

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE WALTER J. BRASWELL**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE )  
PETITION OF PUBLIC SERVICE )  
ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY )  
FOR APPROVAL OF AN INCREASE )  
IN ELECTRIC AND GAS RATES )  
AND FOR CHANGES IN THE ) BPU DKT. NO. GR09050422  
TARIFFS FOR ELECTRIC AND GAS ) OAL DKT. NO. PUCRL 07559-2009N  
SERVICE, B.P.U.N.J. NO. 14 )  
ELECTRIC AND B.P.U.N.J. NO. 14 )  
GAS PURSUANT TO N.J.S.A. 48:2-21 )  
AND N.J.S.A. 48:2-21.1 AND FOR )  
APPROVAL OF A GAS WEATHER )  
NORMALIZATION CLAUSE; A )  
PENSION TRACKER AND FOR )  
OTHER APPROPRIATE RELIEF )**

---

**DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF DIAN P. CALLAGHAN  
ON BEHALF OF THE  
NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF THE PUBLIC ADVOCATE  
DIVISION OF RATE COUNSEL**

---

**RONALD K. CHEN  
PUBLIC ADVOCATE OF NEW JERSEY**

**STEFANIE A. BRAND, ESQ.  
DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF RATE COUNSEL**

**DIVISION OF RATE COUNSEL  
31 Clinton Street, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
P. O. Box 46005  
Newark, New Jersey 07101  
Phone: 973-648-2690  
Email: njratepayer@rpa.state.nj.us**

**FILED: NOVEMBER 19, 2009**

**REDACTED VERSION**

## Table of Contents

<b>I.</b>	<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF TESTIMONY</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>INFORMATION REVIEWED</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>CURRENT SERVICE METRICS</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>CUSTOMER SERVICE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PLAN</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>SERVICE PERFORMANCE</b> .....	<b>15</b>
	A. Customer Operations: Call Centers and Customer Service Centers.....	16
	B. Billing .....	19
	C. Meter Reading .....	20
	D. Disconnections for Nonpayment .....	21
	E. Sub-metering Tariff Revisions .....	24

### **Exhibits**

### **Attachments**

### **Appendix-Resume**

## Direct Testimony of Dian P. Callaghan

### I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1 **Q. Please state your name, title, and business address.**

2 A. My name is Dian P. Callaghan. I am an independent consultant on utility  
3 consumer protection issues, currently retained as a Senior Consultant by  
4 McFadden Consulting Group, Inc. My business address is 7843 E. 6<sup>th</sup> Place,  
5 Denver, Colorado 80230.

6 **Q. Please provide a summary of your education and experience.**

7 A. A copy of my resume is contained in the Appendix.

8 **Q. Please summarize the Petition filed by Public Service Electric and Gas  
9 Company in this docket.**

10 A. On May 29, 2009, Public Service Electric and Gas Company (“PSE&G,” “Public  
11 Service,” or the “Company”) filed its Petition for approval of an increase of  
12 1.93% or \$133.7 million in electric distribution revenues, and 2.95% or \$96.92  
13 million increase in gas distribution revenues. The Company is seeking a return on  
14 equity of 11.5%, the establishment of a Pension Expense Tracker and a Gas  
15 Weather Normalization Clause. Public Service has about 2.1 million electric  
16 customers and 1.7 million gas customers in 300 urban, suburban, and rural  
17 communities. PSE&G’s electric and gas distribution base rates were last  
18 increased in November 2006.

1 **II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF TESTIMONY**

2 **Q. What is the purpose and scope of your testimony?**

3 A. The New Jersey Department of the Public Advocate, Division of Rate Counsel  
4 (“Rate Counsel”) retained McFadden Consulting Group, Inc. to review and  
5 evaluate certain aspects of PSE&G’s base rate case. In its testimony, the  
6 Company states that it is investing to improve customer service, the centerpiece of  
7 which is its new customer information system (“iPower,” or “CCS”). The  
8 purpose of my testimony is to evaluate PSE&G’s performance regarding its  
9 billing system, meter reading, customer operations, and disconnections for  
10 nonpayment. I also analyzed the Company’s proposed revisions to its sub-  
11 metering tariffs (Standard Terms and Conditions, §9.2.3 – Electric, and §§8.3.1  
12 and 8.3.3 - Gas).

13 In addition, I reviewed the need and desirability of a service performance  
14 plan focusing on the service metrics that measure the key interfaces between the  
15 Company and its customers. These are the measures that most commonly impact  
16 customers when they need to interact with the utility. Examples include customer  
17 calls to the Company’s call center, how long it takes to reach a customer service  
18 representative, and the number and types of complaints to the Board of Public  
19 Utilities (“BPU” or “Board”).

1 **Q. Are any other Rate Counsel witnesses addressing PSE&G's service**  
2 **performance and consumer issues?**

3 A. Yes. Richard W. LeLash is addressing PSE&G's historical service performance  
4 on a variety of metrics. Mr. LeLash and I are jointly sponsoring the service  
5 metrics and industry benchmarks recommended in my testimony.

6 **III. INFORMATION REVIEWED**

7 **Q. Please describe the materials and information you reviewed in conducting**  
8 **your analysis and preparing your testimony.**

9 A. In conducting our analysis, McFadden Consulting Group, Inc. reviewed the  
10 Company's filed Petition and exhibits, as well as the prefiled direct testimony and  
11 exhibits of Ralph A. LaRossa and Stephen Swetz. I also reviewed the Company's  
12 responses to discovery in this docket, various relevant Board orders and  
13 regulations, and researched sub-metering policy in other states.

14 **IV. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

15 **Q. Please summarize your conclusions and recommendations.**

16 A. Based on my review of PSE&G's filing and proposed sub-metering tariff  
17 revisions, its service metrics and service performance in specific areas, and its  
18 transition to a new customer care system, I recommend the following:

- 19
  - The Board should require PSE&G to adopt a service performance  
20 plan with eight specific measures and benchmarks that reflect the  
21 key interactions between the Company and its customers. The  
22 Company should measure its performance on these metrics  
23 monthly and submit quarterly reports to the Board and Rate

1 Counsel. Exhibit DPC-1 provides a recommended performance  
2 plan for PSE&G.

- 3 • PSE&G customers are experiencing long wait times to reach a  
4 service representative at the general inquiry call centers. Also, the  
5 Board is receiving a high number of complaints about the answer  
6 times, as well as increased complaints about billing and meter  
7 reading. Several factors, including the economy, have contributed  
8 to these problems. Another factor is the Company's  
9 implementation of its new iPower customer care system. In  
10 addition to the on going service performance plan, and until  
11 PSE&G's performance improves and complaints to the Board  
12 return to 2008 levels, I recommend the Board monitor PSE&G's  
13 hiring of additional employees in the call centers, monitor the root  
14 cause analysis of complaints to the Board as shown in Exhibit  
15 DPC-2, and track the impacts of iPower on customers.
- 16 • Notices to PSE&G customers of discontinuance for nonpayment  
17 have increased dramatically in 2009 as have complaints to the  
18 Board about such notices. Again, the economy is a factor, but the  
19 implementation of iPower and changes in Company procedures,  
20 including a new Credit Worthiness Score ("CRW"), have also  
21 contributed. I recommend the Company file its shut-off notice  
22 policy, including the CRW, in its tariffs and, if approved by the  
23 Board, post it on the PSE&G web site so its customers are aware of

1 the policy and can challenge the accuracy of the CRW as it relates  
2 to their individual accounts. Also, the Board should examine both  
3 the content and number of notices and reminders of nonpayment  
4 issued by the Company to determine if these notices are excessive  
5 and unduly alarming to customers.

6 • I recommend the Board reject PSE&G's proposed gas and electric  
7 sub-metering tariffs because they are inconsistent with the Board's  
8 2005 Sub-metering Order<sup>1</sup> and, while the proposed revisions may  
9 solve problems for landlords, they create problems for tenants.  
10 Moreover, the proposed revisions constitute a significant policy  
11 change that should be considered in a generic proceeding where all  
12 parties at interest can voice their opinions.

## 13 V. SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS

14 **Q. What service improvements has PSE&G made since its last rate case and**  
15 **what service improvements does it plan to make?**

16 A. In addition to making improvements in its infrastructure to provide adequate, safe,  
17 and reliable service, Public Service asserts it continues to invest in customer  
18 service improvements. The Company's April 1, 2009 implementation of its new  
19 customer information system, known as iPower or Customer Care System

---

<sup>1/</sup> I/M/O A Pilot Program Allowing Sub-metering (Formerly Check-metering) in Residential Properties Regulated by the New Jersey Housing & Mortgage Finance Agency, BPU Docket No. AO05080734, Decision and Order Approving Sub-metering Pilot Program, dated September 19, 2005. ("Sub-metering Order")

1 (“CCS”) is its primary effort to improve customer service.

2 **Q. Please briefly describe the iPower system.**

3 A. PSE&G’s iPower system replaced its 30-year old Customer Information System,  
4 upgraded its Interactive Voice Response Unit (“IVRU”), and implemented a new  
5 self-service website, allowing customers to see and pay their bills on line, offer  
6 paperless billing, start or change service, schedule appointments, enroll in budget  
7 billing, report and monitor power outages, and other customer conveniences. A  
8 new Home Energy Toolkit will permit customers to analyze their energy usage.

9 The upgraded IVRU will permit self-service, such as bill payment, using  
10 plain language prompts. The new CCS also includes improved hand-held mobile  
11 computers for field personnel in collections, gas service information, and electric  
12 meter technicians to enhance routing and scheduling. The iPower system is  
13 designed to improve automated call queuing so that hold times in the call centers  
14 can be reduced. The CCS also provides advanced customer database capabilities  
15 that will permit the Company to track additional performance measures and  
16 identify and serve customers better.

