural gas companies, like a Penn Fuels which serves parts of Delaware County and parts of Berks and so forth. We are comparing ourselves also to those companies as well as to the inner city utilities like Equitable and People's Gas of Pittsburgh.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative

Roebuck.

1.8

REPRESENTATIVE ROEBUCK: You referenced the problem in part as an inner city problem, part of economic conditions. I wonder, however, at least some of the complaints I get relate more broadly to landlords who don't pay gas bills and tenants are affected. What percentage is characterized as those who are in economic situations, economic disadvantage, and those who are just bad players, those who are either major whatevers who don't pay their gas bills or those that are landlords that don't pay the gas bills, that kind of situation?

MR. KNUDSEN: It is a hard question to answer. Let me phrase it this way. Several inner city companies who experience what's called bad debt or the provision for uncollectible accounts are in the 5 percent range. We are in the 7-8 percent range, so we are disadvantaged.

Now, to your question, a good number of those are folks who simply fall off the economic edge. They simply contract for their services and then can't pay for them. We try very hard to make sure that those people don't fall off the system.

In fact, this reference I had earlier to the \$31 million of LIHEAP, which you all very graciously made available for us, went a long way to keep that number down this last year. It would have been much higher were it not for the fact that we very aggressively went out and solicited these people. We have to ask them to participate in the program. We have to get out there and talk to these folks. It would have been much worse were it not for LIHEAP and Crisis.

This last year was particularly difficult because, as I say, rates went up so substantially that people's budgets, even if they could have paid it, if they wanted to pay it, they

didn't have the funds to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE ROEBUCK: So if I understand, the problem is almost exclusively the problem of those individuals who fought the economic age, not those who are just for whatever reason taking advantage of the system?

MR. KNUDSEN: I would say that. We haven't done that analysis specifically, and it's something that I would like to do so that we do understand exactly what the composition of the cost that we incur for folks who don't pay the bills.

REPRESENTATIVE ROEBUCK: If I could just ask one other question, and that is that given the nature of the market that you deal with, exclusively a Philadelphia market, what options are there to expand your service area so that you might bring in some more people? You seem to be producing product at a fairly good rate. You have wonderful facilities. As we saw yesterday, it suggests you have very good facilities to produce gas and store it and so forth. What options do you have to address part of this problem by the ability to expand the area that you service?

MR. WHITE: PGW is limited to the city of Philadelphia. In other words, we cannot install

distribution facilities in Montgomery County in
PECO's territory.

REPRESENTATIVE ROEBUCK: By statute or by PUC regulation?

MR. KNUDSEN: No, by statute.

MR. WHITE: As we mentioned yesterday during our tour, we do look for alternatives or we do look to maximize our assets in any way we can when our firm customers don't need those assets. We are very careful about establishing a mix of expenditures that meet our firm customers' requirements on those very cold days and those very cold winters, but we don't want to spend money that we don't need to spend. And, therefore, we do not reserve assets that are in excess of what we need for those firm customers.

However, when you have a warmer winter and you have opportunities to sell off system, you can use some of those assets that you reserve on behalf of the firm customers and you can make opportunity sales. And we avail ourselves of those opportunities. And any dollars we make in that arena, we flow directly back into the firm customer.

We have no shareholders. There's no sharing. If you go into any other investor-run

utility in the state of Pennsylvania, they have a sharing mechanism for any off-system sales and for most alternative business. In point of fact, they have set up unregulated affiliates to spin off and actually protect as much of that revenue stream as they possibly can.

We do not do that. We take 100 percent of any margin that we can generate through our assets and we roll it right back to the firm customers. And that includes the sale of gas to interruptible customers, which are larger duel fuel users in the city of Philadelphia. And 100 percent of the margin from those customers is used to support the items that we pointed out on these charts; debt service, labor and so forth.

REPRESENTATIVE ROEBUCK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative

Blaum.

1.5

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Knudsen, as president and CEO, you talked about the fee. PGW, that's managed by a public board?

MR. KNUDSEN: No, it's a nonprofit corporation called the Philadelphia Facilities

Management Corporation. And as Representative

```
Perzel observed, yes, the board is appointed by the
 1
 2
     mayor. It is a private nonprofit group.
 3
                   REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Appointed by
     the mayor and confirmed by --
 4
 5
                   MR. KNUDSEN: No, there's no
 6
     confirmation. It's just appointed by the mayor.
 7
                   REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: How many
     members?
 8
                   MR. KNUDSEN: We presently have six.
 9
10
     We're missing one member. Usually we have seven.
11
                   REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: As President
12
     and CEO of PGW, do you have the sole authority to
13
     hire and fire?
1 4
                   MR. KNUDSEN: I have the authority to
15
     hire and fire in the main, but there are clearly
16
     senior positions that, as anyone would, go to the
17
     board and in this instance to the mayor to say, you
18
     know, is this person acceptable. But, by and large,
19
     we do our own hiring and firing.
20
                   REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Thank you very
21
     much.
22
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative
     Pallone.
23
24
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Thank you,
25
     Mr. Chairman.
                    I try to simplify things for myself.
```

```
1
     I'm not always that smart. I think you said that
 2
     the bill comes from two components. One is the gas
 3
     cost which is based on the commodity price. While
     you may have reserves that you paid at a higher
 4
 5
     price, the ratepayer pays whatever that commodity
     price was?
 6
 7
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  That's correct.
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:
 8
                                             The second
 9
     piece is the base rate which is your cost to do
10
     business. If I'm understanding that properly,
11
     Philadelphia Gas Company went ten years without a
12
     rate increase?
13
                   MR. KNUDSEN: That's correct.
14
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: But you still
     incurred regular economic cost of living increases,
15
     whether it be collective bargaining agreements,
16
17
     maybe some utility rates that you pay, electric,
18
     water, whatever else that you use in your
19
     facilities. And you paid for that with fund balance
20
     or what in the corporate cycle would be retained
21
     earnings?
22
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Yes.
                                        By and large, we
23
     paid for it with fund balance or retained earnings,
24
     that's correct.
25
                                             So for ten
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:
```

years there was no rate increase but you, for lack of a better term, suffered increases in your cost of doing business?

1 1

MR. KNUDSEN: That's right. The profit margin -- we don't have a profit but I'll use that term. The profit margin kept shrinking throughout the decade. We knew that we needed a rate increase or at least some of the public parties knew that we needed a rate increase, but none came.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: My point is, is there in your industry or industry standard a fund balance or retained earning expectation? Is there a generally-accepted figure? If you do a million dollars worth of business, you should have \$10,000 in the fund balance? If you do a billion dollars worth of business, you should have a million dollars in the fund balance? Is there an industry standard?

MR. KNUDSEN: Let me turn it around. If this were an investor-owned utility, one would assume that we would have about 40 percent equity, something like that. On a billion dollars, let's say our assets would be \$400 million dollars, and you would be entitled to something on equity alone maybe 10 or 12 percent right now. I haven't done

```
1
     one of the rate cases for a long time. So you would
     look at somewhere between $40 million to $50 million
 2
     of surplus or profit that you would have expected to
 3
     get from the customers.
                               That's what an
 4
     investor-owned utility in very gross terms would
 5
 6
     attempt to get.
 7
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: My question
         What is the percentage of increase you are
 8
     is:
 9
     asking for with the PUC base rate? You want to go
10
     from what to what?
11
                   MR. KNUDSEN: You mean --
12
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: I am from the
13
     Pittsburgh area, not the Philadelphia area, so I'm
14
     not familiar with this company at all.
15
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  To answer that question,
16
     it would be about a 10 to 12 percent increase
17
     overall, based on our total costs.
18
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Have you
19
     extrapolated the figures more as an academic
20
     exercise to determine what your increases would have
21
     been had you had the agency or PGW done an annual
22
     increase in base price each year to cover normal
23
     operating costs annually instead of doing it in a
24
     decade?
```

MR. KNUDSEN:

We have not done that.

25

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: So you don't know if it would have been much longer?

1 4

MR. KNUDSEN: This would have been a very different picture. The red line which is the long term debt, which sort of track the blue line which is the investment, it might have been flat or just slightly increased. And we would tried very hard to -- it wouldn't have been flat, but it would have been somewhere between the horizontal and the blue line.

We look to fund -- we should be looking to fund about half of that \$50 million to \$60 million from our surplus. We should be throwing off \$25 million to \$30 million a year. The problem is from that first chart which was the blue, we didn't have that surplus to contribute to the long term, to offsetting this long-term investment.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Is it safe to say because you did not increase rates each of the last ten years?

MR. KNUDSEN: We didn't increase rates each of the last ten years, yes, and we had these kind of -- this disastrous experience with weather starting in 1997. The combination of those has lead to these problems.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: That's what I'm not clear on. If we enjoyed warmer winters and we used less gas, if your base rate is indicative of what your cost of doing business is, that cost would be flat whether you produced and/or delivered gas or not. The only thing that would change would be the amount of gas that's used and the amount that the ratepayer pays for the gas that they consume. Your gas lines and maintenance and upkeep would be the same whether you're pumping gas at a higher rate or not.

MR. KNUDSEN: That's exactly the issue. The rate is established assuming a normal weather pattern of what they call 4600 degree days. And that would assume a weather pattern right now where on the average the weather would in the 30s, the low 30s right now. We're not having that now.

Now, when we sell fewer units, we don't recover all of the costs that we need to recover, because it's predicated on a normal winter. So as soon as those volumes start to go down, that's a direct impact on the bottom line. So we don't have the profits. Now let's reverse it.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Your base rate is not a fixed cost at --

```
1
                   MR. KNUDSEN: No.
 2
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: -- $100 per
 3
     client and then add on to that, it's based on the
     volume or cubic feet of gas?
 5
                   MR. KNUDSEN: A portion of it is fixed
 6
     in the way you mean it. Regardless of what happens,
 7
     the customer has to pay a bill. For residential
     customers here, it's $12 a month. But beyond that,
 8
 9
     the difference then is a variable --
10
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: There's three
11
     components?
12
                   MR. KNUDSEN: There's three
13
     components. From your perspective, there's three
14
     components, that's right.
1.5
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Thank you.
16
     have no further questions.
17
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative
18
     Kenney.
19
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY:
                                            Mr. Knudsen,
20
     just to go back to the call center issue, do you not
21
     think calls -- you said that your calls are down?
22
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  Yes.
23
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: I think people
24
     -- probably customers just refuse to call any more.
25
     They're so tired of calling.
```

```
MR. KNUDSEN: Well, I invite them to
 1
 2
     call.
 3
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: How many calls
     does the PUC receive? Do you know? I don't know.
 4
 5
                   MR. KNUDSEN: You mean --
 6
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: When they call
 7
     me, I say call the PUC.
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Well, the PUC's volume
 8
 9
     of calls, which are either informal or formal
10
     complaints, have also dropped substantially. So
11
     that with people getting through in the last four to
12
     five to six months, all of these issues are getting
13
     resolved on a timely basis, and we don't have the
14
     same concern.
15
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY:
                                            Do you know
16
     the number?
17
                   MR. KNUDSEN: I can get you the
18
     number. As I say, I think we are doing about 4,000
19
     calls a day. That's 20,000 a week. That's about a
20
     million calls a year. Now, we were one and a half,
21
     almost two times that in years past.
22
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY:
                                            Representative
23
     Blaum made me think, because you know the story
24
     Philadelphians at least read in the paper about
25
     PGW's past management.
```

MR. KNUDSEN: Yes.

2.0

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: So when we say since 1995, \$800,000 in annual salaries and bonuses with three former managers; and \$1.4 million to move 26 employees around; has all that gone away I hope?

MR. KNUDSEN: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Managers and consultants --

MR. KNUDSEN: We have -- our -- let me turn it around. Our management payroll has gone down each of the last two years overall. But within that, that means both a reduction in absolute numbers of managers, but those managers then to whom we gave more responsibility or expanded their departments, they may have gotten an increase.

But we have a plan, and it's a model of compensation developed by the Hay Group, which is a consulting firm we've used to do this kind of thing. And we are always making sure that we are within the requirements of the studies that have been done about us and comparable industries -- or comparable companies. Our pay structure is based on an industry look. It's just not PGW.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: If I looked at the management salaries and bonuses in the last

couple years, would there be increases in those?

MR. KNUDSEN: Let me be very clear.

There are no bonuses. They were bonuses promised as a matter of contract to the prior -- the folks who

5 | are now in trouble.

MR. WHITE: Well, to be clear, there were three positions; the CEO, the CFO and the COO; the chief operating officer, the chief financial officer and the chief executive officer. During our last set of permanent management -- now, this predates both Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Hill. This goes back to the time when Mr. Hawes was the CEO, Mr. Martin was the COO, and Mr. Sharbutt was the CFO. And those gentlemen all had a contract with a bonus.

There is no such thing at PGW today.

Now, as far as managers at PGW, we have reduced managers, we have combined jobs. Yes, when we combine a job, when we ask an individual to take over not only the 400-person department that he's working in now but also another 400-person department and we don't change his title, but we change his salary, we change his salary in recognition of the added responsibility and the added work that we are asking this gentleman to do.

We have a lot of examples of that over

the last couple of years where we have combined positions, reduced staffing and promoted people through -- as a result of attrition. We do have a lot of retirees. When we have someone retire from a key position, we have to replace that position and we will provide them with an increase if it's someone from within.

MR. KNUDSEN: I think one of the most interesting statistics was in 1989 we had about 27,050 employees. We are down to 1,750 right now. That's about a \$60 million reduction in the labor bill over that period of time as well. And, again, I want to be real clear. The salaries that we are paying are in conformance with a plan that also has within it a comparison to comparable companies in the area. So that we are not giving people compensation packages -- really, it's not a package, it's a salary -- that is way out of line.

The other thing that's not understood very well, I think, relative to a municipal utility is that people who come to PGW gain skills, have market value. They can leave us, all right. So it isn't like a municipal entity which one assumes there's a certain amount of stability and people are going to stay with you. This is a business and

```
other businesses like us like our talent. In fact,
1
     we are a source of talent for other gas utilities in
 2
 3
     the tri-state area. We are constantly trying to
 4
     persuade our folks to stay. So that's another
     aspect of this compensation question.
 5
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: How many union
 6
 7
     employees do you have?
                   MR. KNUDSEN: We have about 1,400
 8
 9
     union employees.
10
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: How many
11
     nonunion?
12
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Thank you for making
13
     that distinction. We have about 350 nonunion.
14
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: You service
15
     how many customers?
16
                   MR. KNUDSEN: About 520,000 customers.
17
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: And if I
18
     looked at an industry standard, I could go to a
19
     single source utility that just gives gas. Is there
20
     anyone that we can compare PGW to?
21
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Here you get in trouble,
22
     because we are the only one who has 4BCF with an LNG
23
     tag. So that's another what, 75 people.
24
                   REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: I'm sorry,
25
     what was that?
```

MR. WHITE: If I could take that in another direction, we do not do the outsourcing that you would find at Equitable and People's. We have a no layoff clause for our union personnel. Other companies, if you live in Montgomery or Bucks County and PECO is putting a new main down the street and services, you will oft times recognize that those folks are not PECO employees. In most cases, PGW work is done by PGW employees, and we think that's a good thing.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: You understand the frustration of employees. When I'm standing at a basketball game talking to my neighbors that work at PGW, I mean, over the years that's why I'm asking, has that changed? We read the stories, whether it was three employees making \$800,000 or getting a million dollars in goodies for their home, that's what we read.