17 **Q. Has the iPower system actually improved customer service?**

18 A. Not yet. The Company correctly anticipated there would be transition problems  
19 with the new system for about 9 to 18 months. Although PSE&G customers are  
20 using the convenience of web accounts and paperless billing, customer complaints  
21 related to iPower are significant. Thus far, about 30% of the customer complaints

1 to the Board are due to the iPower implementation.<sup>2</sup> Later in my testimony, I will  
2 discuss in more detail the impacts of the iPower transition on billing, call center  
3 answer times, shut-off notices, and customer complaints.

4 **VI. CURRENT SERVICE METRICS**

5 **Q. What service performance measures and systems does PSE&G currently use**  
6 **to both evaluate and improve its performance?**

7 A. Primarily, the Company uses a sophisticated tool that measures its service  
8 performance monthly on a number of different metrics incorporated into its  
9 Balanced Scorecards for Electric Delivery, Gas Delivery, and Customer  
10 Operations. Also, a consolidated Balanced Scorecard combines key measures  
11 from each of the individual scorecards.

12 Each year, PSE&G sets targets for the various measures in the scorecards  
13 and tracks monthly progress toward achieving those targets. The targets are  
14 reflected in employee goals and are an integral part of employee performance  
15 evaluations and compensation.<sup>3</sup> The scorecards are provided to employees  
16 quarterly so they can monitor their progress toward achieving the performance  
17 goals.

18 In addition to service performance measures, the Balanced Scorecards  
19 include measures of employee safety, staffing, development, and training;  
20 economic measures such as current capital performance and energy efficiency-

---

<sup>2/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request DCA-6 attached.

<sup>3/</sup> Direct Testimony of Ralph A. LaRossa, p. 11, lines 6-19.

1 productivity measure (carbon abatement); and, green energy metrics such as peak  
2 (MW) demand reduction and renewable energy generated (kWh).

3 **Q. What specific service performance metrics are included in the Gas and**  
4 **Electric Delivery Scorecards and the Customer Operations Scorecard?**

5 A. The “Safe and Reliable” category in each of these scorecards include the  
6 following performance measures with specific annual targets to be achieved:

7 Customer Operations

- 8 • Percent of actual meters read
- 9 • Meters not read for >7 months
- 10 • Meter reading errors/10,000 reads
- 11 • General inquiry service level (percent of calls offered and answered by rep.  
12 in 30 seconds)
- 13 • Abandonment rate – inbound collections
- 14 • First contact resolution
- 15 • Billing exception time
- 16 • Cashier errors
- 17 • BPU inquiry rate – collections
- 18 • BPU inquiries – non-collections
- 19 • Customer perception surveys (CPI) – residential/small business, large  
20 business
- 21 • Moment of Truth (MOT) survey – residential and small business

22 Gas Delivery

- 23 • Gas leak reports per mile

- 1 • Leak response rate
- 2 • Appointment kept (appliance service)
- 3 • BPU Inquiries – non-collections
- 4 • Perception survey (res/small bus.)
- 5 • Moment of Truth survey
- 6 • Damages per 1,000 locate requests
- 7 • Open leaks
- 8 • % regulatory compliance

9 Electric Delivery

- 10 • Outage measures: SAIFI, MAIFI, CAIDI, CEMI
- 11 • Forced automatic outage rate (trans.)
- 12 • Mean time to service
- 13 • Perception survey (res/small bus.)
- 14 • Moment of Truth survey
- 15 • Number of regulatory inquiries

16 **Q. Does PSE&G track other customer service performance measures?**

17 A. Yes. Public Service tracks a number of other performance measures such as  
 18 billing accuracy, call abandonment percentage, etc., but these measures may not  
 19 have specific targets or benchmarks to achieve because they are not part of the  
 20 Balanced Scorecard. The Company also coordinates a national panel of utility

1 companies that produces an annual Utility Peer Panel Study with key measures  
2 compared across utilities.<sup>4</sup>

3 **Q. Please explain how the Customer Perception and Moment of Truth Surveys**  
4 **measure customer satisfaction.**

5 A. The Perception Survey or Customer Perception Index (“CPI”) is a telephone  
6 survey to a random sample of residential, small business and large business  
7 customers who may or may not have had a transaction with the Company. The  
8 CPI is an index of three questions that ask about overall satisfaction, how the  
9 Company is meeting expectations, and how it compares with the ideal utility. In  
10 addition to the CPI, the survey measures customer perception on a variety of  
11 actionable areas such as reliability of service, customer experience with the call  
12 centers and customer service centers, etc. The survey results in these areas  
13 provide valuable information for improving service to customers.<sup>5</sup>

14 The Moment of Truth (“MOT”) surveys are performed immediately after  
15 the Company has provided a particular service to measure how well it is  
16 performing and satisfying customers. The MOT surveys of residential and small  
17 business customers measure telephone (call centers), field, emergency, and office  
18 services. Although a single score each for Gas Delivery, Electric Delivery, and  
19 Customer Operations is tracked through the Balanced Scorecard, the MOT  
20 generates additional data that the Company can use to improve its operations and  
21 customer satisfaction.

---

<sup>4/</sup> LaRossa Direct Testimony, p. 13, lines 10-14.

<sup>5/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-CI-7 attached.

1 **Q. Does PSE&G’s performance measurement system reflect a Company focus**  
2 **on customer service and utility service improvement?**

3 A. Yes, I think Public Service values both the measurement of its performance and  
4 the service improvements that attention to performance measurement can produce.  
5 The Company strives to be “best in class” as compared with similar energy  
6 utilities. My testimony does not touch on all the various tools the Company uses  
7 to track its performance.

8 **Q. Does the Company provide the Balanced Scorecards to the Board or to Rate**  
9 **Counsel?**

10 A. Not to my knowledge. The scorecards are essentially internal documents that the  
11 Company uses to measure and improve its operations, financial position,  
12 employee development and safety, and customer satisfaction. They provide an  
13 accountability tool for management and employees.

14 **VII. CUSTOMER SERVICE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PLAN**

15 **Q. Do you think PSE&G’s performance measurement plan is sufficient to**  
16 **provide accountability to its customers and the Board?**

17 A. The Company’s system of performance measurement is comprehensive and  
18 includes an extensive set of service metrics. However, it misses some of the key  
19 measures important to customer interactions and transactions with the Company,  
20 and it is an internal accountability system. A performance plan with a set of key  
21 customer service measures is an important tool for PSE&G accountability to  
22 regulators and customers.

1 **Q. What do you recommend?**

2 A. I recommend that the Board require PSE&G to adopt a service performance plan  
3 with specific, well-defined service metrics and benchmarks that set standards for  
4 each measure that the Company should meet. PSE&G's performance should be  
5 measured monthly and quarterly reports submitted to the Board and to Rate  
6 Counsel. I have included as Exhibit DPC-1 a service performance plan for  
7 PSE&G that Mr. LeLash and I recommend the Board require the Company to  
8 adopt. Many of the metrics are either tracked by Public Service now, or soon will  
9 be through iPower.

10 **Q. Please describe the performance plan you recommend as Exhibit DPC-1.**

11 A. The Service Performance Plan contains eight measures, each operationally  
12 defined, and each with a standard industry benchmark for energy utilities. The  
13 plan measures the Company's performance in answering calls at its call centers, in  
14 reading meters, billing accuracy, gas leak, odor, and emergency call response,  
15 service appointments met, and overall customer service through the complaints to  
16 the BPU. Exhibit DPC-1 also provides data on PSE&G's prior performance,  
17 where available, on each of these measures. The prior performance indicates  
18 these are reasonable targets that the Company either is or should be meeting.

19 **Q. Please describe the call center measures and benchmarks.**

20 A. The first measure is average speed of answer ("ASA") with a benchmark of 80%  
21 of calls answered in 30 seconds from the time the customer indicates the desire to  
22 speak with a customer service representative to when the representative picks up

1 the phone. This is usually referred to as a service level goal. PSE&G's Scorecard  
2 target has varied annually, and has generally been in the 75% range.

3 The second measure is the abandoned call percentage ("ACP") with a  
4 benchmark of 5% or fewer calls abandoned. When a customer terminates a call  
5 before it is answered, it indicates frustration with the amount of time spent in the  
6 queue. Since the ACP is not a PSE&G Scorecard measure, the Company has not  
7 established a target. Public Service met the benchmark we recommend in 2007  
8 and 2008. Due to the iPower transition, the Company will not meet the industry  
9 benchmark in 2009.

10 A companion measure to the ASA rate is the average amount of time in  
11 seconds it takes to reach a customer service representative. If the Company is not  
12 achieving the ASA, this measure reveals how long, on average, customers are  
13 waiting to talk to a representative. We are not recommending a benchmark or  
14 target for this measure, but rather that it be reported and monitored.

15 The customers' contacts with the call centers are critical to their overall  
16 satisfaction with the Company's service. Consistent efficient response to  
17 customer calls is what customers expect. This is why this measure should be  
18 evaluated on a monthly basis.

19 **Q. What measures and benchmarks are you recommending for meter reading  
20 and billing?**

21 A. For meter reading, we recommend percentage of meters read, with a benchmark of  
22 95% of meters read on cycle. PSE&G has consistently achieved an average of

1 about 90% meters read. I will discuss the issue of estimated bills later in my  
2 testimony.

3 The measure for billing is a measure of billing accuracy, which is the  
4 number of rebills per 1,000 customers measured as all bills mailed to customers  
5 that are later adjusted, cancelled, or re-issued for any amount or reason. The  
6 benchmark is 20 or fewer rebills per 1,000 customers. Since 2006, PSE&G has  
7 fallen just short of achieving this benchmark. The Company's Scorecard targets  
8 for 2006-2009 meters read were, respectively, 90%, 91%, 89.5%, and 90.1%.