Then you hear about consultants doing this and the frustration of the men and women who work for PGW out there worrying about their job every day because they don't know where this company is headed. Because management -- and I'll say it -- has driven this company into -- it's a disgrace. They are sitting there wondering. Consultants doing

this and bringing in somebody to do that. They are frustrated, and I hear the frustration.

And Representative Pallone, I look at this, when you come sit there for ten years and do nothing, not you but the governance structure, and then appear at the PUC's door and say we need \$65 million, they look at the legislators and say why don't you write to the PUC and ask for \$65 million, not under the management structure that I have seen.

MR. KNUDSEN: I see.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: I think I reflect those men and women that work at PGW that are afraid for their jobs, but it's not their fault. It's the new structure. It's the governance structure. My fear is it will continue to be a governance structure, because the PUC says, hey, get somebody in charge to lead this company. It's so bad you're telling me you can't find somebody to lead the company.

MR. KNUDSEN: I can't go quite that far. I'm saying it's been difficult to do.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: What the PUC has -- one of the reasons we wanted the PUC so the public could see, we are giving you this increase and we want these conditions met in exchange for

that rate increase. So when we say here is money to help you get you back going forward, and say by September of 2000, please put somebody in leadership in that place.

1.3

2.0

And here I sit at the end of January 2002, you don't have anybody. There's nobody leading this place in the sense of what the PUC asks for. That's the frustration that I have and I think my constituents have.

MR. KNUDSEN: Let me just respond on the rate relief question. Had there been no shift to the PUC, this administration, this management, would have asked for from the Gas Commission the same amount of money. We have a requirement and a fiduciary responsibility to make sure that all of those bonds are serviced on a semiannual basis. We need the money to do that; otherwise, this place is insolvent.

And the problem -- and this is one of the most difficult messages for us to communicate to outside of Philadelphia, and that is that the general fund is not an equity investor in PGW.

There is no deep pocket into which we can reach and say because the weather is what it is, cough up 20 million bucks. There are no sources of funds like

```
that for us. So we have only the customers to go

to. The customers are the owners of PGW in effect.

And it is this relationship now that we have to

reestablish and go forward.
```

I am very sympathetic, Representative, to the frustrations. We are, and this group and the folks behind us, are committed to preserving this asset and preserving the 1,750 jobs we've got the responsibility for both developing and husbanding and preserving.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: The \$18 million, is the PGW still sending that \$18 million to the city general fund?

MR. KNUDSEN: That is by statute. We have to forward those funds to the city.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: I'm just asking.

MR. KNUDSEN: If you read the management audit, by the way -- this is a very interesting point -- they will say that that \$18 million is much less than the city is entitled to as an owner, whether you call it payment in lieu of taxes, whether you call it a dividend. The problem that we have right now and that the city is facing is that that \$18 million, plus the \$45 million that

we borrowed, they need that money back. It is part of the overall financing structure of the city.

They have a five-year plan. If they don't get our \$18 million, they're down practically a hundred million dollars in their plan for that five-year period.

So as far as this management is concerned, we have no choice but to meet the requirements of the law which is to forward \$18 million to the city on an annual basis.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,
Representative Kenney. I'm still having some
difficulty understanding. I think Representative
Pallone brought out some good issues about these two
ways that -- the two elements that come into play
what to charge the customer, the cost pass through
of the natural gas that you sell and then your
operating other costs that are part of your base
rate.

I keep on thinking of the analogy of the two brothers that wanted to start a business of selling watermelons off the back of a truck. They went down to the food distribution center, bought

the watermelons for a dollar, drove up here to the boulevard, sold them off the back of the truck at a dollar a piece. And at the end of the day they said, we are not making any money, what are we going to do? They said, we will have to get more watermelons.

So just give me --

MR. KNUDSEN: To use your analogy, our watermelons are our gas, and their time in that truck and that gasoline is the base rate portion and their profit. So they should have charged the four things in addition to the buck, so they should have charged \$1.50 for the watermelons.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: I recognize that, there's the cost of insurance and other things that come into play. But what I don't -- and I think Representative Pallone asked the question. I'm not so sure I understood the answer, that it doesn't really matter what the cost of the gas is if you are selling it for whatever you are buying it for. That rate can go up or down, so your money is made on the base rate.

MR. KNUDSEN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: That could be

25 relatively flat based on activity. So figuring when

the weather is warm like this, people aren't firing
up their heaters, they're still cooking, whatever.

That operating expense should be probably lower
than --

2.0

- MR. KNUDSEN: But not for us. For the customer, the customer is benefiting substantially right now because they are using less gas. And as Mr. White has just said, the cost of that commodity is down. So there's fewer watermelons and they are cheaper.
- The issue for us is -- and I'll come back to the Representative's point -- if we only charge -- if we could charge a monthly charge of \$100 is his example, that recovered all of the fixed costs or the base rate kind of costs, we wouldn't care about the weather because we would be recovering everything we have that we need to recover for. The problem is that only a portion of our base rate is fixed on a monthly basis and has only recently gone from \$8 to \$12.
- CHAIRMAN GANNON: If I could interrupt. What I'm hearing is that -- I'm not sure I understood this -- is that the base rate is somehow tied in with the amount of gas that you sell?

1 MR. KNUDSEN: Sure. 2 CHAIRMAN GANNON: So if the volume of gas that you sell goes down, your base rate goes 3 down but those costs remain? 4 MR. KNUDSEN: That's right. 5 The revenue goes down as a function of the volumes that 6 7 go through the system. 8 CHAIRMAN GANNON: That's the third 9 component, I guess, that's coming into play. 10 even though you have a base rate that's supposed to 1 1 recover those costs plus a little extra, because the 12 volume of gas is going down, actually revenues being 13 generated by that are actually lower than your 14 costs? 15 MR. KNUDSEN: That's right, and the 16 costs stay at the higher level. 17 CHAIRMAN GANNON: That's what I didn't 18 understand. What is being done internally within 19 the company right now to improve your collections? 2.0 What are you doing nuts and bolts, what are you 21 actually doing here? MR. WHITE: Well, what we are planning 22 23 to do, as Mr. Knudsen said, our billing system has 24 stabilized. And we have, as a result of last winter 25 and as a result of the runup in gas prices and as a

result of the fact that the billing system was unstable at that point and there was a reluctance of the owner to allow us to move forward, and as Mr. Knudsen said, various members of city council to move forward with the shutoff policy without the assurance that the statistics backing it up are correct, we obviously allowed this amount of uncollectible to grow.

1.5

Moving forward, we are going to provide for collection strategies that will be year-round strategies. Before we get out of the moratorium season -- and as you may or may not know, we have a winter moratorium. We do not have the ability to shut off residential or human needs customers. However, we are going after commercial customers that are in arrears.

But, nevertheless, the ones that are -- customers that are residential or human needs customers, we don't have the ability to turn off gas until the end of the moratorium or April 1st. So what we are doing, we are preparing the context and to put the process in place that is required by tariff. So that when we get to April 1, we're at a position where we have already done the notice period and so forth. And we'll continue that on

1 well through the year. CHAIRMAN GANNON: And this is 2 3 something different than was done prior? MR. KNUDSEN: The problem is this, 4 with the billing system having been what it was for 5 two plus years, we weren't able to effectively 6 7 collect. Now we can and now we are going to. 8 CHAIRMAN GANNON: This is a two-prong 9 What other types of services can you question. 10 provide? Other than selling to your retail 11 customers and your business customers here in 12 Philadelphia, what other types of services could you 13 provide to generate revenue? And would you need any 14 statutory authority whether by ordinance or by the 15 Legislature to be able to provide those services to 16 generate other money other than directly from your 17 own retail and business customers? 18 MR. WHITE: Certainly. As I touched 19 on earlier, we have assets that meet our firm 20 customer requirements, but some of those assets 21 could be further maximized. And, as an example, we 22 have an LNG facility that we fill currently in the 23 summer. 24 CHAIRMAN GANNON: What is an LNG 25 facility?

MR. WHITE: Oh, I'm sorry. That is a liquefied natural gas facility. And what we, in essence, do is we take gas off of the interstate pipelines. We reduce the temperature of that gas to 268 degrees below zero, and we actually put the gas in a liquid state. And, by doing that, we actually can store 860 times the volume of gas in one cubic foot. So, in other words, if it's in a gaseous state and you reduce it to a liquid state, you've got 860 times more available to you, which we then turn into a gaseous state in the winter for our customers' use.

That's liquefied natural gas. It's gas turned into a liquid, turned back into a vapor in the winter operating season. PGW has a facility that's got 4 billion cubic feet, and that facility is located over in the Richmond section of Philadelphia. It's been there and operational since 1969. We are in the process at this time of replacing one of the components of that facility, and that is the component that actually turns the gas into a liquid state.

That new facility will allow us to liquefy gas not only in the summer, but it will allow us to liquefy gas year-round. So if we have

warm periods of time in the early part of the winter, we can liquefy that gas. And if we have more gas in storage, we may be able to generate additional revenues. This is one additional revenue stream.

1.5

Other things that we are looking at that are much more speculative are the possibility of shipping LNG up the Delaware River, from the Delaware Bay up the Delaware River, and off-loading it into our facility. We could fill the facility two-thirds of the way up in 24 hours. Right now it takes 214 days to fill that facility. So by having the ability to ship gas to that facility, we could turn that facility or use that natural gas to make money through the year. So there are opportunities that we are investigating at all times.

In addition to that electric generation, we have been contacted on numerous fronts by companies that were interested in siting a natural gas-fired generating facility in the city of Philadelphia. They coordinate that with the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation, PIDC, and there's certain lots in the city of Philadelphia that are available that have various tax advantages and so forth.

We work with these people to encourage 1 them to come into the city of Philadelphia. One of 2 3 these facilities would really turn our load around if we could encourage them into the city of 4 5 Those types of opportunities are out Philadelphia. 6 there. We're pursuing them. There's a lot of 7 components to the success of those facilities. to answer your initial question, is there anything 8 9 that this particular committee could do, offhand I 10 can't come up with a specific direction that you 11 could help us out with. 12 MR. KNUDSEN: But we'll think about 13 it. 14 MR. WHITE: We'll certainly give it 15 some additional thought. 16 CHAIRMAN GANNON: I just came across 17 this information -- I don't know whether it's 18 accurate or not -- last evening. I was talking to 19 one of my constituents who works in the 20 transportation business. And he told me that there 21 was -- I believe it's on Tangier Island in the 22 Chesapeake Bay, a liquid gas facility. Does that 23 ring a bell in the Chesapeake Bay? 24 MR. WHITE: He might be referring to

the Williams Company's Cove Point liquefied natural

25

1 gas facility. 2 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Maybe that's what it 3 Is that located on Tangier Island? is. MR. WHITE: I'm not quite sure if it's 5 on Tangier Island. CHAIRMAN GANNON: He seemed to 6 7 indicate that that was not operating. Is that true? 8 MR. WHITE: That facility has recently 9 been purchased by Williams, and they're trying to 10 get the approvals from the Federal Energy Regulatory 11 Commission to continue to operate or to restart that 12 facility. That facility will be handled much like 13 the Distra Gas Facility in Boston. The Distra Gas 14 Facility in Boston, they are about the same size as 15 PGW's facility, and they turn over the inventory 40 16 times a year with ship deliveries from Algiers and 17 some other middle eastern countries. 18 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Algiers. But you 19 can't do that right now with the facility that you 20 have the way it's configured? 21 MR. WHITE: We can't off-load ships at 22 PGW's facilities, so we can't take in LNG from other 2.3 countries. What we do to fill our LNG facility is 24 strictly take gas off of the interstate pipelines, 25 and that gas is coming from the producing regions in

```
1
     Louisiana and Texas onshore and offshore.
 2
                   So all the gas that we buy currently
 3
     is domestic and it's being moved to Philadelphia
     within two interstate pipelines which we reserve
 5
     space in and we liquefy that gas.
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: My point was
 6
 7
     wouldn't it be beneficial or could you get involved
     in that shipping aspect of it? You just can't do it
 8
 9
     because of --
10
                   MR. WHITE: We don't have the
11
     authority to do that presently, but we have been
12
     approached by individuals that are discussing those
13
     issues with us. So we will continue to discuss
14
     those along with -- we'll interact with the city and
15
     the owner on that particular issue.
16
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      So that you are
17
     looking at that and it's not something restricted by
18
     law, it's just a matter --
19
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                We are exploring all of
     those options.
20
                     There may, in fact, be legal
21
     impediments but we aren't there yet.
22
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      That's what I was
23
     getting to.
24
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Now, if what you're
```

suggesting is we come to you for help when we get to

25

```
1
     that point, maybe that's --
 2
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: That's exactly what
     I was thinking. If you needed that kind of help
 3
 4
     from us, then that would help generate your other
 5
     revenue. Because from what you're telling me is the
 6
     more gas you sell, no matter what the weather is,
 7
     that keeps that relationship between your operating
 8
     expenses and your revenues.
 9
                   Just a comment, gas generating
10
     stations, particularly those that use gas during the
11
     summer, if they're using gas supplied by PGW, your
12
     volume of sales go up, even if your residential
13
     sales are flat?
14
                   MR. WHITE: That's correct.
1.5
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  The whole idea of
16
     distributed generation, which is what you are
17
     referring to, electric generation and/or gas summer
1.8
     air conditioning, those are two things that would
1.9
     help us out enormously.
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Are you permitted to
20
21
     borrow money from your pension fund?
22
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  No.
23
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: You talked about the
24
     governance structure, and I was not fully aware of
25
     this.
            But is that presently the way that exists
```

right now, with the mayor and his staff, city council, the Gas Commission, the PUC and then this nonprofit corporation, all pointing on top of your head, is that the way it is currently?

MR. KNUDSEN: And the Gas Commission, that is correct, that is the structure right now.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: It seems to me that that makes your job extremely difficult. Somebody calls up and says I'm the secretary to so and so and I've got a nephew at such and such a place and I want you to go out there tomorrow and fix that problem.

MR. KNUDSEN: It ain't easy. As I have tried to indicate or I have indicated in my testimony, this is a legal structure. Unless that's changed, we live with that. And we have come to understand the rules and how one does these things, and we attempt to meet the needs of all of the groups. Were it more simple, my job would be more simple. But that's not what I'm getting paid for.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: I'm not asking to note your job isn't too easy. Respond to policy. You are more from the technical administrative management. But it seems strange to me that you have a Gas Commission and then you have this

nonprofit corporation which owns this company. It doesn't seem to make sense to me that you have these two entities, so to speak.

MR. KNUDSEN: Let's be real clear.

Prior to the move to the PUC, the Philadelphia Gas

Commission had a similar slate of responsibilities.

They had to look at safety. They were responsible

for customer service. They were responsible for

rates. They were responsible, in addition, where

the PUC is not involved on an annual basis, the Gas

Commission is our budgeting vehicle. We would have

a budgeting requirement with the city anyhow as a

municipal entity.

PUC took customer service rates and safety. It still left the budgeting question. And as a city entity, there is a requirement in our management agreement that the budgets be evaluated outside of the structure of PGW. So that's why we are where we are right now.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: With respect to rate increases and request for rate increases or adjustments, logistically how does that occur? Does the nonprofit corporation, or do you go to the nonprofit corporation and say, we need X number of

```
1
     dollars, we need a rate increase, and they go to the
 2
     Gas Commission?
                   MR. KNUDSEN: No, no. They are our
 3
     Board of Directors. What we will do, like any other
 4
     -- if we were an investor-owned utility, we would do
 5
 6
     the same thing. We would go with a plan, a
 7
     financial plan, that says here is our requirement,
     here are the deficits we need to fill or whatever,
 8
 9
     here is the amount of rate request that management
10
     is recommending. The board then gives its approval,
11
     and then the board is out of the picture.
12
     Management then prepares the filing and that then
13
     goes to the PUC.
14
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: The Board of
15
     Directors has to approve that?
16
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  That's correct.
17
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Then the next step
18
     is for the Gas Commission prior to the PUC becoming
19
     involved?
20
                   MR. KNUDSEN: No, the Gas Commission
21
     does not get involved in that aspect. The Gas
22
     Commission only gets involved in establishing the
23
     budgets for PGW once a year.
24
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: I'm talking about
25
     prior to the PUC.
```

```
1
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Oh, yes, prior to the
 2
           Then it would have gone to -- the filing would
     not have gone to the PUC as it does now.
     have gone to the Gas Commission.
 4
 5
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: The Gas Commission,
 6
     how many people?
 7
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  There are five.
                                                   There
     are two appointments from the mayor, two
 8
 9
     appointments from city council and the city
10
     controller's representative.
11
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: So essentially the
     city of Philadelphia would have to approve or
12
13
     disapprove?
14
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  That's correct.
15
                    CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      Do you know, say, up
16
     until 1992, up until the time that the PUC took over
17
     that function, how many requests were made or were
18
     there any requests made?
19
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  There were no formal
20
     requests for a rate increase placed before the Gas
21
     Commission in that period of time.
2.2
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Could the Gas
23
     Commission on its own after -- I'm sure there's a
24
     lot of interaction. The Gas Commission is only
25
     responsible for one utility in the whole world and
```

that is the Philadelphia Gas Works. Did they on
their own come down and say, you guys need some more
money?

2.3

MR. KNUDSEN: I'm not clear on that question. I can get back to you with that. My sense was that we couldn't, that the Gas Commission could not do that on its own initiative. I will get back to you on that.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: I don't understand that with the PUC, because the PUC oversees all of the utilities in Pennsylvania; telephone service, water service, electricity and gas. It just struck me that you have this one entity which is so closely interrelated with the city which owns your utility.

MR. KNUDSEN: I'll get back to you on that.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Don't misunderstand me. I'm not trying to politicize it. I'm just trying to figure out what was going on here.

One of the things, too, I notice in the charts, I'll go back to July, particularly with the service responses, which is where a lot of criticism was coming with respect to telephone service. Back in July, at least in the charts, look pretty bad in terms of the calls that were lost,

abandoned, and the response time and all that. 1 Then there is pretty dramatic improvements. Is that when 2 3 you came on board? MR. KNUDSEN: No. 5 CHAIRMAN GANNON: I'm trying to give 6 you credit for this. 7 MR. KNUDSEN: I'll take it anyhow. No, the issue that we had was -- and one of our 8 9 officers has likened PGW to a 165-year-old house 10 with a lot of rooms and you could only go room to The issue of the call center had to wait 11 room. 12 until we got the billing system repaired. 13 As of last December -- and we had been 14 at it almost a year then to repair the billing 15 system. As of last December, I was comfortable that it was time to really look at the call center and 16 17 customer service situation with much more intent. 18 We then put together a program of development of the 19 change over the spring and then implemented it in 20 July. And then the thing took off. 21 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Well, getting back 22 to my original thought, and that is I see a big mess 23 in July and then there's improvement. Then October 24 seemed to be a benchmark month.

MR. KNUDSEN:

Yes.

25

CHAIRMAN GANNON: It seemed like a couple of things happened. A big improvement, but then there was a spike where there was a big falloff which occurred over a matter of a day or so.

MR. KNUDSEN: Right.

2.0

CHAIRMAN GANNON: I have been told that that was -- we have like a -- there's a couple of things that happened. I'm talking about the cold spike.

MR. KNUDSEN: Right.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: We had a cold spike in the weather. And that when that happens, a lot of people try to avoid that cost, so that's the day they turn on their heater and that's the day they find out it doesn't work. Then you can see in October --

MR. KNUDSEN: October the 1st.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Now, that's the explanation. Then all of a sudden it goes up, a little fluctuation, now we have relatively warm weather. What have you done in terms of or do you know what would happen, let's suppose tomorrow the temperature drops to 15 degrees and all of a sudden people are cranking up the heater again. Would we see another big spike like that, or do you have

built into the system so that -- that those anticipated -- that heavy quality period, where people are all of a sudden are excited about heating their house, that we won't see a spike quite like that?

MR. KNUDSEN: I will go on record as saying you won't see a spike like that. That
October 1st was two things. It was the first really cold day. We call it linoleum day when people's feet hit the ground in the morning and they run for the thermostat. There was also the issue of our ability under the old collective bargaining agreement which expired on that day to not dispatch people freely who had similar abilities to handle phone calls.

What you see there, the dips that you see are Mondays. That's when people call. We've been able to address the Monday problem by invoking the flexibility clauses in the collective bargaining agreement that allow us to put people with similar abilities on this problem alone for a concentrated period of time, a couple hours. We don't need them much more than that. And then they go back and do what they did before, whether it was in the district offices which we can remotely deal with in terms of

the phone system, or whether it was in our collections department which also we don't need to move physically around. We just need to be able to dispatch people within the phone system.

So being able to do that, we have been able to eliminate those Monday dips. To answer your question, if we got a very cold day, it is likely that we would get a volume of calls that would drop that down. I would hope not down to 0, but probably maybe in the 50 or 60 range.

But here's the issue. Our requirement is that we average 80 percent of the calls in 30 seconds. So even if we have a dip on a day like that, under the standard we are allowed to essentially average that into our overall performance.

The interesting thing is that once you've addressed that sort of spike requirement, then it normalizes off over the rest of the week.

You can see if you follow the days there, as you go through the week it gets lighter and lighter.

MR. WHITE: And, certainly, we track the weather forecast.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Okay.

MR. KNUDSEN: Yes. We are ready to

```
dispatch people depending upon what the weather
1
 2
     forecast is.
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: My understanding is
 3
     you have two types of calls. One is a service call,
 4
     a routine call; the other being an emergency where
 5
     somebody senses some potential danger with a gas
 6
 7
     leak, for instance.
 8
                   MR. KNUDSEN: There's three.
                                                  Then
     there are the billing issues as well.
 9
10
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: What is your average
11
     percentages right now as of today, do you know that?
12
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  Yes.
                                        Right in the heavy
13
     months of repair requirement, which is like November
14
     through January, the service is about 30 percent of
1.5
     the calls. The rest of the year, February and March
16
     through the fall, it tends to drop to about 12
17
     percent.
18
                   So then the inverse of that is the
19
     billing, 70 going up to 88 percent. The emergencies
20
     tend to be fairly constant, and they are 300 to 400
21
     calls a day.
22
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      Now, what is your
23
     percentage on your response time? I understand you
24
     have a 30-second response time?
```

MR. KNUDSEN: The emergencies we must

25

```
respond to in 10 seconds, and we are within standard
 1
 2
     on that. And the remaining calls, all of them,
 3
     whether they are service or billing, we must respond
 4
     to 80 percent of them in 30 seconds.
 5
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: What is the
 6
     percentage on that, on those two different types of
 7
     calls, the response time?
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Why don't you answer
 8
 9
     that because you have the data.
10
                   MR. WHITE: Certainly. At the present
11
     time, we're answering the phone in 5 to 6 seconds
12
     after a customer makes his or her decision as to
13
     whether they are calling on a billing or service
     call. If they call on our emergency split, the
14
15
     standard there is 10 seconds. It's not 30 seconds.
16
     And we are doing better than 98 percent of the calls
17
     that we get in that 10-second time frame.
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: You are answering --
18
19
     98 percent of the time you are answering those
20
     emergency calls within 10 seconds?
21
                   MR. WHITE:
                                Yes.
22
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: What about the other
23
     calls?
24
                   MR. WHITE: The other calls, we want
25
     to manage to 80 percent. We have an 80 percent
```

```
1
     standard. If we're answering 99 percent of the
     calls in 30 seconds or less, the chances are we have
 2
 3
     people that are sitting around without a full plate
     of work to do. So what we're trying to do is we
 4
     want to manage to the 80 percent. So if we find
 5
 6
     that we have staffing that is pushing up the
 7
     percentage of calls well beyond the 80 percent, we
     want to get that staffing back on to other
 8
 9
     functional responsibilities; for instance,
10
     collection or work in the district office, whatever
     group we have drawn from.
11
12
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: What is the
     percentage average right now? Where are you with
13
14
     respect to that 80 percent?
15
                   MR. KNUDSEN: What does that show?
16
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      89 percent.
17
                   MR. KNUDSEN: 89 percent, that's the
18
     January summary numbers.
19
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      That's probably a
20
     little higher?
21
                   MR. KNUDSEN: That's right, because
22
     that's a cost. That difference between 80 and 89 is
23
     a cost of people not being fully deployed.
24
     want to do now is whatever billing problems --
25
     remember, these are experts of bills. We can bring
```

```
other billing problems to them to resolve while
 1
 2
     they're waiting for the call to come.
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Prior to, let's say,
 3
 4
     back in July and August, what were those
 5
     percentages?
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Well, 0 to 1 or 2 or 3
 6
 7
     percent.
 8
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: So you were --
 9
                   MR. KNUDSEN: We were abandoning 40
10
     percent of our calls. The next slide would show you
11
     we're abandoning less than 1 percent or 1 percent.
12
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: It would seem to me
13
     it was pretty dismal back prior to August of 2000.
14
                   MR. KNUDSEN: There's no question.
1.5
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      Now you are at 89,
16
     less than 2 percent of the calls abandoned. And
17
     abandoned, as I understand it, and correct me if I'm
18
     wrong, it wasn't that you abandoned calls, it was
19
     just that the customer hung up before --
20
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Before a representative
21
     picked up. They made their choice, what they
22
     wanted, but they hung up before the person could
23
     answer.
24
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: And that could be
25
     for any number of reasons?
```

Yes. 1 MR. KNUDSEN: 2 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Including they just 3 felt they waited too long. MR. KNUDSEN: By and large not. Ιf 5 you're waiting -- what we found is that people will 6 wait 5 or 10 or 15 seconds once they've made their 7 selection. They won't go anything more than that. What we're sort of confused about is why you would 8 9 hang up in 5 seconds unless the baby was crying. 10 I had heard that CHAIRMAN GANNON: 11 what was frequently happening -- what did not happen 12 infrequent was that a person would want a service 13 call; for example, they might want their heater 14 started, they were having trouble with their heater. 15 They would call and say, you know, I think I smell 16 gas which then goes into an emergency call. 17 somebody would be diverted, run out to that 18 residence, and the person would then utilize that 19 situation to do what they really wanted to do. Ιs 20 Did that happen? How do you handle that that true? 21 type of situation today? 22 MR. WHITE: In point of fact, that did 23 happen, and it happened more as a frustration issue 24 for our customers. Because they couldn't get 25 through on the service line, they chose to call

through the emergency line and basically gain the system. Obviously through the improvement in the response time, in the call response time, we have reduced those situations where the system is being gained.

Mowever, when it does happen and our man is dispatched, we always dispatch a service technician on an emergency call. If the individual gets out there and uses their discretion -- and these are experienced technicians. They get out there and the customer says, well, I really didn't want you out here for an emergency, I just have a problem with my range. Basically, what we'll do in that instance is tag the range and inform the customer they can call back through the service line and arrange an appointment.

The problem for that is it's a problem for the customer and it's a problem for us. The customer didn't get through on the service line previously and used this technique, and this technique costs us a number of visits to get the same single visit issue addressed.

Now that we have reduced this number, it's saving the company money and it's also, due to the fact that the customer can get through to us on

the phone, the customer doesn't have to use these types of actions to get a response from PGW.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Just another clarification. Representative Roebuck's not here. He had discussed something that his constituents had complained about, an experience they were having, and I guess maybe some of the other Philadelphia members too, where the customer would have some type of a contract, a service contract, with your organization. And then they would have a service call and they would be charged some type of \$50 fee, even though they had a service contract. What was happening there with that type of situation?

MR. WHITE: We have what we call a parts and labor plan. It's an insurance plan. We typically have about 110,000 people on that plan. This year we have about 85,000 people on the plan. We got a late start. We obviously couldn't put the plan out until we knew we had a labor agreement. We actually didn't initiate the plan until after the October 2nd time frame. Typically, we would have already had a mailing out well in advance of October 2nd, and we would have followed up with a second mailing. So that did hurt our participation this year.

But, nevertheless, if a customer has a parts and labor plan and it covers -- for instance, one of our parts and labor plans and our most popular plan is heater/water heater combination.

It's an \$89 plan. They call us and we get out there and it's to fix their range. Well, their range isn't covered under the plan. Our first 45 minutes on the job is a \$50 service fee. That would be an instance that I believe that that would occur.

If the person has a parts and labor plan and we're out there to fix a particular range or a particular piece of equipment that is under that parts and labor plan, they are not going to get charged.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: I have no further questions. Any questions from any other members? Representative Blaum.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Mr. Knudsen, you mentioned earlier that you used to testify against this committee. And you were a consumer advocate of some sort?

MR. KNUDSEN: I am a financial expert, and I was retained by the Office of Consumer Advocate in Harrisburg for other utilities in Pennsylvania. But I was retained by the Consumer

Advocate of Philadelphia for the Philadelphia Gas
Works, and I started doing that in 1986.

1.3

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: You mentioned that the previous group had some difficulties. When were you brought in, and were you brought in as some type of reform movement?

MR. KNUDSEN: Yes. I was brought in at the time of the change of administration. I was part of an advisory to a transition effort, and the mayor then decided that he would keep me on in a financial capacity at the time. He also brought over the water commissioner, who is a man with great respect within the city of Philadelphia, in order to send a signal that things were going to be different.