9 **Q. What measures do you recommend for safety and reliability?**

10 A. We recommend two measures of safety and reliability. First, we recommend  
11 establishing a benchmark of Company response to gas leak, odor, and emergency  
12 calls of 95% responded to within 60 minutes. The response must be by qualified  
13 personnel so that the issue can be addressed and resolved the first time. The  
14 Company currently tracks this measure and has consistently exceeded the  
15 benchmark with an annual average response of 99.9% responded to within 60  
16 minutes. We are also recommending that when the benchmark is not met, the  
17 Company report the actual response time and the reason for the delay. If delays  
18 are excessive, the Board needs to consider remedial action.

19 Second, we recommend a measure of service appointments met with a  
20 benchmark of 95% met. This is a measure of percentage of appointments  
21 completed on the day scheduled and includes meter installations, disconnects and  
22 reconnects, billing investigations, initial and final meter reads. Although PSE&G

1 currently tracks only appliance service appointments met, iPower will give it the  
2 capability to track this measure.

3 We are not recommending an electric system reliability measure at this  
4 time. The Direct Testimony of Charles Salamone on behalf of Rate Counsel in  
5 this docket provides an in-depth discussion of electric system reliability metrics.

6 **Q. What measure are you recommending for overall customer service and  
7 satisfaction?**

8 A. We are recommending a fairly common industry benchmark of less than 1  
9 complaint to the BPU per 1,000 customers annually as a good measure of overall  
10 performance. Generally, customers lodge complaints with the Board only after  
11 they have been unable to resolve the issue with the utility. It has been my  
12 experience over the years that complaints to regulators are an early warning sign  
13 of service quality problems. In addition, we recommend the Company continue to  
14 track and report complaints by root cause category, such as billing, collections,  
15 etc.

16 Although Exhibit DPC-1 indicates PSE&G has fallen short of the  
17 benchmark, we believe this common industry standard is reasonable and PSE&G  
18 should be able to meet it.

19 **VIII. SERVICE PERFORMANCE**

20 **Q. Please describe PSE&G's performance on the various service metrics since  
21 its last rate case.**

22 A. The Direct Testimony of Richard LeLash on behalf of Rate Counsel in this docket  
23 addresses the Company's actual performance on a variety of measures, both

1 historically and current. My testimony addresses the Company's performance in  
2 the specific areas of customer operations, billing, meter reading, and  
3 disconnections for nonpayment and, in particular, the impact of the iPower  
4 transition on service performance in these areas. In addition, I reviewed the  
5 Company's performance on the specific customer-utility interaction measures  
6 included in the service performance plan I recommend in my testimony.

7 **A. Customer Operations: Call Centers and Customer Service Centers**

8 **Q. Please describe PSE&G's Call Centers and Customer Service Centers.**

9 A. Public Service has 16 Customer Service Centers ("CSC") throughout its service  
10 territory, and five call centers. There are two centralized call centers that take  
11 customer calls, as well as one call center for collection and two for construction  
12 inquiries. The CSCs are business offices that handle customer transactions and  
13 inquiries. The centralized or general inquiry call centers handle any kind of  
14 customer call from reporting a gas leak to asking about their bills.

15 **Q. How many employees staff the CSCs and call centers and what staffing  
16 changes has the Company made in the past few years?**

17 A. Customer Operations has about 1600 employees, with about 675 full-time  
18 equivalents ("FTEs") at the CSCs and call centers. At the 16 CSCs, the  
19 Company reports an increase of 6 employees in 2009. The General Inquiry call  
20 centers (North and South) had a reduction of 6 employees in 2007, an increase of  
21 71 employees in 2008, and a reduction of 37 employees in 2009, with the largest

1 reduction in June.<sup>6</sup> Public Service reported hiring about 30 temporaries to work  
2 during the iPower transition and stated that the “current business plan does not  
3 reflect our present plans to increase staffing by 50 employees” during October and  
4 November to the call centers.<sup>7</sup>

5 **Q. Please describe PSE&G’s performance on the service measures you reviewed**  
6 **for its general inquiry call centers.**

7 A. As shown in Exhibit DPC-1, the Company does not meet the industry standard of  
8 80% of calls answered in 30 seconds (“ASA”) and has not met the standard in 35  
9 of the last 44 months. Although expected to decrease due to the iPower transition,  
10 the 2009 answer speed performance dropped dramatically. This means that  
11 PSE&G customers are experiencing long hold times waiting to talk to a service  
12 representative.

13 This same exhibit shows that, while Public Service met the industry  
14 standard of 5% or fewer calls abandoned (Abandoned Call Percentage (“ACP”))  
15 in half of the past 36 months, the Company fell far short of meeting the standard  
16 in each month of 2009, topping out at 24.9% calls abandoned in April when  
17 iPower was launched.

18 For Average Speed of Answer, Exhibit DPC-1 shows the Company  
19 averaged just under a minute for a service representative to answer the call from  
20 2006-2008, but in the first 8 months of 2009, the average was almost 4 minutes  
21 with a high of almost 6.5 minutes in April.

---

<sup>6/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-A-131 attached.  
<sup>7</sup> See Response to Discovery Requests DCA-12 and RCR-CI-30 attached.

1           Taken together, these three measures indicate that customers have long  
2 wait times to reach a service representative and are experiencing a high level of  
3 frustration given the abandoned call percentage. The Company attributed most of  
4 the increased call volumes and call handle times to the economic downturn, but  
5 iPower contributed to the poor performance of the call centers after April 1,  
6 2009.<sup>8</sup> Reducing the number of FTEs in the call centers in June, even though the  
7 Company was experiencing increased volumes and hold times, likely  
8 compounded the iPower problems. Curiously, PSE&G lowered its ASA target to  
9 61% for 2009 versus a target of 75% in 2008, rather than attempting to maintain  
10 answer time during the iPower transition.

11 **Q. Do customer complaints to the Board reflect these performance problems?**

12 A. Yes. Exhibit DPC-2 shows that complaints of “answer time too long” increased  
13 from 7 in 2008 year-to-date (“YTD”) to 144 in 2009 YTD. Similarly, complaints  
14 of “first call not handled” more than doubled from 2008 to 2009 YTD. Overall,  
15 call center complaints were more than 4 times greater year-to-date 2009 over  
16 2008.

17 **Q.***[Confidential testimony begins here]* 

18  
19 A. 

20  
21  
22

---

<sup>8/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-CI-30 attached.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21



**[Confidential testimony ends here]**

**Q. What do you recommend to the Board?**

A. Previously in my testimony, I recommended the Board require PSE&G to submit quarterly reports to the Board tracking a number of specific service performance metrics, including those mentioned above. Until performance improves, the Board also should monitor the root cause analysis of complaints as shown, for example, in Exhibit DPC-2 and require the Company to report the steps it is taking to remediate the problems.<sup>9</sup> The complaint categories, such as meter reading, customer service center, billing, are too broad and do not reveal the nature of the complaints. The root cause analysis gives the Board both the volume and reason for the complaint. Also, the Board should monitor the Company's progress in hiring 50 additional employees to staff the call centers, and track the impacts of iPower through the Board staff's EDI Stakeholder Group.

**B. Billing**

**Q. Did you find any billing issues in your review of the Company's performance?**

A. Yes. Exhibit DPC-2 shows the root cause analysis of billing complaints to the Board. Complaints about high bills in 2009 YTD are more than double those for 2008 YTD. Complaints of inaccurate bills skyrocketed in 2009 over the same

---

<sup>9/</sup> See Response to Discovery Requests RCR-CI-30 and 32 in which the Company outlines the steps it is taking to improve the call center performance, including training and hiring additional employees.

1 period in 2008, and the total number of billing complaints has more than doubled.  
2 Exhibit DPC-1 shows the average rebills/1,000 customers is higher in 2009 than  
3 2008, which one would expect due to the impact of the iPower implementation.  
4 Overall, billing complaints to the BPU, from a high of 1,081 in 2006, dropped to  
5 416 in 2008. However, the number of billing complaints in the first six months of  
6 2009 is 433, which is higher than the total billing complaints in all of 2008.<sup>10</sup>

7 **Q. What do you recommend to the Board concerning the billing complaints?**

8 A. Again, the high number of complaints about billing in 2009 is largely due to the  
9 implementation of iPower. According to a telephone discovery conference with  
10 the Company, iPower generated multiple bills to certain customers. I recommend  
11 the Board monitor the root cause analysis of billing complaints until the  
12 complaints drop to 2008 levels and require the Company to report the steps it is  
13 taking to fix the billing problems.

14 **C. Meter Reading**

15 **Q. What are the problems you found with meter reading?**

16 A. Meter reading complaints in 2009 have increased about 1.5 times over 2008 YTD.  
17 The root cause is both estimated reading and iPower migration as seen in Exhibit  
18 DPC-2. Also, Exhibit DPC-1 shows that the Company is reading about 90% of  
19 meters on cycle, which falls short of the 95% industry standard.

20 **Q. What do you recommend?**

21 A. The Service Performance Plan in Exhibit DPC-1 will permit the Board to monitor  
22 PSE&G's percentage of meters read on a quarterly basis. Also, the Company has

---

<sup>10</sup> / See Response to Discovery Request RCR-CI-15 attached.

1 a measure in its Balanced Scorecard that tracks meters not read in more than  
2 seven months. Board rules at N.J.A.C. 14:3-7.2(e)(3) permit the utility to  
3 discontinue service if at least eight months have gone by since the last meter  
4 reading was obtained and after proper notice. Notice is required on the fifth and  
5 seventh months. I recommend the Company track the percentage of meters not  
6 read by the fifth month to reduce the percentage not read before the critical  
7 seventh month.