And as I indicated to you in my comments earlier, the first thing he asked was I want a six-point program for reform. And we immediately started down that inventory of concerns, and that then led into some of the early stuff with the PUC when the PUC stepped into the picture in July of that year. But we were already underway three or four months before then.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: I see. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

```
CHAIRMAN GANNON: Well, I want to
 1
 2
     thank you very much, Mr, White and Mr. Knudsen, for
 3
     testifying before the committee and taking
     additional time to answer questions.
 4
 5
                   MR. KNUDSEN: Mr. Chairman, thank you
     very much. We would certainly like to invite all
 6
 7
     the members who didn't take the tour yesterday to
 8
     come see us again.
 9
                   MR. WHITE: Thank you.
10
                   MR. KNUDSEN:
                                  Thank you.
11
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Our next witness is
12
     Carol F. Pennington, Acting Small Business Advocate,
13
     Office of Small Business Advocate.
14
                    Thank you, Ms. Pennington. You may
15
     proceed.
16
                   MS. PENNINGTON: Good afternoon,
17
     gentlemen. I first want to say I am the Acting
18
     Small Business Advocate. Some of you may have known
19
     Mr. Ryan who was the Small Business Advocate who
20
     retired in July, and I have been appointed the
21
     acting.
22
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you.
23
                   MS. PENNINGTON: I want to say, first
24
     of all. that the Office of Small Business Advocate
25
     has been representing small businesses in all the
```

gas cost proceedings before the Commission in recent history since it's been instituted. And these include, of course, the PGW proceedings.

In general, the Office of Small
Business Advocate agrees with the findings of Senate
Environmental Resources and Energy Committee
pursuant to Senate Resolution 75. In other words,
the price fluctuations faced by Pennsylvania gas
consumers were the result of supply and demand
factors affecting the wellhead price of natural gas.
And Pennsylvania gas utilities, including
specifically PGW, were not at fault.

I might note that the management audit of PGW which was prepared for the PUC was highly critical of PGW's management. However, it concluded that PGW is acquiring gas at a reasonable cost.

PGW has an appropriate gas supply management strategy.

Nevertheless, there have been financial tools utilized by many of the gas companies in recent times, particularly hedging where you can have a variety of contracts which will establish a band of risk which a company is willing to accept. And, however, when you reduce the company's ability to react to the market, sometimes

you reduce their flexibility and then the company can't always take advantage of the cheapest kind of gas.

1.5

Basically, companies are better off with a balanced portfolio; long-term instruments, short term contracts and spot prices. We believe that if a competitive market can be developed at the retail level, residential and small business customers both will benefit from the lower prices associated with aggressive competition, but also from the wider array of gas supply products that have alternative risk options. In other words, a person can get a price for a year or they might be able to go with the spot market, the daily market or a monthly market.

Therefore, the Office of Small
Business Advocate reiterates its support for the
development of competitive marketplace for retail
gas supply to potentially allow smaller customers
more flexibility for assuming gas price risk.

This committee has requested information about PGW's oversight by the PUC. I might remark that I believe we concur with the remarks made by Representative Perzel where we think that the customers have been better off with this

PUC oversight.

1.5

We have also been asked to give our views of PGW's delivery of services and their experiences and perceptions concerning corporate responsiveness to customer concerns. These issues are very important to my office and to small business, specifically because small business customers of PGW pay a customer charge of \$18 per month as well as a usage charge of \$7.12 per MCF.

Now, these two charges constitute the current base rates for PGW. Customers must also pay a charge for the actual cost of gas which is delivered to them. And the Office of Small Business Advocate is unaware of any gas distribution company in the Commonwealth with overall base rates for small business customers that are as high as those of PGW.

On the other question about customer service, we have reviewed the management audit that was done for PGW. We can't comment yet on the improvement in customer service. We believe that there is some. And, as I understand it, the Commission will be reviewing PGW's customer performance by the end of March and will make a decision then.

We believe that publicly-owned utilities require as much regulatory oversight with associated public scrutiny as privately-owned utilities. And we believe that PUC regulatory oversight will provide both short and long term benefits to the vast majority of PGW's customers.

We fully support the decision to subject PGW to PUC oversight and eventually hope that PGW will be up to industry performance standards because of it. How long that process takes is uncertain, and part of that is due to PGW's reaction to PUC decisions. Specifically, in the short time that PGW has been under PUC oversight, the company has filed both interim and permanent petitions for increases in base rates and exercised its right of appeal to Commonwealth Court. And, of course, this does delay some of the process of regulation.

One thing that we are looking forward to in my office is the filing of PGW of its restructuring filing with the Commission by July 1st, 2002. In that proceeding, PGW will require to unbundle its rates, so that the monopoly portion of the business is priced in one package and then the competitive gas supply portion is on the other side.

1 In the best of all possible worlds, 2 PGW's unbundled rates will be cost based in order to facilitate shopping and maximize the potential for 3 4 savings for ratepayers. The OSBA will continue to work with 5 6 all the other parties to the proceedings to reform 7 PGW and to bring it up to industry standards. we look forward to helping in that process. 8 9 And we thank you, sir. 10 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much, 11 Ms. Pennington. Questions? 12 Yes. 13 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Thank you, 14 Mr. Chairman. Ms. Pennington, are you suggesting 15 that the bill that the ratepayer gets does not break 16 out the two different cost components that we 17 discussed with the last speaker? 18 MS. PENNINGTON: Are you talking about 19 the gas portion versus the base rate portion? 2.0 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: 21 MS. PENNINGTON: They are generally 22 broken out. There is a customer charge. For PGW, 23 that's \$18. For the small business customer, that's 24 \$18 a month and that's a fixed price per month. 25 Then you have a volumetric charge. With an ordinary

```
company, there is simply the customer charge and one
 1
 2
     volumetric charge, and the volumetric charge is for
 3
     the cost of gas. And there's no profit in the cost
 4
     of gas portion, but there is in the base rates.
                   With PGW, it's my understanding they
 5
     collect their base rates in two ways; the customer
 6
 7
     charge plus a volumetric charge and then again
     there's a volumetric charge for the actual cost of
 8
 9
     gas.
10
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:
                                             Then the
11
     third component as we discussed, which is the actual
12
     commodity, the gas cost, which I'm assuming it could
13
     be purchased on any other market under deregulation?
14
                   MS. PENNINGTON: Yes, that would be
     the portion that is subject to deregulation.
15
16
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: So they do
17
     show all three components on the bill?
18
                   MS. PENNINGTON: I am not certain.
                                                        Ι
19
     have not seen the bill. Unfortunately, sir, I am
2.0
     not the attorney who worked on this case.
21
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: You seemed to
22
     have suggested that.
23
                   MS. PENNINGTON: It's included in
24
             It's all included in there.
25
                   REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Thank you.
```

```
1
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much,
 2
     Ms. Pennington, for appearing before the committee
     and sharing this information from the perspective of
 3
     the Small Business Advocate.
 4
 5
                   MS. PENNINGTON:
                                     Thank you, sir.
 6
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      Thank you.
 7
                    Our next witness is Phillip A.
     Bertocci, Supervising Attorney, Community Legal
 8
 9
     Services, Inc.
10
                   Welcome, Mr. Bertocci. Proceed when
11
     you are ready.
12
                   MR. BERTOCCI:
                                   Thank you.
                                               Community
13
     Legal Services provides free legal assistance to
1 4
     low-income Philadelphians, including many senior
15
     citizens, and for years has been involved with the
16
     Philadelphia Gas Works in several different ways.
17
     We have an attorney and two paralegals who spend
18
     almost their full-time dealing with PECO, PGW and
19
     the Philadelphia Water Department for individual
20
     client service problems for low-income people.
21
                   CLS also has served for over a decade
22
     as a public advocate for proceedings before the
23
     Philadelphia Gas Commission, representing
24
     residential ratepayers. So in that sense we are the
25
     Philadelphia public advocate.
```

We also represent low-income groups in PGW's rate proceedings in Harrisburg before the PUC, CEPA, that's the Consumer Education and Protective Association, TAG which is a Tenants' Action Group, ACORN which I'm sure you're familiar with, and also Action Alliance for Senior Citizens.

I'm going to try to -- you already heard a lot about PGW. And I'm going to try to avoid repeating those things, except in situations where it will help to accentuate some of the themes that I want to stress.

I think one of the most important facts about PGW is we do have 150,000 people essentially, our customers that are at or below the poverty level, out of 450,000 to 500,000 residential customers. I think -- and PGW has one of the largest low-income programs in the state, which provides discounted service for low-income people.

The collections problem I see

particularly is one of identifying those folks in

Philadelphia who can pay but won't. And PGW,

especially in the last couple years due to the

problems that it's had with its computer systems,

has not been able to really execute a strategy which

would focus on the collections problems that have

been caused primarily by simply the technological difficulties they experienced. And that really goes to the burdens which are presently posed on this company by past mismanagement.

As far as the present levels of rates, I agree with everybody who says that essentially PGW's gas procurement policies are strong. And they have an additional advantage. The LNG facility enables them, in fact, to do better than most natural gas companies because they're able to buy gas when it's cheap, liquefy it and then instead of buying expensive gas on the spot market, use this gas in the winter when it's really expensive. So that that's an advantage for PGW customers.

The fact remains, however, that we had a peak, a runup in gas prices, which increased prices by 50 percent, and those prices have moderated. But, as we speak today, PGW customers are still paying 30 percent more than they paid at the beginning of November 2000 for gas.

Now, I'm talking about their overall rate. We have heard discussions of the combination of the customer charge, the gas cost rate and the base rate. I think I have a footnote in my testimony where I break that out for you so you can

see that.

This 32 percent increase is not going to be -- even though natural gas prices are going down, we don't expect to see this 32 percent be further moderated any time soon, because PGW even by buying gas prudently has in storage a substantial amount of gas that was bought at a time when gas was more expensive. They had to do that to protect themselves, but that means that we are not going to see an immediate downward flow in gas costs in this coming year, between now and say the beginning of the next heating season.

And I will say that rates are under continued pressure because of PGW and the city's policy decisions, really the city. I mean, Mr. Knudsen is right. He is a particular point in a hierarchy where there are a good number of folks above him. But the city has made the policy decision to try to essentially refurbish PGW through ratepayers' funds alone and not through any contribution of equity by the city itself.

I think it's important from my perspective to -- and this may repeat a little bit of what has been said by others, too -- to underline the degree to which the present situation is the

product of prior mismanagement. And we can talk all we want about the weather, we can talk all we want about no rate increases over a period of ten years, but we are where we are today and you are where you are today, essentially because on the one hand we had really a meltdown of management and fiscal controls which led to a series of scandals and misappropriations of funds.

2.1

But probably much more seriously, we had really a breakdown of management itself for PGW, so that we had, as the year 2000 began, and with all the concerns of Y2K, we had an effort to implement a new billing system, a new information system, at a time when essentially the new system was not tested, was not ready to go.

Nevertheless, it was implemented, and it led to hundreds of thousands of bills being incorrect, a tremendous crisis in confidence on the part of customers as to the accuracy of their bills. And even today -- PGW has made substantial progress since that time of that meltdown. But even today there are still problems in getting certain systems to work. We still have problems getting, for instance, histories of accounts, something called a statement of account going back four years; which

allows a customer who wants to know, well, just exactly how did my bill get to be \$2,000 or \$1,500.

That information is still hard to get. What we get is something that looks much more like, well, this is what the computer says. But we say, well, show us. On this record, where were our payments made, what was our bill, how does it all come out to this final number. That's still a problem for PGW. They were better than they were before, but that's still a problem.

As management has told you, they are at the point now where they recognize -- and I credit them for this. They recognize they need a comprehensive plan for collections. The Gas Commission, in fact, has underscored that and picked up on something the PGW themselves have said and that we have been saying and asked them to submit to the Gas Commission, which has a managerial function within the PGW system, to present a comprehensive collections plan.

And what we're hoping that this comprehensive collections plan will do, which will identify more than PGW has ever done, essentially segment the population of PGW customers into the various categories, and to develop strategies to

best collect from the particular category of customers. There are customers that can but won't. There are customers that usually can but sometimes have problems. There are customers that are simply low-income customers who really should be on a low-income program. There are a good number of low-income customers in Philadelphia who aren't on the low-income program.

And we anticipate that there's going to be a development of a strategy to essentially approach customers in a way which is designed to maximize what can be obtained from those customers and to do it at a cost which is not prohibitive to PGW. It does not make sense to pay \$100 to collect a \$60 debt. I mean, it's makes no more sense for PGW than it would for PECO.

Since the transfer of jurisdiction over PGW's tariff to the PUC, as I said, the city has continually sought base rate increases to pay for past mismanagement, and they have not provided, we think, adequate assurance that service or operational efficiency will improve.

What we have had really is three -- or we're in the process of our third base rate increase. We have had a request for an interim base

rate increase. That was in the beginning of -- in 2000. Then we had a permanent base rate increase in January 2001. And I read in the newspapers that PGW is about to -- is poised to ask for another \$30 million to \$50 million in additional base rate increases next month.

The effect so far of those increases has been to provide PGW with about \$30 million in base rate increases for 2001 and fiscal 2002; \$30 million, and they've generally been asking for between \$52 million and \$65 million. So the PUC basically has given them in one way or another in what -- we call it base rate, but there were some things that were done that act as the equivalent of a base rate increase for those years, but we are not technically speaking base rate increases.

As I say in my testimony, the requests for base rate increases have been presented as what I term the present administration's "in your face" style and have drawn sustained opposition from consumers. In the PUC public input hearings, PGW customers already pressed by increases caused by the runup in natural gas prices expressed outrage that they should be expected to make further payments when levels of service were so unacceptable.

In hearings before the PUC, the Office of Consumer Advocate and the Philadelphia consumer groups have also opposed PGW's rate requests on the grounds that they were excessive under any standard. They've also insisted that no additional rate increases should be granted until PGW has achieved reasonable levels of service and achieved substantial cost reductions also, cost and productivity savings.

2.5

Consumers have also taken the position that customers should not be required to fund PGW's cash flow needs through increased rates when they have already been providing and still provide as we speak a hundred million dollar commercial paper program which PGW has exhausted over the past decade.

Customers have also pointed out that PGW's repeated requests for a "cushion" to assure compliance through rates with their bond covenants is not appropriate in a situation where the city continues to budget -- or PGW continues to budget for and pay \$18 million annually to the city essentially as a return on equity. What privately-owned company in PGW's operational and financial condition would continue to make

distributions to its shareholders as if nothing were wrong.

I think you've heard about some of the other things that I was going to say on that subject. Let's just take a look at the \$18 million payment itself, the city payment. PGW will -- and the city will say on a regular basis, well, you can't cut into -- we are not making any money. You can't cut into this \$18 million.