8 **D. Disconnections for Nonpayment**

9 **Q. Have PSE&G's disconnections for nonpayment increased, and if so, why?**

10 A. While actual disconnections for nonpayment have not increased, shut-off notices  
11 have increased substantially. Exhibit DPC-3 shows dramatic increases in shut-off  
12 notices each month of 2009 versus 2008, ranging from 22% in February/March to  
13 a 39% increase in May. The Company attributes the increases primarily to the  
14 economic downturn with the resulting increases in the unemployment rate and  
15 number of bankruptcies.<sup>11</sup> However, the jump in shut-off notices in May and June  
16 must also be due to the iPower implementation.

17 As shown in Exhibit DPC-2, the number of complaints about receiving a  
18 notice/reminder increased 150% in 2009 over 2008 YTD. Concern about being  
19 shut-off increased 125% for the same time period. While it is reasonable to  
20 assume that the economy is a major contributor, the iPower system allows the  
21 Company to send a variety of reminders, notices and bill messages.

---

<sup>11/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-CI-59 attached.

1 PSE&G customers are clearly sensitive about receiving these notices and  
2 reminders, based on the number of complaints. Since actual shut-offs have not  
3 increased, it is more likely that customers are paying their bills late rather than not  
4 paying them at all. Many consumers have to pay some bills one month and others  
5 the next due to reduced incomes. The Company's reminders and notices have  
6 likely also increased as late payments have increased.

7 The Company has a complex policy for what triggers a shut-off notice.  
8 This policy combines an internal Credit Worthiness Score ("CRW") with  
9 delinquent amounts that, when a threshold is reached, trigger reminders or actual  
10 discontinuance notices, which apparently are hard or soft notices. Some  
11 reminders or notices are written on the customer's bill.

12 **Q. Please explain the Credit Worthiness Score.**

13 A. Customers accumulate points for unpaid bills, returned items and broken  
14 installment plans. Residential customers are sent reminders with delinquent  
15 amounts of \$30 and \$60 and internal Credit Worthiness Scores greater than or  
16 equal to 0. When the delinquent amount exceeds \$60 and the CRW is between 0  
17 and 109, additional reminders are sent. Discontinuance notices are sent to  
18 residential customers with delinquent amounts exceeding \$60 and a CRW greater  
19 than 109.<sup>12</sup>

20 Industrial and commercial customers are sent shut-off notices with  
21 delinquent amounts greater than \$60.

---

<sup>12/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-CI-53 attached.

1 **Q. Is the Credit Worthiness Score calculation in PSE&G's tariffs or on its web**  
2 **site?**

3 A. No, and I think it should be both in the tariffs and on the Company's web site so  
4 customers know what to expect and the Board can determine if the policy is  
5 equitable, consistent with its rules and regulations, and is being applied uniformly.

6 **Q. Do you think the Company's reminder/shut-off notice policy is consistent**  
7 **with the Board's rules?**

8 A. It may not be. The BPU's rules at N.J.A.C.14:3-3A.2(a) prohibit service  
9 discontinuance unless either the customer's arrearage exceeds \$100 and/or the  
10 customer's account is more than three months in arrears. Although not  
11 specifically stated in the rules, a utility should not be permitted to issue a notice of  
12 discontinuance to a customer who is not actually at risk of discontinuance under  
13 the rules.

14 As of the writing of my testimony, I have not received a copy of PSE&G's  
15 policy so I cannot say definitively whether it complies with the Board's rules and  
16 regulations.

17 **Q. What do you recommend?**

18 A. First, the Company should file its shut-off notice policy, including the Credit  
19 Worthiness Score calculation, in its tariffs and, if approved, post it on the PSE&G  
20 web site in the tariff section. This way, customers will know why they are  
21 receiving various reminders and notices about delinquent accounts, and be able to  
22 challenge the accuracy of PSE&G's CRW as it relates to their account.



1                   Finally, PSE&G’s gas tariff permits sub-metering in industrial or  
2 commercial buildings, but limits sub-metering in residential buildings to those  
3 that are publicly financed or government-owned, are condominiums or  
4 cooperative housing, or charitable institutions.

5 **Q. Please summarize PSE&G’s current electric sub-metering tariff provisions.**

6 A. The Company’s current electric sub-metering tariff also requires that, when the  
7 customer of record charges the tenant for the tenant’s usage, the charges shall not  
8 exceed the amount Public Service would have charged the tenant if he/she had  
9 been served and billed directly by Public Service on the most appropriate rate  
10 schedule, including reasonable administrative expenses.<sup>16</sup> The electric tariff  
11 permits sub-metering in commercial or industrial buildings, but specifies that all  
12 new or renovated residential units must be separately metered by Public Service.  
13 Sub-metering in existing residential buildings is not prohibited.

14                   To summarize, PSE&G’s current gas and electric tariffs permit sub-  
15 metering in commercial and industrial buildings and in certain specified  
16 residential buildings, although the residential buildings where gas sub-metering is  
17 permitted are different from those where electric sub-metering is allowed. The  
18 landlord/customer of record may not charge the tenants more than what the tenant  
19 would have paid if billed and served directly by Public Service, including  
20 reasonable administrative expenses. The current Public Service tariffs provide

---

<sup>16/</sup> Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Tariff for Electric Service, Standard Terms and Conditions, §9.2.3, B.P.U.N.J. No. 15 Electric, Exhibit P-1, Schedule 1, First Revised Sheet No. 28 Superseding Original Sheet No. 28, Effective March 20, 2005.

1 rate protection to the tenants of the landlord/customer of record by specifying a  
2 maximum, capped rate.

3 **Q. In addition to the definition of sub-metering, what other provisions in the**  
4 **Board's Sub-metering Order are relevant to this discussion?**

5 A. Importantly, the Board's Sub-metering Order established two conditions for  
6 customers of record or primary consumers when charging tenants for actual usage:  
7 (1) the total charges to tenants cannot exceed the cost incurred by the primary  
8 consumer for providing the commodity; and, (2) the total charges to tenants  
9 cannot exceed the amount that the utility serving the customer of record/landlord  
10 would charge the tenant for the same service. The Board continued its prohibition  
11 on reselling energy for profit.

12 The Board's definition of sub-metering seems to limit the term to the use  
13 of direct metering devices for determining the tenants' energy usage. Requiring  
14 the use of direct metering is consistent with the Ordering Paragraph which finds  
15 that sub-metering has the potential to increase conservation efforts.<sup>17</sup> Other  
16 methods of allocating the landlord's energy bill, such as according to each unit's  
17 square footage, would not meet the definition of sub-metering and presumably  
18 would not be regulated by the Board.<sup>18</sup>

19 The Sub-metering Order did not specify a difference as to the type of  
20 residential buildings where electric or gas sub-metering is permitted. The Board's  
21 Order states that both electric and gas sub-metering are permitted only in

---

<sup>17/</sup> Sub-metering Order, pp. 2 and 5.

<sup>18/</sup> Ibid., p.2.

1 residential buildings that are publicly financed, government owned,  
2 condominiums or cooperative housing, and charitable institutions.<sup>19</sup>

3 Finally, the purpose of the Board’s Sub-Metering Order was to approve a  
4 five-year pilot program allowing electric and gas sub-metering of residential  
5 multi-unit housing in conjunction with the New Jersey Housing & Mortgage  
6 Finance Agency (“NJHMFA”).<sup>20</sup> Recently, however, the Board issued an order to  
7 show cause why the sub-metering pilot program should not be suspended due to  
8 wide discrepancies of metered usage in similarly situated apartments. The Board  
9 stated that it would consider this matter on November 20, 2009.<sup>21</sup>

10 **Q. What are PSE&G’s proposed revisions to its electric and gas sub-metering**  
11 **tariffs?**

12 A. The proposed gas and electric sub-metering tariff revisions state that if the  
13 customer of record/landlord charges the tenant for usage, the charges cannot  
14 exceed the tenant’s share of the landlord’s bill, based on the tenant’s pro rata  
15 share of the total usage, “except that reasonable administrative expenses may be  
16 added.”<sup>22</sup> (emphasis added)

17 The proposed tariff revisions would eliminate one of the two conditions  
18 set forth in the Board’s Sub-metering Order: that the customer of record’s charges  
19 to the tenant may not exceed the amount Public Service would have charged the

---

<sup>19/</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20/</sup> Ibid., p.5.

<sup>21/</sup> BPU Docket No. AO05080734, Order to Show Cause, October 28, 2009.

<sup>22/</sup> Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Proposed Gas Tariff #15 Redlined with Guide to Changes, Schedule 6, Exhibit P-1, Original Sheet No. 21, §§8.3.1 and 8.3.3; and Proposed Electric Tariff #15 Redlined with Guide to Changes, Schedule 3, Exhibit P-1, Original Sheet No. 27, §9.2.3.

1 tenant if he/she were served and billed directly by the Company. The revisions  
2 also allow reasonable administrative expenses to be added rather than included in  
3 the tenant's share of the landlord's bill. The rate the landlord can charge the  
4 tenant would no longer be capped at an appropriate PSE&G rate that includes  
5 administrative expenses. Instead, the landlord can charge the tenant his/her pro-  
6 rata share of the landlord's bill based on the tenant's usage plus administrative  
7 expenses.

8 **Q. Are PSE&G's proposed revisions to its electric and gas sub-metering tariffs**  
9 **consistent with the Board's Sub-metering Order?**

10 A. No. First, as I mentioned previously, the sub-metering tariff revisions would  
11 eliminate one of the two conditions specifying how a customer of record/landlord  
12 is permitted to charge tenants for sub-metered energy costs.

13 Second, the term check-metering needs to be deleted and the definition of  
14 sub-metering inserted to be consistent with the Board's Sub-metering Order. The  
15 Company has indicated it will revise the language of its tariff to conform to the  
16 Board's Order.<sup>23</sup>

17 Third, the current and proposed electric tariffs are inconsistent with the  
18 Board's Sub-metering Order by permitting sub-metering in existing (i.e., not new  
19 or renovated) residential buildings. The Board's Order stated that electric and gas  
20 sub-metering is allowed in industrial or commercial buildings, and residential  
21 buildings that are publicly financed and government-owned, cooperative housing

---

<sup>23/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-TAR-6 attached.

1 or condominiums, and charitable institutions. The Board did not differentiate  
2 between electric and gas sub-metering as to the type of residential buildings in  
3 which sub-metering is permitted.

4 **Q. What is PSE&G's rationale for requesting these tariff revisions?**

5 A. On January 18, 2007, PSE&G filed a Petition seeking Board approval to revise its  
6 electric and gas sub-metering tariffs. In this docket, the Company states that it is  
7 proposing sub-metering tariff modifications to conform its tariff language to  
8 PSE&G's proposed tariff revisions in its 2007 Petition to the Board in BPU  
9 Docket Nos. GT07010036 and ET07010035.<sup>24</sup>

10 The Company's 2007 Sub-metering Petition asserted three related reasons  
11 for revising its sub-metering tariffs.<sup>25</sup> First, PSE&G's gas and electric rate  
12 schedules have been unbundled and customers can purchase energy supply from  
13 third party suppliers ("TPS"). PSE&G's energy supply pricing for nonresidential  
14 customers is now more complicated with monthly market-based pricing for gas,  
15 and, depending on size, either fixed price or hourly market-based pricing for  
16 electric supply, and new billing determinants related to electric capacity and  
17 transmission obligations. Second, given these industry changes and the  
18 complicated pricing options, a customer of record/landlord cannot determine what  
19 a tenant would have paid under an appropriate PSE&G tariff. Third, even if a  
20 landlord could calculate a theoretical bill, it might not be comparable to the

---

<sup>24/</sup> Direct Testimony of Stephen Swetz on Electric Cost of Service and Rate Design, p. 72, lines 1-4, and Direct Testimony of Stephen Swetz on Gas Cost of Service and Rate Design, p. 47, lines 1-4. As far as I have been able to determine, the Board has not ruled on PSE&G's Sub-metering Petition.

<sup>25/</sup> The 2007 Sub-metering Petition is attached as Schedule SS-E-22 (Electric) and Schedule SS-G-23 (Gas) to the Direct Testimony of Stephen Swetz.

1 landlord/customer of record's bill if the landlord is purchasing energy from a TPS  
2 or under a different PSE&G rate schedule than the tenant's likely rate schedule if  
3 the tenant were a PSE&G customer. As a result of these industry changes, some  
4 of the Company's landlord/customers are unsure how to comply with the current  
5 sub-metering tariffs.<sup>26</sup>

6 PSE&G states that its intent "is that landlords be allowed to recover their  
7 costs for providing electric and gas service to their tenants. The Company also  
8 believes it is unfair to the landlord if his electric and gas bill is higher than that  
9 which would have been billed to the individual tenants and thus the landlord has  
10 to take a loss on his electric and gas costs."<sup>27</sup>

11 **Q. Has PSE&G been asked by any of its landlords/customers of records to**  
12 **revise its sub-metering tariffs?**

13 A. Yes. The Company refers to three of its commercial customers of record who  
14 manage or operate tenant-occupied commercial properties. PSE&G states that  
15 these landlords asked PSE&G if the shortfalls they experienced between what  
16 they paid for energy (generally the BGS-CIEP with Retail Margin rate) and the  
17 appropriate rate schedule for their tenants (then the PSE&G BGS-FP rate) could  
18 be recouped through the "reasonable administrative expenses" allowed in the  
19 tariff.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>26/</sup> I/M/O Public Service Electric and Gas Company Petition for Change in Tariff for Gas Service and Tariff for Electric Service Regarding Check Metering ("2007 Sub-metering Petition"), p.3.

<sup>27/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-TAR-5 attached.

<sup>28/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-TAR-15 attached. The Company advised the landlord-customers to seek Board advice.

1 **Q. What is the likely result for tenants if the Board approves PSE&G's sub-**  
2 **metering tariff revisions?**

3 A. The likely result of modifying the sub-metering tariffs as requested by PSE&G  
4 would be higher rates to tenants. The landlords expressed a concern to PSE&G  
5 about making up their shortfalls, not ensuring that tenants pay the lowest rate for  
6 energy. Although most would be commercial tenants, the proposed gas and  
7 electric tariff revisions would permit sub-metering in some residential buildings,  
8 thus allowing the revised gas sub-metering tariff to affect some residential  
9 tenants' rates as well. The Company states it does not intend the tariff change to  
10 affect residential tenants and, in response to discovery, proposes to amend its  
11 revised tariff to clearly exclude residential tenants, who would then be subject to  
12 the current sub-metering tariff.<sup>29</sup>

13 **Q. Do you recommend the Board approve PSE&G's proposed revisions to its**  
14 **sub-metering tariffs?**

15 A. No, for three reasons. First, as I mentioned previously, the Company's proposed  
16 tariff revisions are inconsistent with the Board's Sub-metering Order. Second,  
17 PSE&G's solution to a problem it identifies with its current sub-metering tariff  
18 creates other problems. Third, this proceeding is the wrong one to address and  
19 resolve this problem. Many interested parties are not present at the table to voice  
20 their opinions, particularly the sub-metered tenants. In addition, broader policy  
21 issues with sub-metering are implicated by these proposed tariff revisions, policy

---

<sup>29/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-TAR-21 attached.

1 issues that are better addressed in a generic proceeding or rulemaking rather than  
2 one utility's rate case.

3 **Q. Why do you think the Company's base rate case docket is not the**  
4 **appropriate proceeding for the Board to decide whether to approve the**  
5 **proposed sub-metering tariff revisions?**

6 A. The Company's proposed tariff revisions raise a number of important sub-  
7 metering issues that should be addressed in a rulemaking or other generic  
8 proceeding where all interested parties are noticed and have an opportunity to  
9 participate. For example, the sub-metered tenants who would be most affected by  
10 this tariff change are not PSE&G customers and would have no way of knowing  
11 that their interests are at stake in PSE&G's rate case. The sub-metering tariff  
12 revisions are a very small part of this docket, buried in thousands of pages of  
13 testimony and exhibits.

14 These tariff changes may set a precedent for other utilities to seek the same  
15 modifications, so the impact of the revisions could go well beyond PSE&G and its  
16 customers/landlords and their tenants.

17 The Board's should convene a sub-metering working group representing  
18 the various affected stakeholders, including tenants, landlords, sub-metering  
19 companies, Rate Counsel, and other state agencies to discuss the sub-metering  
20 issues. This process should be used to determine the problems with the existing  
21 sub-metering tariffs and recommend solutions that could then be incorporated in  
22 sub-metering rules that apply to all energy utilities.

1 Consistency across utilities and fairness to both landlords and tenants  
2 argue for a process open to all stakeholders that results in rulemaking on sub-  
3 metering.

4 **Q. What are some of the broader sub-metering policy implications of the**  
5 **Company's proposed tariff revisions?**

6 A. Many of the broader policy implications of the proposed tariff revisions involve  
7 consumer protection and enforceability concerns. I will discuss some of these  
8 policy issues in conjunction with my discussion below of the problems with the  
9 Company's proposed tariff revisions.

10 **Q. Please explain some of the problems created by the Company's proposed**  
11 **changes to its sub-metering tariffs.**

12 A. The problems include whether it is possible for tenants to determine the  
13 reasonableness of rates they are being charged, the enforceability of the tariff, the  
14 lack of notice to tenants of the change in rates and other consumer protections,  
15 and Board jurisdiction over the energy cost allocation method.

16

17 **Q. Please explain the issue regarding the reasonableness of the rates charged to**  
18 **sub-metered tenants.**

19 A. In attempting to make its sub-metering tariffs more equitable to its customers of  
20 record/landlords, PSE&G makes them unfair to tenants. The current tariffs  
21 protect the tenants from being overcharged by capping the rates. While customers  
22 of record/landlords would be able to recover their total energy costs under the  
23 proposed tariffs, their tenants' rates would likely increase. This is because the

1 landlords' concern is how to recover their total energy costs, not how to get the  
2 best rates for their tenants. Moreover, tenants would be unable to determine if  
3 they were being fairly charged unless they were given additional information by  
4 the landlord.<sup>30</sup> The proposed tariffs would not require landlords to give tenants  
5 the necessary information to determine their pro-rata share of the building's  
6 energy costs plus administrative expenses, and landlords would have no incentive  
7 to do so. If landlords provided this information, tenants might challenge the  
8 allocation method.

9 Only "reasonable" administrative expenses could be added under the  
10 revised tariffs, but the tenant lacks the necessary information to determine  
11 whether these expenses are actually reasonable. Again, the landlord would have  
12 to be willing to provide this information to tenants and tenants would need some  
13 guidelines about what administrative expenses are considered reasonable.  
14 PSE&G suggests that the Board could set guidelines.<sup>31</sup>

15 PSE&G's argument in favor of the tariff change is that, due to unbundling,  
16 it is virtually impossible for the customer of record to determine the appropriate  
17 Public Service tariff upon which to base its rates. With PSE&G's proposed tariff  
18 revision, it would be virtually impossible for tenants to determine if they were  
19 being overcharged, or to determine if the customer of record/landlord were

---

<sup>30/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-TAR-4 attached. In its response, PSE&G states that under the proposed sub-metering tariff, the tenant could determine if he/she were being overcharged by "asking the landlord/customer-of-record for the work papers supporting the allocation of expenses to either all tenants or at a minimum the calculation supporting their pro-rata share (e.g. their share of square footage) of the bill."

<sup>31/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-TAR-28 attached.

1 reselling energy for a profit. Thus, the proposed change does not solve the  
2 perceived problem, it merely shifts it to the tenant.