But this \$18 million really is a payment which is made regardless of PGW's performance to the city. And it's a payment that's being made when we've seen the costliness of the mistakes which have been made. So that despite the kinds of mistakes which have been made, which I think I've documented in my testimony, PGW is saying, well, we are fixing that, and part of our problem now is that we are tapped out as far as our borrowing is concerned and we need to pay down our debt. We want ratepayers to pay down that debt, but at the same time we want you to keep paying us the \$18 million year after year after year.

The fact remains that as a municipally-owned utility and not an investor-owned utility, the city has the same need and

responsibility as a private owner of a monopoly service to develop and maintain workable systems of governance which focus on accountability rather than disperse and eliminate that. One of the problems that we're seeing is that the focus that the PUC has had on governance, for instance, on streamlining governance systems, making the governance system work, we don't see that right now. We don't see the PGW governance system, the interaction between the mayor, the Gas Commission and city council. We don't see an improvement in that interaction despite the crisis.

If anything, we see more stalemate and a passing on of the rate request to the PUC. And I've heard a recognition on your part, you are really -- the PUC is really -- the state now is being asked to provide cover for various parts of the city of Philadelphia ownership, who among themselves are not able -- who have not been able so far to live up to their responsibility to work out their differences and provide a cooperative management of this municipal utility.

This municipal utility -- and I think that's a substantial responsibility of the city leadership, because this municipal utility is of

tremendous value to Philadelphia ratepayers.

We estimate, and every time that an investigation is made of selling PGW, it's recognized that there's about \$50 million in savings to ratepayers annually that comes from the fact that the gas works is municipally owned. Now, the benefits of municipal ownership are not really passed on to ratepayers because of the inefficiencies and dysfunctions that have been allowed to develop.

But the fact is that if PGW was sold, that so far -- and maybe there will be a new report that will come out tomorrow that I'll have to look at. But so far, it looks as if anything, the purchaser of PGW would have to find \$50 million of savings in running this company just to keep it even. We just don't think that there is \$50 million in savings that can be rung out of this company, operational savings.

So that's the dilemma that we're in.

We have a municipal gas works just as we have a

municipal water department. The water department at

most takes \$4 million a year from ratepayers and

pays it to the city; the gas works, \$18 million.

And look at the difference in service.

In conclusion, at this point I'm saying, well, I think there's been some progress from the absolute lowest level at the time of the effort to transfer over to the new billing system in July of 1999. But I don't think that PGW has really turned the corner. Some of the basic structural problems are still there as far as management is concerned. We don't have permanent management. There's been no move to make interim management permanent.

We recognize that there are a lot of people at PGW who are very dedicated and hardworking citizens of Philadelphia working for their municipal utility. They deserve to have and to be recognized for the effort that they are making. But the system itself has been broken, and so that much of that goodwill has been in some way squandered, not by them but by the framework in which they've been required to operate.

One of the things from the legislative standpoint that you can do -- and I mention it just at the end of my testimony -- is to support the recommendations of the Natural Gas Universal Service Task Force. You may recall in the Gas Choice Act there was a provision which said that there would be

established a Natural Gas Universal Task Force made up of essentially representatives of consumer interest and utilities, to consider the affordability of gas service in the Commonwealth and to make recommendations, even recommendations to the Legislature about the possibility of the use of the general fund, the state general fund, to support under some circumstances low-income programs, low-income customers to make utility service affordable.

I made a copy of that report and I circulated it to you. I think that that is a way to -- one thing that can be done. But on a day-to-day basis, the most important thing is that PGW and the city of Philadelphia have to be encouraged and continually pressured, I think, to make the utility function and fulfill the promise that it has as a municipally-owned utility. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much, Mr. Bertocci. This was very interesting information to the committee. I appreciate you giving us the views of Community Legal Services with respect to the operations of the Philadelphia Gas Works. Thank you very much.

MR. BERTOCCI: Thank you.

```
1
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Our next witness is
     Mr. Francis Redding, President of SEIU Local 686,
 2
     Gas Works Employees' Union.
 3
                   MR. REDDING: Thank you, gentlemen,
 4
     for the opportunity to testify here today.
 5
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      Thank you, Mr.
 6
 7
               You may proceed when you are ready.
     Redding.
                   MR. REDDING: I have James Lennox on
 8
 9
                He's an employee in our office in Allied
10
                Shawn Plunkett is in the Field Services
11
     Department. Feel free to redirect some of those
12
     questions about the call center and about service to
13
     these two, because the jobs that they do are almost
14
     exclusively with customer contact. So instead of
15
     hearing the theory, you will hear about the actual
16
     practices.
17
                    I'm President of Local 686, SEIU,
18
     AFL-CIO. I represent approximately 1,400 members
19
     which include about 400 union employees in the
20
     Distribution Department who excavate city streets to
21
     repair and replace old and leaking gas mains and
     services for the businesses and residents within the
22
2.3
     city limits.
24
                   There are also about 400 union members
25
     in the Field Services Department who on a daily
```

basis respond to emergency gas leaks and carbon monoxide complaints, along with providing appliance service. Also, they have provided a very important heating repair service to over 500,000 residential, commercial and industrial customers.

The balance of our members include our gas supply workers who keep the gas flowing through our two plants, Richmond in the northern end of the city and Passyunk in the southern end. In December of 2000, you may recall an explosion that occurred at our Passyunk facility. Subsequently, our members were recognized along with the city firefighters by Philadelphia City Council for doing some important things that day. They shut off some critical valves and were credited with averting a major catastrophe. One of our guys, Mike Duffy, he was injured during that explosion and he continued to work through that and perform very admirably.

Other 686 members kept the gas flowing through the mains and visited thousands of homes and businesses and investigated gas leaks. And they lit pilots to protect and ensure the health and safety of Philadelphia citizens at that time, along with protecting our property.

We also represent meter readers, field

and office collection, transportation, materials management, accounting, building services, district office and call center personnel. Although our members who work in the call center provide an important emergency function, the other departments in the past have been utilized to provide a vital supplemental emergency workforce by visiting customers' homes to investigate gas leaks during prolonged and severely bitter winter cold spells in our past.

1.5

1.8

1.9

Our office and field collection and our district office members have generated millions of dollars for PGW by securing state and federal dollars through LIHEAP and Crisis grants, thereby assisting needy families and offsetting potentially higher uncollectibles that would unduly impact other PGW customers. Please note that PGW is attempting to reduce the hours and close some of our district offices that many customers not wealthy enough to have checking accounts rely on to personally visit and pay their bills.

The district offices should remain open, as they are a vital service to PGW ratepayers.

My principal reason for testifying here today is to raise the consciousness of the

state Legislature regarding the critical services our members perform for the citizens of Philadelphia and apprise this committee of some of the negative changes that we know are taking place at PGW that adversely affect PGW ratepayers who have relied on those services through the history of PGW.

I am sure that this committee is aware of the problems that PGW had with its call center last year, published reports of customers waiting excessive amounts of time attempting to get through on the phone lines for emergencies and service, left the impression that PGW employees were not working as hard as they could to meet the needs of their customers.

Although I would submit to you that Local 686 members have always put their best effort forward in the past as well as today and that the actual problems with the new \$100 million cost computer system that also created tens of thousands of billing errors, the fact is that the reason we believe the call center appears to be properly working at this juncture is because less people are calling PGW.

This reduction in calls is due to the fact that Philadelphians are rapidly discovering

that PGW no longer wants to provide those very services they have come to rely on for decades.

Examples of services that are no longer available are residential appliance service and repair, including heater repairs for customers who are not low income or do not have the PGW parts and labor plan.

Due to political pressure, exceptions were made for senior citizens about a month into the current heating season. This is unfortunate because not only does this policy subject over 80 percent of PGW customers to the use of private contractors, who many times are much more interested in selling \$3,000 heating systems than replacing \$100 parts, it also ignores an important revenue source for a company that continually states that it is currently in a serious financial crisis.

In a city like Philadelphia, where one-third of its population is at or near the federal poverty level, many citizens who struggle and pay their bills and who in large part live in older homes with older heater systems will be subject to calling a contractor who realistically cannot make a living, much less a profit, doing minor maintenance on heating appliances.

A great many heaters in Philadelphia have cast iron cores that virtually can last forever if some entity is willing to replace minor parts that wear out, like pilots and safety switches. I can personally attest to the fact that when heating systems fail in many Philadelphia residences, it is sometimes the last functioning necessity in that home and renders those customers to the use of more dangerous alternatives, such as kerosene heaters, or virtually evicts families who ultimately turn to the state for more costly help such as new housing. This will eventually require the raising of state taxes to provide such assistance.

More importantly are the safety implications for the reduction in services. Since PGW has curtailed appliance services, it is being reported from our field technicians that there appears to be a higher incidence of carbon monoxide incidents resulting in hospitalizations and even deaths. How accurate statistics to verify these occurrences could be obtained should be investigated and pursued.

The alarming thing about the new PGW policy is that there has been a deliberate effort by PGW to reduce gas leak complaints that would

minimize such incidents. On the premise that PGW customers are acculturated to call in bogus gas leaks to obtain expedited heater service in cold weather, PGW has instituted policies that require that technicians provide no service on such calls despite the outside temperature or special age or health circumstances of the occupants.

The more important PGW agenda is to educate those people not to call. Unfortunately, the fact that people would call for any reason in the past triggered chimney inspections and carbon monoxide checks that saved many lives. Many times PGW leak investigators were able to make minor adjustments on such calls that alleviated problems that would have rapidly become worse and injured unsuspecting customers.

As you know, carbon monoxide is odorous, as is natural gas, without a chemical additive. Again, I would emphasize the age and disrepair of Philadelphia dwellings and the level of income of citizens. Unfortunately, Philadelphians do not have the financial resources to properly maintain their chimneys and heating appliances as their suburban counterparts do, but instead have relied up until now on PGW.

The elimination of heater inspection services, additional hidden charges for parts and labor customers, and a seven-day wait for service that was in effect until a week ago for parts and labor customers are dissuading PGW customers from calling the company for service. Such measures have been responsible for reduction in just one year in the parts and labor plans from 116,000 to 85,000 customers. All of these measures are leading to a future reduction in manpower that will compromise the safety of Philadelphia citizens by reducing the number of gas leak investigators who are also the appliance technicians.

1.5

The primary purpose of maintaining appliance service all those years was to maintain a year-round experienced and qualified leak investigation force. The city of Philadelphia has over 3,000 miles of gas main. Over half of it is antiquated cast iron main susceptible to serious breakage. The return of a cold winter, such as the kind that we experienced in the 1980s, will result in catastrophic consequences for the city and its citizens. Leaks of the magnitude that result in fatal explosions will proliferate, posing a threat to life and property that cannot be measured merely

in dollars and cents.

Our 400-man distribution force that does an excellent job of excavating and repairing the system will rise to the task as they always have in the past. However, individual appliance technicians who use leak detection equipment to measure levels of natural gas and evacuate residents when necessary make the initial responses.

Reductions in appliance service will result in the reduction of manpower that does this emergency response work. Recall that there are only 400 emergency/appliance service technicians for over 500,000 PGW customers who live in older homes, row homes in many cases, with older and antiquated gas mains and pipes. This is a formula for disaster given one normally cold winter and PGW's excessive amount of cast iron pipe. It would be unconscionable to allow a reduction in services that you know will result in a decline in emergency response personnel.

Reliance on private contracting will not be sufficient either. The sporadic incidence of cold winters in recent years will make it impossible to predict how many emergency workers will be needed and trained. Due to cost constraints, contractors

will definitely underestimate the number of workers needed. When an emergency unexpectedly strikes, as it has in the past, Philadelphians will risk injury and death for profitability determinations by contractors. Permanent full-time trained and experienced utility workers are the only option in a city such as Philadelphia with its closely quartered population and its antiquated cast iron main natural gas system.

As an example, what would have happened in New York on September 11, 2001 if experienced unionized city response personnel were not available? More people would have either died or have been seriously injured.

In Philadelphia, Local 686 members as employees of PGW are an important part of the city's emergency response forces.

How can anyone ignore the possibility that an antiquated natural gas distribution system such as the one owned by PGW could be a target for either domestic or foreign terrorism? Given this new fact of life that we never know where or when such forces will strike, we can ill afford to allow a company that possesses such an experienced and competent emergency workforce to gradually disband

that force by eliminating a part of its job that ensures that the employees who make up that force are adequate in numbers and competent in what they do. Regardless of the means of PGW customers, they deserve no less.

I'd just like to say one other thing. Whatever happens, please don't let PGW managers borrow from our pension fund. Even if I'm ever afforded the opportunity to have a seat on that little V that hovers above Tom Knudsen's head, please don't ever let that happen.

We would be happy to answer any questions. As I said previously, Shawn here is a field services guy. Jimmy works in the office. We would like to speak to some of the issues you raised with some of the other witnesses.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Any questions? Representative Blaum.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: No.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: I'm sorry. I appreciate you coming in and offering your testimony. I'm going to ask the staff to follow-up on some of the issues that you've raised in your testimony. But, just briefly, I would like to have your reaction with respect to this issue of the call

service center and billing service and the interchangeability or the new interchangeability of these employees between those two systems from your perspective.

MR. REDDING: I'm not receiving reports on it to what extent they're using flexibility, but I do know that they've hired a number of people in the call center, 30 to 40 more people.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Would those people be members of your union?

MR. REDDING: They are members of our union. I would suggest that perhaps that the reason that the number of calls are reduced possibly are due to the weather conditions, people aren't calling because of the weather. Some people are being educated to the fact that we don't do as much service as we used to do. As I said in my testimony, we used to do appliance service for non-parts and labor plan customers for a charge, and I think that if a study were done you would probably find that that's a potential revenue source for PGW, a profit can be made from that. There has been a lot of goodwill established over the years with the Philadelphia public and our service technicians.

I think it's suffered with some of the problems that we have had, particularly with that computer system that I think was primarily responsible for the issues with the call center, but I think that the main reason that the call center is improved is basically because of the weather, the added personnel, and the fact that people don't call us for services as they used to.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much, Mr. Redding, for appearing before the committee and presenting as a representative of the employees of PGW your perspective on the service that PGW provides to the citizens of Philadelphia and incorporate those remarks in the record. I am going to ask my staff to follow-up on some of the issues that you raised in your testimony.

MR. REDDING: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much.

Next, we have another series of witnesses, all of whom are identified as PGW customers. And perhaps it might be more efficient and better for the committee if those individuals would appear as a panel and provide us with their comments.

Betty-Ann Workman, PGW Customer; Nancy Houston, PGW Customer; Maria Dirkson, PGW Customer; and Michael

DeVincent, PGW Customer.

1.8

Why don't we start, if we could, what I would like to do since this is a panel, it may be helpful, is if you could give us a summary of the highlight of the points that you want to make to the committee for the record, because what you are going to be saying is going to be transcribed by the reporter. And that will remain as part of our record with respect to our report back to the General Assembly. So if you could highlight those points that are critical to you.

And we'll start with Ms. Workman and go through. And when we're done with that, we can go back if you wanted to reemphasize something or highlight something or explain something. So we'll start with Ms. Workman.