3 **Q. Please explain why you think there is an enforceability issue with the revised**  
4 **tariffs.**

5 A. The Board, like the tenants, would lack the information necessary to enforce the  
6 tariffs and determine whether the tenants were being overcharged unless landlords  
7 were willing to provide that information. PSE&G acknowledges that such  
8 information would include: the landlord's calculation of the tenant's utility bill  
9 with all supporting documentation and calculations, including the landlord's  
10 utility bill(s) from PSE&G or a TPS; the allocation method or meter readings;  
11 documentation of the building's administrative costs; the landlord's accounting  
12 records of administrative costs; and the method of allocating administrative costs  
13 to each tenant.<sup>32</sup>

14 It is unclear what jurisdiction the Board has to order and enforce such  
15 record-keeping and disclosure requirements on customers of record/landlords, and  
16 whether the Board retains complaint jurisdiction if tenants want to challenge the  
17 landlord's allocation of their energy costs.

18 Thus, enforceability of the proposed sub-metering tariffs is an issue.  
19 PSE&G states that it is unable to verify whether a customer of record/landlord is  
20 complying with the sub-metering tariffs, as it does not have the information  
21 necessary to determine whether the customer of record/landlord is properly

---

<sup>32/</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-TAR-29 attached.

1 charging a tenant.<sup>33</sup> Presumably, the Board would have similar difficulties  
2 determining a breach of the tariff.

3 **Q. Would tenants be given advance notice of the tariff change and the**  
4 **subsequent rate change?**

5 A. There is no provision in the revised tariffs to give advance notice to tenants, but  
6 that is ultimately a responsibility of the customer of record/landlord. As the  
7 customer of record/landlord is not regulated by the Board, it is unclear even if  
8 there were a notice requirement, whether it would be enforceable. It may be that  
9 the tenants would be subject to any rate increase not clearly prohibited in their  
10 lease.

11 Because PSE&G's proposed tariff revisions remove the cap on rates  
12 provided in the current tariffs, notice and other consumer protections become even  
13 more important. For example, the proposed tariffs do not require clear and plain  
14 language disclosure of the basis for the charges, meter accuracy, or what recourse  
15 tenants would have if they wanted to dispute the charges.

16

17 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

18 A. Yes, but since some discovery requests were still outstanding as of the date I  
19 prepared my testimony, I reserve the right to modify my testimony as needed.

---

<sup>33/</sup> See Response to Discovery Requests RCR-TAR-13 and -14 attached.

# **EXHIBITS**

**SERVICE PERFORMANCE PLAN FOR  
PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY**

**A. CALL CENTER**

(1) **Measure:** Average speed of answer (ASA)

**Benchmark:** 80% of calls answered in 30 seconds

**Definition:** Measured in seconds from the time when a customer indicates the desire to speak to a representative to when the representative picks up the phone. Includes abandoned calls. Measured monthly, reported quarterly.

	<u>Prior Performance<sup>1</sup></u>			
	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009 (Ja-Aug)</u>
Range	64.6 to 84.7%	59 to 82.4%	65.5 to 81.1%	56.8 to 71.5%
Annual average	74.4%	74.4%	75.1%	61.8%
# months benchmark met	3 of 12	5 of 12	1 of 12	0 of 8

(2) **Measure:** Abandoned call percentage (ACP)

**Benchmark:** 5% or less of calls abandoned

**Definition:** The number of calls to the IVR system that are terminated by the caller before reaching the selected destination, whether a department or a representative. Measured quarterly.

	<u>Prior Performance<sup>2</sup></u>			
	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009 (Ja-Aug)</u>
Range	3.3 to 9.4%	1.7 to 7.7%	2.6 to 7.6%	6.5 to 24.9%
Annual average	6.7%	4.1%	4.6%	16.4%
# months benchmark met	2 of 12	9 of 12	7 of 12	0 of 8

<sup>1</sup> See Response to Discovery Requests RCR-CI-12 and DCA-10, p. 5 of 5 attached. The response provided by PSE&G may reflect a different definition of ASA to include calls answered by the IVR system, a less stringent measure. The AGA/EEI Data Source benchmarking shows that PSE&G's ASA defined as calls answered by a representative within 30 seconds was only 61% for 2008. See Response to Discovery Request RCR-CI-13 attached.

<sup>2</sup> See Response to Discovery Requests RCR-CI-12 and DCA-10, p. 5 of 5 attached.

(3) **Measure:** Average Speed of Answer (in seconds)

**Benchmark:** Track and monitor only.

**Definition:** The time in seconds it takes to reach a customer service representative. Measured monthly, reported quarterly.

**Prior Performance**<sup>3</sup>

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009 (Ja-Aug)</u>
Range	25 to 81 sec	34 to 95 sec	31 to 76 sec	72 to 385 sec
Annual average	50 sec	51 sec	46 sec	229 sec

**B. METER READING AND BILLING**

(4) **Measure:** % of residential meters read

**Benchmark:** 95% of meters read

**Definition:** The percentage of meters actually read on cycle.

**Prior Performance**<sup>4</sup>

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009 (Ja-Jn)</u>
Range	87.9 to 90.3	88.4 to 90.5%	88 to 90.5%	87.3 to 89.3%
Annual average	89.5%	89.9%	89.7%	88.2%
# months benchmark met	0 of 12	0 of 12	0 of 12	0 of 6

<sup>3</sup> See Response to Discovery Request DCA-10 p. 5 of 5 attached.

<sup>4</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-CI-16 (UPDATE) attached.

(5) **Measure:** Billing accuracy

**Benchmark:** 20 or fewer rebills per 1,000 customers

**Definition:** The number of rebills per 1,000 customers measured as all bills mailed to customers that are later adjusted, cancelled, or re-issued for any amount or reason.

	<u>Prior Performance<sup>5</sup></u>			
	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009 (Ja-Jn)</u>
Range	20.3 to 26	18.3 to 24.5	19.5 to 24.3	21.4 to 23.9
Annual average	22.6	20.5	22.1	23.0
# months benchmark met	3 of 12	8 of 12	4 of 12	0 of 6

---

### C. SAFETY AND RELIABILITY

(6) **Measure:** Gas leak response time

**Benchmark:** 95% of calls responded to within 60 minutes

**Definition:** Leak, odor, and emergency call response measured from the initial customer call to the time qualified personnel arrive at the location to either assess or implement a “make safe” condition.

**Exception reporting:** Provide a report to the BPU for all calls that are not responded to within 60 minutes, giving the reasons for the delay.

	<u>Prior Performance<sup>6</sup></u>			
	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009 (Ja-S)</u>
Annual average	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%
# months benchmark met	12 of 12	12 of 12	12 of 12	9 of 9

---

<sup>5</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-CI-19 attached.

<sup>6</sup> See Response to Discovery Requests RCR-CI- 3, 44, attached, and Follow-up Response to October 29, 2009 Discovery Conference Call.

(7) **Measure:** % of service appointments met

**Benchmark:** 95% + service appointments met

**Definition:** The percentage of appointments completed on the day scheduled. Includes appointments for meter installations, disconnects and reconnects, billing investigations, initial and final meter reads. Excludes regularly scheduled meter reads, gas leaks, emergencies, outages, appliance service appointments, and appointments missed by the customer.

PSE&G currently tracks only appliance service appointments met, but iPower, its new customer care system will generate the data needed to track other service appointments met.

**D. OVERALL CUSTOMER SERVICE AND SATISFACTION**

(8) **Measure:** Customer complaints/inquiries to the BPU

**Benchmark:** Less than 1 complaint/inquiry per 1,000 customers annually.

**Definition:** The number of verbal or written complaints/inquiries made to the BPU, not including complaints to PSE&G, which are measured as an annual average number of complaints per 1,000 customers. The Company also should report complaints by root cause category, such as billing, collection, etc.

	<b><u>Prior Performance</u></b> <sup>7</sup>			
	2006	2007	2008	2009 (Ja-Jn)
Annual average # complaints/ 1,000 customers	2.4	2.4	2.4	3.0 est.

<sup>7</sup> See Direct Testimony of Richard LeLash, Schedule 4, and Response to Discovery Requests RCR-CI-15 and 19 attached. Please note that the 2009 data is an estimate based on actual performance from January thru June.

**BPU INQUIRIES/COMPLAINTS BY ROOT CAUSE CATEGORY  
SEPTEMBER 2009 YEAR-TO-DATE<sup>8</sup>**

**A. General Inquiry Call Center**

<b>Root Cause:</b>	<u>Sept 2009</u>	<u>2009 YTD</u>	<u>Sept 2008</u>	<u>2008 YTD</u>
Answer time too long	7	144	0	7
Discourteous employee	2	9	0	6
Employee error	2	29	5	24
1 <sup>st</sup> call not handled	12	140	4	60
iPower migration	20	92	0	0
Supervisor not call back	0	4	0	1
VRU issue	0	3	0	1
<hr/>				
TOTALS	43	421	9	99

**B. Billing**

<b>Root Cause:</b>	<u>Sept 2009</u>	<u>2009 YTD</u>	<u>Sept 2008</u>	<u>2008 YTD</u>
High bill complaint	73	483	18	209
iPower migration	19	87	5	33
Inaccurate bill	19	112	2	6
No bill received	7	48	0	2
<hr/>				
TOTALS	128	835	33	319

<sup>8</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-CI-45, pp. 12, 21, 22 attached. Only the root cause complaints were included in the tables if there was either a large number or a substantial difference between 2008 and 2009.

**C. Collections**

<b>Root Cause:</b>	<u>Sept 2009</u>	<u>2009 YTD</u>	<u>Sept 2008</u>	<u>2008 YTD</u>
iPower migration	5	24	0	0
Received notice/reminder	98	1352	142	883
Shut-off concern	136	817	43	651
Shut-off for nonpayment	112	1011	176	1187
<hr/>				
TOTALS	394	3669	421	3155

**D. Meter Reading**

<b>Root Cause:</b>	<u>Sept 2009</u>	<u>2009 YTD</u>	<u>Sept 2008</u>	<u>2008 YTD</u>
Discourteous employee	2	14	0	3
Estimated reading	21	182	14	164
iPower migration	0	58	0	0
Meter read late	1	8	3	6
<hr/>				
TOTALS	25	290	20	196

**PSE&G SHUT-OFF NOTICES**  
**JANUARY – JUNE 2008 vs. JANUARY – JUNE 2009<sup>9</sup>**

	<u>JAN</u>	<u>FEB</u>	<u>MAR</u>	<u>APR</u>	<u>MAY</u>	<u>JUNE</u>
<b>2008</b>	291,710	316,818	322,356	326,261	318,846	303,155
<b>2009</b>	363,061	387,774	394,192	417,112	443,244	416,734
<b>% Increase</b>	24%	22%	22%	27.8%	39%	37%

---

<sup>9</sup> See Response to Discovery Request RCR-CI-9 attached.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

RESPONSE TO STAFF  
REQUEST: DCA-6  
WITNESS(S):  
PAGE 1 OF 1  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
NEW CUSTOMER SERVICE SYSTEM COMPLAINTS

QUESTION:

What percentage of complaints are directly attributed to the new iPower customer service system?

ANSWER:

Since the launch on March 30, 2009, 31% of the complaints received are directly attributable to the new customer service system.

**OFFERED**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
	ICO*	ICO*	ICO*	ICO*	ICO*
Jan	509,262	510,923	506,138	533,479	625,252
Feb	431,614	425,197	491,544	472,162	596,089
Mar	467,133	459,100	531,316	538,975	532,828
Apr	408,491	373,040	504,651	443,442	720,871
May	359,675	410,235	497,234	437,536	589,496
Jun	415,142	448,681	493,525	696,381	645,204
Jul	385,679	513,962	480,207	520,281	646,442
Aug	434,070	471,118	536,192	486,906	678,896
Sep	389,083	463,355	431,996	483,777	
Oct	503,683	505,361	514,366	599,685	
Nov	450,299	419,234	514,505	491,709	
Dec	461,381	424,308	485,169	599,713	
YTD	5,215,492	5,424,514	5,986,843	6,303,046	5,035,078

**HANDLED**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
	ICH*	ICH*	ICH*	ICH*	ICH*
Jan	476,731	471,868	486,088	513,786	577,495
Feb	401,046	411,388	462,905	453,784	539,498
Mar	433,626	444,909	490,412	515,231	498,384
Apr	379,339	364,540	474,988	423,122	541,325
May	344,565	397,984	476,043	416,886	486,293
Jun	379,913	431,475	468,120	656,800	528,884
Jul	348,165	477,685	451,570	492,217	523,755
Aug	390,016	448,460	504,988	467,270	515,846
Sep	373,877	440,005	414,652	463,927	
Oct	463,544	484,313	497,595	555,922	
Nov	424,716	402,643	498,578	466,227	
Dec	435,340	406,268	469,797	562,667	
YTD	4,850,878	5,181,518	5,694,736	5,987,839	4,211,460

**ABANDONED**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Jan	89,416	32,531	39,055	20,050	47,757
Feb	94,763	30,568	13,809	28,639	56,591
Mar	87,875	33,507	14,191	40,904	34,464
Apr	44,115	29,152	8,500	29,663	179,546
May	51,801	15,110	12,251	22,191	103,203
Jun	50,711	35,229	17,206	25,405	116,320
Jul	52,719	37,514	36,297	28,637	122,687
Aug	47,037	44,054	22,658	31,204	163,050
Sep	20,002	15,206	23,350	17,344	0
Oct	34,980	40,119	21,048	16,771	0
Nov	20,769	25,583	16,591	15,927	0
Dec	27,791	26,041	18,040	15,372	0
YTD	621,979	364,614	242,996	292,107	823,618

**ABANDONED %**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Jan	17.6%	6.4%	7.7%	3.8%	7.6%
Feb	22.0%	7.2%	2.8%	6.1%	9.5%
Mar	18.8%	7.3%	2.7%	7.6%	6.5%
Apr	10.8%	7.8%	1.7%	6.7%	24.9%
May	14.4%	3.7%	2.5%	5.1%	17.5%
Jun	12.2%	7.9%	3.5%	3.7%	18.0%
Jul	13.7%	7.3%	7.6%	5.5%	19.0%
Aug	10.8%	9.4%	4.2%	6.4%	24.0%
Sep	5.1%	3.3%	5.4%	3.6%	
Oct	6.9%	7.9%	4.1%	2.8%	
Nov	4.6%	6.1%	3.2%	3.2%	
Dec	6.0%	6.1%	3.7%	2.6%	
YTD	11.9%	6.7%	4.1%	4.6%	16.4%

**ASA**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Jan	72	81	47	40	76
Feb	83	41	70	44	100
Mar	80	38	95	46	72
Apr	72	25	70	35	385
May	43	35	47	40	261
Jun	98	42	46	51	272
Jul	106	79	37	49	290
Aug	101	57	55	31	384
Sep	38	57	44	32	
Oct	88	52	36	78	
Nov	54	46	34	47	
Dec	53	46	34	59	
YTD	74	50	51	46	229

**AHT**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Jan	223	240	234	233	264
Feb	232	232	237	233	273
Mar	232	233	252	230	267
Apr	225	223	234	231	427
May	215	214	218	229	409
Jun	223	216	220	232	385
Jul	224	224	216	246	400
Aug	232	232	228	251	384
Sep	218	231	225	247	
Oct	228	228	222	246	
Nov	226	231	216	250	
Dec	228	232	224	256	
YTD	238	226	228	227	351

**SERVICE LEVEL (within 30 seconds)**

	2005		2006		2007		2008		2009	
	NCH	NCO								
Jan	69.0%	63.7%	64.8%	62.0%	71.7%	68.9%	78.5%	75.6%	69.2%	63.9%
Feb	64.7%	62.6%	77.1%	72.6%	66.5%	62.6%	74.8%	71.9%	62.7%	56.7%
Mar	65.5%	63.5%	75.9%	70.1%	59.0%	54.5%	78.3%	74.9%	71.5%	66.9%
Apr	69.8%	68.2%	84.7%	79.7%	69.2%	65.1%	79.2%	75.5%	58.6%	44.0%
May	80.3%	77.9%	83.9%	80.2%	79.1%	75.6%	78.5%	74.8%	56.8%	46.8%
Jun	64.6%	62.1%	80.7%	76.5%	80.2%	76.1%	79.3%	74.9%	58.1%	47.7%
Jul	64.2%	59.7%	64.7%	60.8%	82.3%	77.4%	75.7%	71.6%	57.2%	46.4%
Aug	63.0%	60.0%	65.8%	62.0%	73.4%	69.1%	81.1%	77.8%	59.8%	45.5%
Sep	83.8%	79.6%	69.9%	67.1%	79.6%	76.4%	75.1%	72.0%		
Oct	69.5%	66.6%	72.0%	69.7%	80.5%	77.9%	65.5%	60.7%		
Nov	76.7%	73.7%	77.7%	75.3%	82.4%	79.9%	70.2%	66.6%		
Dec	75.1%	71.9%	75.7%	73.3%	81.8%	79.2%	67.2%	63.0%		
YTD	70.3%	67.2%	74.4%	70.8%	75.4%	71.7%	75.1%	71.4%	61.8%	51.7%

**VRU**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
	VRU IN				
Jan	101,977	109,194	140,980	152,336	162,457
Feb	91,559	97,175	138,220	131,486	154,561
Mar	101,996	99,614	145,664	135,301	145,778
Apr	96,767	81,796	140,976	123,258	256,303
May	81,240	89,820	98,013	123,587	192,340
Jun	91,364	101,906	94,726	169,945	202,798
Jul	96,104	126,400	89,923	140,573	200,515
Aug	103,126	108,403	133,222	121,595	192,395
Sep	84,641	101,075	101,153	130,113	
Oct	104,483	108,010	120,444	151,752	
Nov	87,898	90,392	139,070	136,797	
Dec	93,075	107,927	139,421	156,855	
YTD	1,134,230	1,221,712	1,481,812	1,673,598	1,507,142

**VRU %**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
	VRU IN				
Jan	30.8%	21.4%	23.1%	29.0%	28.1%
Feb	26.2%	22.8%	23.6%	29.9%	28.6%
Mar	25.8%	23.5%	22.4%	29.7%	29.3%
Apr	23.1%	25.5%	22.4%	29.7%	47.3%
May	25.3%	23.6%	22.6%	20.6%	39.6%
Jun	23.0%	24.0%	23.6%	20.2%	38.3%
Jul	23.5%	27.6%	26.5%	19.9%	38.3%
Aug	24.1%	26.4%	24.2%	26.4%	37.3%
Sep	20.1%	22.6%	23.0%	24.4%	
Oct	20.3%	22.5%	22.3%	24.2%	
Nov	20.5%	20.7%	22.4%	27.9%	
Dec	20.2%	21.4%	26.6%	29.7%	
YTD	23.4%	23.6%	26.0%	27.9%	35.8%

**HVCA**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
Jan		4,318	94	5,286	28,881	
Feb		1,116	847	5,028	37,411	
Mar		131	338	59,166	8,275	
Apr		76	586	1,758	0	
May		1,272	5,776	2,378	7,961	
Jun		781	16,409	139,286	11,013	
Jul		14,955	22,261	22,925	20,243	
Aug		1,662	33,715	24,300	33,685	
Sep		9,675	10,853	8,047		
Oct		138	12,762	32,220		
Nov		68	1,827	520		
Dec		232	3,171	40,279		
YTD		0	34,424	108,839	341,193	147,489