MS. WORKMAN: I wasn't aware that I was going to be part of the panel because I have a lot to say. I live in one of those old houses that the gentleman just described built in 1902. And we have lots of old creeping places where air comes in.

I have sent to you, delivered to you, my final draft of a revised draft dated 31 January. When we think about computers, we know the kind of errors computers can make, so I'm a little bit used

to the rationale that the computers weren't doing their jobs. Clearly, the computer wasn't doing its job.

1.1

I am Betty-Ann Workman. I am a widow for eighteen and a half years. I am retired from a full-paying job. But as you can see at the top of this document, I am still doing education consulting which sends me away from my house several times a month for two days, three days, four days sometimes. I'm not going to bore you with that because it is in the document. I wanted to warn you that most of my testimony is personal, it's anecdotal and it's intuitive.

I'm a native Philadelphian as was my late husband, so I'm pretty familiar with the workings of city agencies, including the utilities. During the last five or ten years, I have written some dismal documents concerning services across the board, including those of the Philadelphia Gas Works, which is the reason for being here today.

My first clear notice of the initial services occurred when I signed up for the parts and labor plan. Since I live alone and my children are grown, I took the precaution and believed the gas company and what the job limitations say, that the

service and labor plan would cover any emergencies which would occur during the course of the heating season, certainly for my appliances and certainly for the heater and the hot water system.

And I depended on the gas company to keep its word. Sure enough, an emergency did occur. In 1999, I woke up one morning and the house was 56 degrees. I knew something was wrong. I pulled out my service contract and called the number and asked for someone to come and see what was wrong with the heater. I was very abruptly and rudely told -- this was a Thursday morning. I was abruptly and rudely told that I could not receive service until the following Tuesday.

When I questioned the young woman as to why her report didn't match the documentation on the service contract, she said, we only provide service Monday through Friday as business days and you're too late. The contract said Monday through Friday, including Saturday when there is an emergency. I was paying at that time \$75 for this plan, and it went up as the years went by.

When I continued to argue with this young woman who I realized was only part of the system, she said the only thing I can do is to put

out a work order for Tuesday, and that's all that

I'm prepared to do and dismissed me summarily.

2.0

Now, the epilog to that incident was that even after Tuesday arrived, PGW support never did. It was that year, 1999, that I decided I needed no longer to enroll in the service and labor plan because it didn't work. The PGW's concern and attention to customer service was as dismal and minimal as ever, and that its only interest was in bilking citizens out of more money.

While I was outraged by it, I wasn't surprised. PGW has demonstrated on many occasions its total disregard for customer service. Rates have increased astronomically in the course of the last ten years. The simplistic claim by the management, senior management, of PGW of the fluctuations in energy prices doesn't account for, as far as I'm concerned, does not account for the dramatic increases in consumer cost and the obvious diminishing of customer service.

So my appearance here today, as I said, is personal, it's anecdotal. I want to share my experience with you, which I am clear is not just my experience. So I'm testifying not only for myself but for the citizens of Philadelphia, which I

consider myself a good one, most of whom because of shifting demographics are now either minority residents, senior citizens -- I'm one -- or dispossessed or all three. And I believe we have all been shallowly treated, ignored or poorly serviced by PGW.

It's an open secret that some of our political leaders have escaped or ignored the PGW dragnet or have been exempted by the Philadelphia PGW bureaucracy. Every once in a while, an article will appear in one of our local ordinances or the city paper that attests to that.

So I count myself among these hapless groups who are being so poorly serviced by the PGW.

Now, my current and running dispute with PGW over the last two years involves not only unrealistic bills which PGW claims I owe them, but the failure of PGW to post bills to my residence. If you refer to the document, you will see that I have a mailing address 201 East Sedgwick Street. Please be mindful of the fact that I have been in this house for 36 years at that same address. My legal address is 7003-05-07 Boyer Street. The gas company uses the legal address and so does PECO, the electric company.

Over in 2001, in the year 2001, I received only nine bills from PGW. When I called to ask where these bills were going, I got not anywhere close to a rational explanation. So I wrote a letter which I think is either attached to your document or is on the table, to that effect.

Imagine now, no bills. I'm not in the habit of letting my bills slide, even though my income is greatly reduced as a result of my early retirement. At PGW here this last spring, I raised the same concern, and I was assured that it was going to get better and that it would be looked into. The only satisfaction I got was one call from somebody or other who assured me that, indeed, I did owe \$2,975, which I continue to dispute to this moment.

I think it's fascinating, and I want to call your attention to this egregious error, the fact that I was not receiving the bills. Then the blame was shifted to the post office. Now, the mystery to me is how in 34 years preceding that the bills arrived on time, posted, and how PECO which uses that same address at 7007 Boyer Street manages to get its bills posted to my house on time.

So the only conclusion I can draw is

that it is not the post office's fault. It is the fault of PGW, which is part of my ongoing dispute.

The latest insult around this dispute came in January, when on 14 January another bill collector, following hot pursuit behind the collector that came in December, appeared at my door claiming I was in arrears and he was here to collect. You haven't sent a payment since last October, claimed he. I was too outraged and too upset to get into it with him, since I knew it wasn't his fault anyway. So I gave him a check for \$300 which I thought would have sent him on his happy way.

Despite the fact, now January 3rd -can we go back -- December 11th I believe it was.

January 3rd, I paid for gas on this horrific bill
\$300. Another collector appears on my doorstep on
the 14th saying they haven't received a payment
since October. How does that square with this
wonderful description from the senior managers who
testified so long that things are all going better
with the gas company, that accounts are now settled
easily, that the computer system is up and running
and that everything is coming up roses?

Well, it's not coming up roses in my

life. That additional \$300 that I gave to this third collector had been allocated to another part of my budget. But in order to keep him from, quote, cutting off my gas, I gave him the check for \$300.

It used to be that largely no matter how large they were, were amortized, and the gentleman spoke to this, over the heating months from September 15th, whatever it is, till March 15th or April 1st, and then there was justifiably demand for payment. I find it hard to have the gas company explain to me why three collectors came to my house within a course of five and a half weeks during the heating season to, quote, cut off my gas, demanding payment.

Aside from the fact that I'm outraged by all this, you can tell by the quiver in my voice I'm absolutely outraged. As I said, not just for myself, but I'm in a constant state of pique. Every time my doorbell rings I'm saying, oh, it's the gas company again, a constant state of pique at best and in a constant state of stress at worse.

Now, despite some lean times over the course of the last 36 years when my husband and I were in graduate school and raising kids and trying to keep life together, we also were aware that we

had certain responsibilities. One was to maintain our property in some level of decency, and the other was to meet our financial obligations, particularly those surrounding or concerning our home; our taxes, our mortgage, utility bills.

And so this current circumstance with the gas company has me in a real state.

It's not my intention to try to squeeze out from whatever my legal and absolutely correct responsibilities are. But my intention is to have you gentlemen and lady pay real attention to what's going on in the city of Philadelphia with its few remaining citizens.

What I fear is that the gas company with its simplistic explanations of what's going on and how it's managing itself has decided to clear up all the years of mismanagement on the backs of those who can least afford it; the elderly, the minorities and the dispossessed. We cannot allow this to keep happening.

For a few years, we would receive estimated bills. We would receive estimated bills. I paid it as close to it as I could. When they discontinued sending estimated bills and discovered that there was an overage on our account, some \$700,

which has never been returned to us and has never been applied to current bills. I don't know how you even manage like that. It has never been returned and never been applied to current bills.

I have two concerns. One is that I have A plus credit records at the moment. I went into a store once with my platinum America Express card and the salesperson said, whoa, you could buy a house with this. And I'm very proud of that. It took us a long time to get to this spot, and I'm not about to have the gas company ruin that for me. But, at the same time, I will not tolerate the harassment that the PGW is putting me through.

When we were an intact family, two kids, husband with a job, motherhood for several years and then I had a market place, and everybody was taking at least one shower a day, when I was doing three loads of laundry every day or at least two times a week, when I was cooking three full meals a day for a family of four on the gas stove no less, my bills came nowhere close to where they are now, where they average somewhere around \$500 a month.

Now I'm in a place that I've always called home, where I take one bath a day under the

usual circumstances, where I cook when I feel like it which isn't too often, where I do laundry three loads every two weeks, I cannot explain how I get a bill for \$2,975.

1.5

2.0

I'm away a lot of the time during my consultancies. And when I leave home, I turn the thermostat back to 60 degrees. When I am home, I the thermostat is usually at 65 which is cool, but I'm usually upstairs in my little office and I don't care. So I'm really baffled. One person who came to my house, I posed this question to him. He said, well, it's because of my pilot light. The pilot lights are causing me \$500 a month?

I hope you can understand the mystery that PGW has shrouded itself in on how it conducts business. Now, I am not a legal expert by any stretch of the imagination; therefore, I can't fully have any real expertise in this subject. I can only hope that the accumulated testimony that you've heard today and which you will continue to hear be read into the record and serve to collect the requisite data to improve the workings of PGW or, quote, to uncover violations which will be open to the careful scrutiny.

No public service agencies should be

allowed to conduct public visits in the way PGW has done. I'm not aware what recommendations this body is or will be prepared to make at the conclusion of this hearing. One thing I'm sure of is that the public, especially the most vulnerable among us, must be protected from these furious practices. We deserve nothing less. PGW has defied and betrayed the public trust. We deserve better.

They are an embarrassment to the city of Philadelphia and the citizens who have chosen to remain. I know some of you are not Philadelphians and you are not real sure of what I'm talking about. But the whole structure of the city in terms of city services and delivery of city services has caused many people to leave the city. I'm not going to leave. 7007 is my home. And as long as I can walk, I will be there. I don't think I have to be subjected to the kind of harassment that PGW has put me through.

The Philadelphia Gas Works, in addition to betraying the public trust, has abrogated its responsibility to provide efficient, cost effective and customer friendly services to the citizens of Philadelphia. PGW has, to my way of thinking, committed serious violations, not only in

```
its business practices, but in its moral behavior.

It suffers from incompetent management -- I can see

why they can't get a senior manager. That would be

like calling me up and saying, would you like to be

the captain of the Titanic?

The percentage increases for gas

consumers in the Philadelphia area are
```

1.5

consumers in the Philadelphia area are unconscionable. In the interest of public trust, PGW must be called to task for all of its past misdemeanors. The Judiciary Committee has a monumental and important task in front of it. And that's to bring PGW back to some modicum of fairness and to execute justice for the citizens of Philadelphia. We are depending on you. Thank you.

Workman. Two things. We have asked some folks from PGW to be at this hearing today. They have told us that they will have folks here to talk to you after the hearings.

Thank you, Ms.

CHAIRMAN GANNON:

MS. WORKMAN: That's what they told me last spring, but thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Specifically about the problems that you personally raised. The other aspect is that you made some points that generally perhaps affected you, but some of those issues could

be affecting a lot of folks that live in the city
that may not have had the resources to get here
today or the ability to come here today to provide
that information to the committee.

2.0

And I'm going to ask the staff to follow-up on those issues to make certain that that type of situation that you are talking about, given the changes that have taken place within PGW in the past year, quote, improvements in services.

I notice most of your problems initiated back to 1999, apparently things --

MS. WORKMAN: Yes, there were things before that, but 1999 was the worst.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: And see where the apple fell from the tree. But in light of some of the improvements, we still want to make certain that every possible customer get the services that they're entitled to and that they're paying for. And I'm going to ask my staff to follow-up on those issues and see how PGW does as this investigation continues.

MS. WORKMAN: Well, as I said at the beginning of my recitation, this was a personal account. And, granted, when I was at the hearings last spring, held in downtown Philadelphia, in a

```
ballroom full of people, and the stories were

similar to mine, they all rested in the same place.

The thing that I think hurt me the most was the

number of senior people. Some were even on walkers

who struggled to this hearing because they wanted to

have their voices heard.
```

And from the other end of the community, Latinos and African-Americans specifically, who raised some of these same issues. And that's why I decided to make my testimony very personal, because in some ways I feel I'm speaking not just for myself, but for my peers around the city.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you. The next testifier is Ms. Nancy Houston, PGW Customer.

Nancy, you may proceed.

MS. HOUSTON: I'm just going to paraphrase. I can reiterate a lot of the things that Mrs. Workman has said. I, too, lived in the city my whole life. I have a large family. My parents grew up in the city. My husband and I really enjoy the city. We bought our first house in May of 1999, which is bad timing.

And my story is a story about a person who wanted to pay their bill and couldn't, and that

led to all of my problems for the next two and a half years which is ridiculous. Imagine not being able to pay a bill for almost a year, and then having hearings and hearing things all the time that they have to charge more money because they have no money, but they wouldn't take payment from me.

Again, too, I'm not here -- I wasn't even -- it's hard, like she said, to just put it brief because we've struggled for two and a half years with our problems, a lot of us. And I'm not even here so much because I was so angry about my own situation, but because of so many people I have seen suffer around me as a result of the mismanagement of PGW. And I mean suffer, like my secretary and my baby-sitter.

And, as I mentioned in my testimony, my husband and I, this has put a strain on our budget and taken a lot of time away from me. But we have the means to pay our bills one way or another. I just paid off the last two and a half years last month finally, but I'm surrounded by people who don't. And that's really hard for me, that's really hard to see, when my baby-sitter who is an older woman, a senior citizen, never, ever had a problem before and now lives in a cold house. Her heat is

```
1 turned off. And she has to go into her basement to
```

- 2 | fill kerosene heaters so her pipes don't freeze.
- 3 And she's got arthritis in her legs and has to take
- 4 showers at my house. And it's just hard.
- Anyway, in May of 1999, we purchased
- 6 our first house in the city of Philadelphia. Again,
- 7 | I've always had very good credit, too. I keep
- 8 | track. I can show you every bill I ever had. I
- 9 have everything on file.
- 10 | When I didn't receive a bill by July,
- 11 | I called. And they said they would bill me in time.
- 12 | Well, they didn't. I called every month for seven
- 13 | months. The first piece of paper I got in the mail
- 14 | from PGW was a shutoff notice telling me the
- 15 | importance of paying my bills on time in February of
- 16 | 2000. I was told so many things on the phone. I
- 17 | actually felt sorry for some of the people I talked
- 18 | to from PGW. I felt sorry that they probably had to
- 19 listen to stuff like this all day. Some of them
- 20 | were very nice. I didn't really have that much
- 21 | complaint with the service I got. I was never mean
- 22 | to anybody on the phone. I was just trying to find
- 23 a way for them to help me.
- Nine months after we move in, I got
- 25 | that shutoff notice. It said that I had to pay

\$742.23 immediately. Next month I got a bill that was over \$1,400. I never got any description. My first complaint was inadequate billing system and neglect to inform customers of specific charges. I was never told where those charges came from or when. They just came in a lump sum.

1.3

1.5

That bill came two weeks before my wedding, and they threatened to shut off my service April 1st, which ironically was the day of my wedding. They assigned me to a budget plan of \$100 a month. And I did, I sent them a check right away. I sent them more than what they asked because I wanted to get my bill paid off. I continued to send payments.

My second complaint is their inability to handle requests to accommodate people, specifically tenants and owners. The property we bought is in the art museum area. The house was built in the mid-1800s. It's an old house, big old windows and things like that. I have four apartments. I pay the heat for the whole building. They pay their hot water and stove, gas. So there were five separate bills for that building. What a nightmare that was, let me tell you.

We moved in and decided to fix up each

apartment one at a time, move from one to the other. So when we lived in one apartment, they had the bills together. They told me that they could not separate the heat bills from the apartment. So when we moved to our first floor to try to fix up that apartment and my third floor tenants moved in, I couldn't get gas put in their name. I was told I couldn't.

After -- I mean, it was just comical. Fortunately, I have a job that I can put a call on speakerphone and it tells you how long you have been on hold. Several calls, most of them over an hour wait, I would just leave it on speakerphone. I would have the people in my office help me watch the phones while I was going about my day, maybe minimum 45 minutes. I finally paid the gas bill and just increased the rent a bit on my third floor tenants.

But in December of 2000, we purchased a new property down the street. It is a private one-family residence. When my first floor tenants moved in, they, too, could not get their gas turned on. Now, in this time I stuck with the budget plan, usually paying more than they asked, never missed a payment. My first floor tenants were told that they could not have their gas turned on, meaning their

hot water heater and their stove, until my bill was paid in full for the entire building.

I said, well, I'm still paying off a bill because you didn't bill me for an entire year.

I made so many phone calls, nobody could help me, nobody could help me, in the meantime paying the gas for my tenants again.

Finally, I got a very nice woman on the phone who literally said to me that she was not allowed to do this but she felt so sorry for me, that she did something and separated the bills for me. That's what she told me. She said, I'm not allowed to do this, but I can see your predicament. I figured if I kept calling, somebody might be able to help me.

Meanwhile, I'm fighting with PGW all this time, my bills are skyrocketing. I tried to compare them to last year's bills, but I never got a bill last winter, so I don't even know if they are appropriate or not because I never got a bill. I just got a lump shutoff notice payment. That was very frustrating.

Meanwhile, my husband and I are living in a house that's 58 degrees, wearing sweats. We work a lot so it was no big deal. I don't mind

being cold. I have my heater set so it would go down to 55 during the day, and those bills were outrageous. Unfortunately, I can't do that this year, because I have a 3-month old infant at home. So I have to keep my heat on.

My fourth, not giving appropriate notification and timing between rate increases. I do realize that although my bills might be outrageous, like I said, I do have the means to pay them. There are many hardworking people in the city that don't, like my secretary and my baby-sitter. My secretary last year had a three-year-old daughter. Her gas was cut off. She had to move in with her mother because she couldn't pay her bill. Elderly people, I have two great aunts that were in their 90s, lived a long time. I know their budgets. I know that they couldn't afford those increases.

If I could help some of these people,
I would. But PGW didn't bill people for a long
time. They neglected to bill people. Then they got
these huge bills. Most people cannot pay those
bills. And if they try to make payment
arrangements, they have to go to work during the
day. They can't sit on the phone for an hour and
wait to make payment arrangements with somebody, so

then their bills go delinquent.

So now people have high bills, bad credit, and they want to increase it again. I mean, yes, their billing system is better now and some things have improved. But they've put so many people in a bad situation that give them a chance to climb out of it before you go and increase the rates again. I'm not even talking the money itself, increasing the rates. I'm talking about their mismanagement has put people in some really bad situations. My baby-sitter has a bill of over \$2,000. She will never be able to pay that. She is living in a house with no heat, like I said. It's just really sad, I think.

Just fifth, overall poor customer service. I just implore you not to allow any proposed increases until not only customer service is accessible, but people are given the opportunity to crawl out of the holes that they've been put in by PGW and catch up on their bills and have their heat turned back on. You are just going to make a really bad situation so much worse. That's basically it.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much,
Mrs. Houston. As I pointed out, we have some PGW

people here. Perhaps they can address some of your specific questions relative to you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Our next testifier is Mrs. Maria Dirkson. You may proceed.

MS. DIRKSON: I want to say good afternoon, and it's a very big privilege that you invited me to come to share my problem that I have with PGW gas works. Well, my problem this year is not so bad as it was the following year. But last year I paid for a parts and labor service. asked them to come and clean my stove out and they never came. And so when it came to September when it got real cold, my heater wouldn't come on and I called them. And they wouldn't answer the phone. Ι was on the phone two hours and a half. And then when the girl answered, she told me you can't get no service until two weeks from now.

Then finally when the guy came out he said, this is wrong, that is wrong, we don't cover this, parts and service don't cover this. You have to get an outside person to do this. So he left. And I got an outside contractor, it cost me \$250, which my daughters had to pool the money to give me because I am on an income of \$500.

Well, so I didn't buy no parts and

labor this year because they messed me up last year.

Well, I went on and I called them and asked them to come clean my stove in September. They still didn't come again this year. Thanksgiving it gave out.

Thanksgiving day I called. I called for two hours and a half. And the girl got on the phone and said,

I'm sorry but we can't come out this Thanksgiving day. We don't have people to serve you. We only have two people on service, so they can't come.

They will come Thursday and service you.

I said, oh, my God, this is

Thanksgiving day. I just come from the hospital,
which I was in the hospital and just came home from
a surgery. So I waited two hours and I called back
again. I called back again and she said, oh, we'll
send somebody out in about an hour, but it's going
to cost you \$200 because you don't have no parts and
service. I said, okay, come out. So he came out
and looked at it and he fixed it. It was a new
thermostat that had to go in, and he put that in.

He said, well, we are going to put \$500 on your bill because you should have had parts and service. And, Miss, you know you should have had parts and service, you ought to know better than that. He looked at my daughter and he said, you got

```
enough money, you need to pay it. And he walked out.

My complaint is that the service to
```

My complaint is that the service that they give us is terrible. They need to do better in answering their phones and better all the way around. Plus they did send me a \$200 bill in this bill for me to pay besides \$85 for my regular bill. And I'm on the CAT program as it is. I can't pay no \$200. I got \$500 to work with. I got to pay electric, I got to pay the telephone bill and I got to pay my room. Everything that I have I have to pay. So it's nobody but me, so what they trying to do.

That's all I got to say. The whole thing need to be looked over and done better. I'm not the only one. I have neighbors that complain. I am the committee person in that area, and at least 25 blocks or more has the same complaint of senior citizens just like me. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much, Ms. Dirkson. Our next testifier is Michael DeVincent, PGW customer.

MR. DeVINCENT: Good afternoon. I just wish to comment on some of the things people are saying here.

It is true that waiting on the phone is ridiculous, because when I questioned my bill I was able to read the newspaper, have my lunch and watch two TV shows while I'm on hold. It's ridiculous. When they get you, when they answer the phone, they say we're sorry, we don't have an answer and they hang up. Or if you wait like two hours or so, they pick up the line and you hear them talking and laughing and carrying on and they disconnect you. And you are right back to square one again.

And it is true, though, that when you try to pay your bills they don't want your money. I don't understand that, because that's what led up to my dispute.

What I'm here to talk about is I made a revision of my papers here, because it was such short notice I got, I just threw it together and faxed it right away because I wanted to be heard. I spoke at the PUC meeting back in March of last year, and I presented to the committee my figures here. I wouldn't go into drastic detail because you can read it. But prior to this, I had called the gas company questioning my bill. And I said, you know, it doesn't look right. I said, my gas bill went like from \$112 and was \$400 for a month. And I

said, what gives? They said that we were given a 24 percent increase. I said, well, it doesn't look right.

So the following month they got another increase of 21 percent. So what I did was I sat down -- and I work for a major other public utility company. And when we split with -- well, I work for Verizon. But when we split from AT&T, we had to calculate a lot of tariff changes and things like that. And from my old training, I just took out a calculator and I started playing around with it. And I went, wait a minute, 24 percent of such and such amount is only like 2 and a half cents. Well, PGW calculated 19 and a half cents. That's a big increase. So that came out, instead of a 24 percent increase, PGW actually charged the customer a 277 percent increase for one bill.

The following month the PUC had said they gave them a 24 percent increase, when in fact it was approximately another 203 percent increase that PGW charged us. So then what I did was I called the gas company and was put on hold many times, finally got through. They looked at my calculations and said, oh, you should be our accountant because something looks wrong here. But

they couldn't give me an answer.

Then what I did was I called the PUC in Harrisburg. I sat down and I told the person, I said, this is what I'm coming up with in the calculation, could you check it? She said, yes, certainly. She went over and she told me what the rates would increase. She said, okay, a 24 percent increase, this is what your bill should reflect. I said, no, it reflects this amount. She said, no, it's wrong, where are you getting this amount from? I said, from my bill.

So after talking for about 20 minutes with this representative from the PUC, she got a supervisor on the line. And she, too, did the calculations and found out that they were all wrong. So then I took my calculations and I went to the Bustleton office up in the northeast. When I went there, I went to the front desk, and the gentleman said, what do you want? I said, I want to speak to someone. I have the calculations here and a blank check. I said, I would like to present someone to send these papers into someone to look at my figures and tell me what I actually owe, and I wish to pay at least half of my gas bill right now.

The gentleman says, do you have a

problem with your gas bill? I said, yes. He told

me -- excuse the expression because there's ladies

here -- get the hell out of here. I said, what do

you mean? I said, I just want to give somebody

these papers here. And I have a blank check and I

want to give money. He said, don't pay us. I said,

well, I want to give my papers to somebody.

Now, this is up at the Bustleton office here. He, in turn, told me he would call the police and have me thrown out of there if I didn't get out there and don't pay my bill. And I told him, I said, excuse me, I think you are working for me, I pay your salary. So he told me where to put it, so I left.

In turn, then I went to the PUC meeting that was held up in the northeast in March. And I presented to the PUC representative and the panel there my figures. Now, prior to -- I spoke. But when I went in there, PGW saw me walking in. They, in turn, said, are you here for a dispute? I said, yes. Can we look at your records first? I said, yes. They took me in the room, they looked at my records, and they said, oh, yes, you are in dispute. May I see the papers you want to present? I showed them.

1 Wow, something might be wrong here.

with the bill. I said, thank you.

I'll tell you what. This was the vice president or something with the supervisor there. He said, I'm going to call you back and I'll tell you your right charges. He says, what we will do is we'll look into this for you. Would you mind if we check this out for you? I said, no, I want to pay. I had a blank check that night, too. He said, no, don't pay us anything. Wait until we find out what is wrong

I started leaving. Instead of making a left, I was making a right. The gentleman comes out, grabs me by the arm. Where are you going?

Into the meeting. You don't have to tell the PUC anything. Why not? We are going to handle this at the gas company. I said, I can go in there, it's an open meeting. So I went over and signed the paper and spoke. He did not like that at all, because he stood behind the room and gave me the dagger look.

I presented to the PUC and also the panel my figures. I haven't heard a word from anybody. Then I, in turn, kept calling PGW. I forget the gentleman's name. I said, this man called me, he is not answering my phone calls, what's happening with my bill? You owe a lot of

money. But you don't want my money. Nobody wants my check. Well, we see it's in dispute. Forget about sending us any money, we don't want it yet, because if you send your money in now it's going to get lost. I said, what do you mean it's going to get lost, you just put it on my account. No, if you send any money in and it's misplaced and it's cashed, it's not our responsibility if we keep your money and it's misplaced. So I don't know what's going on there.

So then what I did was I finally ended up filing with the PUC. The PUC investigated this. They called me back. Mr. DeVincent, we have had several accountants at the PUC in Harrisburg look over these rates. Your rates are correct. Where did the PGW get these astronomical high charge rates? I said, can somebody tell me.

So Mr. Angelucci was handling the matter, took it to five major meetings to PGW and presented my figures. They're using my figures in Harrisburg as examples of these astronomical rates that are being charged. Now, five major meetings with these top executives, accountants and everything from PGW. Mr. Angelucci said, we want an answer. He never got one to this day. They can't

answer the rates that are calculated by PGW.

In the meantime, PGW got another 9 percent increase in April. Now, they must have gotten their computers fixed because the 9 percent increase was correct. They did charge an additional 9 percent but at their high rate but it still came out to 9 percent.

Now, Mr. Angelucci sent me a letter saying -- he called me up and said, Mr. DeVincent, you have to have all your late payment charges taken off and they have to recalculate your bill. I said, why? They said, because you won the dispute because they can't prove that your calculations are incorrect, they can't prove that theirs are correct. So by our standards you have gone by our guidelines and you have to be charged the rates that you are quoting them.

But, in the meantime, how much can you afford to put onto this bill until they settle it?

Well, I'm a one paycheck family. My wife is home raising a family. I said, well, I really can't afford it because I've got a mortgage, I've got the electric bill, I've got my own phone bill I've got to pay. I work for the company. I have all my bills, too. So he says, okay, tell you what, \$25 a

month until it's paid. I felt like saying that's still too much. I wanted to give \$1 a month like John Street did at one time. And he owed \$55,000 and he got away with it.

But the fact is to this day I've called PGW, what is my correct rate? We don't know. My latest bill says I still over \$1,000 back bill, but that's not right. What my revised copy shows is that one month I was overcharged by the correct PUC rate. I don't know whether you've got the right copy now. I just put it on this when I came in.

I was overcharged in January \$18.22. That's by the calculations the PUC told me were correct. The following month in February I was charged \$100.35 overbilled by the right calculations. Now, all through this time the rates have gone up and down and up and down.

Now, about a month ago the

Philadelphia Inquirer and the news media said, PGW,

oh my God, it must have been a miracle, out of the

blue has discovered that in the past year they have

overcharged their customers millions and millions of

dollars. But guess what? They don't have that

money to give us back.

So the PUC agreed, you've got to lower

some of your rates. The PGW says agreed, we don't have to pay the customer back, we will start lowering our rates a little bit.

Last week it was announced, PGW needs more money now, they want to raise their rates because we didn't use enough gas this year, but yet they have our millions of dollars already.

Then also it's the customer service charges now. It started at \$2 or \$4 years ago. Then \$6, \$8. It's like \$16 now. I challenged that rate myself years past. What is it for? That's to send you a bill. I said, well, guess what? I can just go to the office. You tell me what I owe, I'll write out a check and hand it to you. And I can save that money, can't I? Oh, no, we want that money from you.

And now charges are changing all right and left. They keep going up and up and up, but they are going against what the PUC says, and they're not going by what was granted to them. And they're admitting now that they overcharged us. But what is my correct bill? You're saying the people are back there. I went over to get a cookie, and a woman comes over by me, hello, Mr. DeVincent. I looked at her and said who are you, I don't

recognize you. She turned around and says, I'm from the gas company. Well, guess what? I haven't seen her since last March. Where's she been?

You want me to go back there and talk to them? No, you talk to them and you get my bill straightened out. Somebody's got to get my bill straightened out, because I don't owe them all that money, and I proved it. And this should be reflected on everybody's bill. This has to be recalculated. They have to be investigated to find out why they got an exorbitant rate. And there is absolutely even by the PUC in Harrisburg has proven, there is nobody in PGW who can justify these rates. And they are nothing but a big rip-off. We're all sitting here with the same complaints.

And, I mean, no reflection on this young lady here about minorities and all. It doesn't reflect just minorities and elderly. It's reflected in all of us. And the thing is, just like this lady here, because of her age, senior citizens, utility companies know one thing, and I can't say about my company because I don't know what they do with elderly people. But the gas company, here is this elderly woman, pays her bills on time, lives by herself. Oh, let's scare her. Give us, give us,

give us. They go after people who pay their bills but not people who don't pay their bills.

I mean, here's somebody like me waving a check, hello, let me sign this, what can I give you? Don't give us anything. Years ago I paid a bill in person. The line was too long so the deposit box, I put it in there. Do you know they lost it? It took them seven months to find it. Do you know where it was? They took the bag that night, stuck it in the store room and forgot about it. Seven months later they finally posted it. I have a double payment on my bill.

They said they can't help it if they lose bills. I said, it's in your own office, what would you do with it? We found the bag, Mr.

DeVincent, we found your bill in there. You did pay it on time. We'll fix your credit rating. Hello, what do you mean my credit rating? It's only in a room right there and you're losing it.

They are losing bills. They don't want your money. They miscalculate things. People aren't getting bills. People come after the senior citizens. They are not honoring anything. This is a big rip-off. This is what's turning into -- well, at the time I said, what's going to happen? This is

last year at the PUC meeting. I said, what's going to happen? Are they going to declare bankruptcy and everybody that paid all that exorbitant money, they lost it all? Well, guess what? They don't have my money yet, so if they go bankrupt they ain't going to get it.

Enron. Everybody is hiding their facts. The fact is these absorbant rates which were calculated and has been proven by Harrisburg, the rates that I came up with by my calculations are true and correct.

And PGW in all fact and matter, they're false. And they're passing it onto us as a higher rate.

That's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much, Mr. DeVincent. It was very helpful. Your remarks are included in the record. I will ask my staff to follow-up on some of the issues in general. Thank you very much, all of you. I appreciate all of you.

MR. ROYAL: My name is James Royal.

I'm the First Vice President of the Urban Leadership

Council. I was in there the day along with Marie to

represent the Urban Leadership Council and our

President, Reverend Bruce Edwards.

Everything that occurred today we

already know. If you remember last year when Reverend Edwards and the coalition organizations was fighting the rate increase, the 400 percent increase that people were receiving. As I heard earlier testimony today, it is very clear that our work is not done. We were asking about the people that were cut off. But we was also asking about the people that were already shut off and did they get back on or could they get back on.

I, not like the rest of these folks here today, I have an agreement. I don't agree with the bill. And let me just say this to the committee. PGW has been late and has not been working in our best interest. And we were asked to be here this morning at 10, and we didn't get started until 11. So all I'm just saying to you is that we always were where we're supposed to be.

It's important that, as we heard the testimony earlier from the management of PGW, that all these folks are above his head. Nowhere in the characterization was the customer, the ratepayer, the person that makes this whole process move forward.

We believe there has been great changes. And there was a misnomer or whatever that

PGW may or may not be sold. We want the public stuff to stay in public hands, because we were attempting to take PGW to court and then we found out there is nobody responsible. We couldn't legally put our hands on somebody and make them fess up or what have you.

When that new computer system went in, we understood what happened, stuff just got lost in the hundreds of millions of dollars. So we are going to -- we didn't have time either to put down a very clear response to the question that was sent out to us in the mail because of short notice. We will send it to you.

But we want to be clear that this fight is not over. We want these things -- the state has taken over too many things now. I think someone said earlier, it is too political in the city of Philadelphia. It's too political everywhere, because if I was part of Enron and my friend here, you'd have the national guard at that building where nothing is getting straightened out. But right now stuff is getting straightened out hopefully because of politics.

We don't believe that PGW is like Enron. We just think it's for this maneuver. I

think during the '90s everything was great and fine, and folks were just happy so the base rate didn't get raised. But we believe that in order to straighten this process out, just like it happened in the city of Philadelphia when Ed Rendell became mayor, he straightened out the budget on the backs of the workers. And PGW is fundamentally trying to do the same thing. But how do you get blood out of a rock?

1 1

1.4

1.6

2.1

2.2

I know this is a statewide issue. I know that you don't live here per se, but you want oversight. Well, the ultimate oversight, we still think it ought to stay in the domain of the public. And so the Urban Leadership Council is going to work to make that happen, because just so many things that came across the table today that we were aware of and many we weren't.

But let me tell you this. When we start -- we have 180 organizations that are part of the ULC. When we got on this gas issue, that number went over 500. And I was laughing to myself when the brother was making these comments, because policemen, firemen were coming into our office saying, get'em. Lawyers, I was surprised they were coming in and saying, get'em. And so at some point

getting them turns around and gets us. If we fool around, everybody will be sitting in the cold.

So we have to fix this thing so that the workers, because this is still a union town. So if the workers are concerned and they work for the company, I'm glad that the president didn't say everything is great. Well, he just said things are getting better and I agree. To some degree they are getting better.

But the point is if this thing continues the way it's going and whoever has any involvement in it, one of the things that you don't hear consistently, and this agenda was clear about it, you put all the technical people first and the people that pay the rates last. The ratepayers should have been at the beginning. So that when the technicians come up and are painting all these pictures, then question them and give them to you from the people that pay the bills or can't pay the bills, then you can say to them, well, what about this question, what about this thing?

The idea is we want better service, we want to be able to pay our bills. I'm telling you a secret. A little more than a month ago, I thought I owed \$800. \$800 was at the top, but after you pull

\$1,600. I caught a deep breath. I said, wait a minute, just three months ago I only owed \$800.

So I said, what do I do now? See, I only did that one or two times. I ain't calling. I'm not going to do that. I went to the office. They didn't know what I was talking about, and you have to stand in a long line. I said, just pay, just pay. That's what a lot of people try to do. But we are at a point where people can't pay. I saw a man's \$5,000 gas bill. He said you want that, come and cut it off. He said I'll build a campfire first.

But there's other older people. There are people who keep talking about the area of responsibility, people off of welfare. Where are they going? When the working people got two or three jobs that we know, you're talking about 400 or 500 people we're talking about. We're talking about the hundreds of thousands in this city that has nothing to do with color or anything else. It's just an average citizen that wants to pay their bills and can't; those that try to give the money and they reject it, and those that want to give the money and don't have it.

And then you got a few people that are slick. You got a few folks that own apartments and things like that, not like this young lady here.

They wouldn't pay a dime on a dead man.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm just saying this to you because it's deeper than you think and harder than you think. But people are just tired. They've given up on fighting city hall because they believe it doesn't do any good. We believe it does. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM:

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much.

Good job.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: I think you made a very important statement that can't be emphasized enough, and that is that the company is really the You are right. We heard from a lot of customers. people today, including you folks representing the There has been a lot of hearings on this customers. issue before, several hearings in Philadelphia. Wе are following up as a result of a sense of the General Assembly. They want the committee to look into -- this is part of an overriding issue in Pennsylvania with respect to energy costs and services that we get from companies that supply this to us.

But I think it's important, as you emphasized, that we always have to go back to the customer and what they are paying for and what they are getting for what they are paying for and what those services are and the quality of the services.

I think everybody agrees that we have talked to that there has been improvement since last year. And I think that's a combination of things. Energy prices have gone down, but also there have been changes, particularly at PGW with respect to the management and the operations of the company with regard to improvements. But I think -- and I agree with one of the testifiers -- they haven't quite turned the corner yet. We are going to be watching that very closely. I'm going to have my staff, as I said before, follow-up with PGW on the issues that were raised by your folks here.

MR. ROYAL: Let me ask you a question. Something came up one day about people's gas had been shut off -- see, my gas in my house has been shut off for about six years. I just said, come on in and cut it off. We are just not going to deal with this. And about three or four months ago, they were coming through the block. And because there was no service, the guy from the gas company said,

this is a state law, the state had come to them saying, if there's no activity in this particular house, then the gas has to be shut off from the main because it may become hazardous. And he said on all of these houses we came to, they were abandoned properties. I said, okay.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 1

25

I just happened to be going out of the house to take a friend of mine to the hospital, and these guys drove up with this jack. And I said, what are you doing? We are going to cut your gas off. I said, what are you talking about? did you notify me? He said, I came by yesterday and there was a young lady standing in the door and I told her I'd be back today to turn off the gas. But in the next breath he said, this house was I said, well, then who did you talk to abandoned. in the doorway if this house was abandoned and you're going to cut the gas off today. If I hadn't had to go to the hospital, right where he drew that circle, I would have put a chair there and sit there. I said, go get the cops.

So I'm concerned, is that true, is that some kind of mandate that the state has with the gas company or the city or whoever, that if there is no service -- because I know houses that

```
1
     have been vacant for 15 or 20 years. They never dug
     up the street until last year. Then they came by
2
     and I said they just paved the street and now here
3
     we have potholes. But is that true?
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: I don't know the
5
     answer to that question. But you raise an
6
7
     interesting point, because I do understand that in
     order to shut off the street in most cases they
 8
 9
     actually have to dig up the street. They don't have
10
     shutoff valves like they do for your water.
11
                   MR. ROYAL: Yes, they do.
12
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: In order to shut off
     your gas from outside the house, they have to dig up
13
14
     the street.
15
                   MR. ROYAL: The follow-up to that,
16
     does the customer have to pay for it when he wants
17
     his gas back on?
18
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: We can go off the
19
     record unless what you want to say --
20
                   MS. WORKMAN: No, I don't want it to
21
     be off the record. I don't think any of this
22
     deserves to be off the record. I'm sorry to be so
23
     tiresome, but I was a teacher for many, many, many
24
     years. And I don't let anything slide by me,
25
     because that's how I do things.
```

```
So I have a couple questions. One is
 1
     a concern, that the presences of the folks sitting
 2
 3
     at this table, I don't really know why they left
     when the suggestion came to me it was this was a
 4
 5
     full meeting of the Judiciary Committee and the
     citizens of Philadelphia.
 6
 7
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: I can't speak for
     the other members of the committee and whether or
 8
 9
     not they attend the hearing.
10
                   MS. WORKMAN: Whether they?
1 1
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      Whether or not they
12
     attend the hearing.
13
                   MS. WORKMAN: They were here.
14
     left.
15
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      I can't speak to why
16
     they would leave. You have to talk to them
17
     directly. They may have other commitments.
18
                   MS. WORKMAN:
                                  That raises another
19
     question for me. What other commitment is more
20
     important than this one? You know, you have lots of
21
     jobs to do. What other commitment is more important
22
     at this moment than taking care of the city and
23
     county of Philadelphia around the very serious
24
     issues?
25
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      I don't have an
```

```
1
     answer for that.
                   MS. WORKMAN: Just put it in your
 2
     little journal and you can answer it when you feel
 3
     like it.
 4
 5
                   The other is that in the academic
     committee when --
 6
 7
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Excuse me just a
 8
     moment.
 9
                   REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: I was just
10
     going to say, Mr. Chairman, the stenographer here is
11
     doing a great job without a break all this time.
12
     That information, every word you say, is made
13
     available to every member of the committee who may
14
     have had other responsibilities.
15
                   MS. WORKMAN: You're saying that, but
16
     I also notice --
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: I want to make a
17
18
     point. I think this addresses what you are saying.
19
     The members of the General Assembly, this is not the
20
     only job that they do. I know this is a very
21
     important issue for you, and we are very concerned
22
     about it and very interested, but that's why we have
23
     a court reporter here today to take down the
24
     testimony. And that is made available to every
25
     member of the committee. A copy of that record is
```

given to every member of the committee and it's made available to every member.

1.5

And this committee will issue a report to the General Assembly perhaps with some of the recommendations based on the policy questions that you raised in your testimony. We won't necessarily address your specific problems.

MS. WORKMAN: I understand that. I'm not asking for that.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: But we are mostly concerned about some of the policy issues that were addressed with respect to your specific problem. But we expect members not staying for the entire meeting. There are demands on their time that are unbelievable and I'm sure they had a good reason to leave, but I can't speak for them. I know their demands are very extreme. They do have other commitments they have to keep, and that's why we keep a record of the proceedings so that they have it available to them.

MS. WORKMAN: I understand all of that, and I wanted that in the record, my disconcertedness, if you will, about their absence. I understand.

Let me just make one more point. In

the academic community where I live, if a professor loses, misplaces, does something, whatever with your work, that's a problem. You know what happens when a professor messes up.

So I want to know just for the record how PGW will give this community, its citizens, its automatic aid?

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you.

MS. HOUSTON: I just had a quick question and it probably -- my quick question is just like hers. I just want you to remember, you said that changes are being made, improvements are being made, and I'm glad to hear that. Just keep in mind, almost every person I know out there has bills, like us, over several thousand dollars. I know these people, some of them bring in maybe \$200 a week. If they ever think they're going to see that money, are they going to have their gas off forever?

And also someone like myself, I paid over \$5,000 to PGW just in the last 12 months, and that is just for my rental unit heat, not the other gas in the house and not my private residence. I have to pay that or the tenants will be without heat. I never saw any evidence ever where that came

```
1
            Like this gentleman here, too, at the time I
     from.
 2
     saw my bill go up and up and up.
 3
                    I could not send them a check because
     they would lose my money so that's --
 4
 5
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: I'm saying that
 6
     service has improved, the call center has improved,
 7
     I have been told that by a lot of folks, including
     you sitting at the table, that there have been
 8
 9
     improvements. So I'm merely reflecting what I've
     been told.
1.0
11
                    I'm not a customer of PGW and I don't
1.2
     live in the city of Philadelphia, so I'm simply
13
     reflecting what I've been told, that improvements
14
     have been occurring. But most of the folks like
15
     yourself, the corner hasn't been turned yet.
16
     want to keep on top of that.
17
                   MR. DeVINCENT: Can I say one thing,
18
     one very brief thing?
19
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON: Very brief.
20
                   MR. DeVINCENT: Very brief. She can
21
     stop -- you can stop typing. It's all right.
                                                     lt's
22
     off the record.
23
                   CHAIRMAN GANNON:
                                      Let me just say that
24
     I want to thank you all for attending the hearing
```

and presenting your testimony. And this meeting is

25

```
adjourned.
 1
                      (The hearing concluded at 2:45 p.m.)
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	I hereby certify that the proceedings
2	and evidence are contained fully and accurately in
3	the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and
4	that this is a correct transcript of the same.
5	
6	
7	Alan M. Our
8	Jeak M. Davis, Reporter Notary Public
9	
10	
11	Notanal Seal
12	Notanal Seal Jean M. Davis, Notary Public Derry Twp., Dauphin County My Commission Expires Mar. 29, 2004
13	Member, Pennsylvania Association of Notaries
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
25	