**TOTAL BARGAINING UNIT STAFF**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Jan	302	322	302	306	360
Feb	296	328	301	300	356
Mar	298	325	298	321	349
Apr	293	321	300	333	349
May	296	308	301	343	345
Jun	280	314	299	347	352
Jul	297	308	292	345	360
Aug	292	311	298	342	360
Sep	300	308	313	343	
Oct	308	307	316	342	
Nov	306	303	312	366	
Dec	303	309	309	365	
YTD					
AVG	298	314	303	338	354

**BARGAINING UNIT IN TRAINING**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Jan	11	21	8	16	31
Feb	11	28	8	1	0
Mar	22	33	11	6	0
Apr	22	31	17	38	0
May	24	17	22	55	0
Jun	24	22	31	61	7
Jul	31	20	17	49	15
Aug	31	15	30	36	13
Sep	29	15	45	0	
Oct	34	0	35	0	
Nov	23	0	34	29	
Dec	5	8	34	30	
YTD					
AVG	22	18	24	27	8

**INTERNET INQUIRY VOLUME**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Jan	3558	5605	6276	6863	7579
Feb	3375	4731	5485	6534	8001
Mar	3643	4835	6877	6879	6510
Apr	3420	4384	6717	6311	7958
May	3566	5630	7755	6804	6217
Jun	5133	7590	7689	8388	8516
Jul	3707	8749	7646	7930	7014
Aug	5571	8122	11375	7314	9873
Sep	4187				

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
CALL CENTER STAFFING AND HOURS

**QUESTION:**

Please provide a breakdown of staffing levels at the call centers. Are there any plans to increase the current staffing levels? What are the hours of the call centers?

**ANSWER:**

The chart below represents the full-time equivalent (FTE) staffing levels at our call centers since 2006. The numbers reported for 2009 are as of June 30. The current business plan does not reflect our present plans to increase staffing by 50 employees. General Inquiry is open 24 hours per day, 365 days per year. The Collection Call Center is open from 7:30am-8:00pm, Monday-Friday. The Construction Inquiry Center is open from 8:00am-3:30pm, Monday-Friday.

**General Inquiry Call Center**

	2006	2007	2008	2009
Northern	248	246	307	298
Southern	50	57	62	57
Total	298	303	369	355

**Construction Inquiry Call Center**

	2006	2007	2008	2009
Northern	33	37	44	38
Southern	12	12	12	10
Total	45	49	56	48

**Collection Call Center**

	2006*	2007**	2008	2009
Inbound	116	87	104	100
Outbound		50	49	45
Total	116	137	153	145

\* The 2006 Collection Call Center staffing level (116), includes both Inbound and Outbound.

\*\* Outbound Collection was split from Inbound beginning in 2007.

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
CHANGES AT CUSTOMER SERVICE CENTERS AND CALL CENTERS

QUESTION:

Please describe any changes made by the Company to its a) customer service centers and b) call centers over the past three years. Please include changes in the number of centers, employee staffing levels, and/or hours.

ANSWER:

PSE&G operates 16 Customer Service Centers (CSC) throughout our service territory, along with five call centers - General Inquiry (North and South), Collection, and Construction Inquiry (North and South).

The number of Customer Service Centers and Call Centers has not changed in the past three years. Similarly, the hours for the respective centers has not changed in the past three years.

The changes in employee staffing levels, by center, for 2006-2009 is as follows:

CSC (16 locations)

·There was an increase of six (6) employees in 2009.

General Inquiry (North and South)

·There was a reduction of six (6) employees in 2007, an increase of 71 employees in 2008, and a reduction of 37 in 2009.

Collection

·There was a reduction of 43 employees in 2007, an increase of 19 employees in 2008, and a reduction of 12 in 2009.

Construction Inquiry (North and South)

·There was a reduction of one (1) employee in 2007 and an increase of six (6) employees in 2008.

Changes in staffing levels are attributable to organizational realignment and preparation for transition to new customer system.

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
PSE&G "REPORT CARD" DATA FOR 2008-2009

QUESTION:

If the BPU has discontinued the Report Card Initiative, is PSE&G continuing to collect the data for each performance indicator? If yes, please provide this data for 2008 and the first two quarters of 2009.

ANSWER:

We understand that the BPU has discontinued the Report Card Initiative. The data for the performance indicators for Electric Delivery are available, as follows:

	<u>2008</u>	<u>1<sup>st</sup> Q 2009</u>	<u>2<sup>nd</sup> Q 2009</u>
SAIFI	0.70	0.15	0.34
CAIDI	65.45	57.85	59.76
Total # of OSHA Reportable Incidents	44	12	19
OSHA Incident Rate	1.52	1.74	1.33
Total # of One-Call Mark Out Requests	266,231	52,397	125,014
Total # of Hits to Underground Facilities	208	26	65
Mark Out and Excavation Success Rate	99.92%	99.95%	99.95%

Attached is the data for the performance indicators for all of the 2008 and the first two quarters of 2009.

**2008 Leak Repairs per Mile.**

District	Jan	Feb	Mar	Qtr 1	Apr	May	Jun	Qtr 2	Jul	Aug	Sep	Qtr 3	Oct	Nov	Dec	Qtr 4	YTD
Clifton	0.030	0.023	0.025	<b>0.078</b>	0.030	0.041	0.033	<b>0.105</b>	0.045	0.042	0.044	<b>0.131</b>	0.057	0.041	0.033	<b>0.130</b>	<b>0.444</b>
Oakland	0.029	0.023	0.027	<b>0.079</b>	0.014	0.017	0.015	<b>0.046</b>	0.014	0.016	0.014	<b>0.044</b>	0.016	0.018	0.018	<b>0.051</b>	<b>0.221</b>
Oradell	0.030	0.019	0.018	<b>0.066</b>	0.019	0.016	0.021	<b>0.056</b>	0.025	0.027	0.021	<b>0.072</b>	0.036	0.031	0.021	<b>0.088</b>	<b>0.283</b>
Orange	0.014	0.010	0.012	<b>0.036</b>	0.021	0.021	0.019	<b>0.060</b>	0.022	0.021	0.025	<b>0.067</b>	0.026	0.020	0.014	<b>0.060</b>	<b>0.224</b>
<b>North</b>	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.019</b>	<b>0.021</b>	<b>0.066</b>	<b>0.021</b>	<b>0.023</b>	<b>0.022</b>	<b>0.066</b>	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.025</b>	<b>0.077</b>	<b>0.033</b>	<b>0.027</b>	<b>0.021</b>	<b>0.082</b>	<b>0.291</b>
E. Jersey	0.048	0.038	0.029	<b>0.115</b>	0.034	0.025	0.031	<b>0.089</b>	0.031	0.041	0.021	<b>0.092</b>	0.030	0.024	0.022	<b>0.076</b>	<b>0.372</b>
Harrison	0.064	0.044	0.048	<b>0.156</b>	0.054	0.038	0.029	<b>0.121</b>	0.033	0.030	0.035	<b>0.099</b>	0.061	0.033	0.034	<b>0.128</b>	<b>0.504</b>
Summit	0.021	0.010	0.011	<b>0.042</b>	0.007	0.010	0.010	<b>0.027</b>	0.017	0.015	0.016	<b>0.048</b>	0.024	0.018	0.012	<b>0.054</b>	<b>0.171</b>
<b>Central</b>	<b>0.037</b>	<b>0.024</b>	<b>0.024</b>	<b>0.085</b>	<b>0.024</b>	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.019</b>	<b>0.063</b>	<b>0.024</b>	<b>0.025</b>	<b>0.021</b>	<b>0.070</b>	<b>0.034</b>	<b>0.023</b>	<b>0.019</b>	<b>0.076</b>	<b>0.294</b>
Audubon	0.031	0.016	0.015	<b>0.062</b>	0.032	0.025	0.023	<b>0.080</b>	0.026	0.030	0.037	<b>0.094</b>	0.048	0.050	0.044	<b>0.142</b>	<b>0.378</b>
Burlington	0.007	0.006	0.011	<b>0.024</b>	0.011	0.010	0.010	<b>0.031</b>	0.010	0.011	0.017	<b>0.038</b>	0.006	0.004	0.003	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.106</b>
N. Bruns.	0.011	0.005	0.004	<b>0.020</b>	0.005	0.007	0.006	<b>0.018</b>	0.006	0.007	0.009	<b>0.022</b>	0.009	0.007	0.004	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.080</b>
Plainfield	0.011	0.011	0.007	<b>0.029</b>	0.009	0.013	0.009	<b>0.031</b>	0.005	0.007	0.008	<b>0.021</b>	0.007	0.007	0.011	<b>0.025</b>	<b>0.106</b>
Trenton	0.017	0.009	0.010	<b>0.035</b>	0.008	0.007	0.011	<b>0.026</b>	0.009	0.010	0.013	<b>0.032</b>	0.014	0.011	0.006	<b>0.031</b>	<b>0.124</b>
<b>South</b>	<b>0.015</b>	<b>0.009</b>	<b>0.009</b>	<b>0.033</b>	<b>0.012</b>	<b>0.012</b>	<b>0.011</b>	<b>0.035</b>	<b>0.010</b>	<b>0.012</b>	<b>0.016</b>	<b>0.039</b>	<b>0.016</b>	<b>0.014</b>	<b>0.012</b>	<b>0.042</b>	<b>0.149</b>
<b>State</b>	<b>0.023</b>	<b>0.015</b>	<b>0.016</b>	<b>0.054</b>	<b>0.017</b>	<b>0.017</b>	<b>0.016</b>	<b>0.051</b>	<b>0.018</b>	<b>0.019</b>	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.057</b>	<b>0.025</b>	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.017</b>	<b>0.062</b>	<b>0.223</b>

Miles=Jan 08 Inventory, subject to change and update

District	Miles	Jan	Feb	Mar	Qtr 1	Apr	May	Jun	Qtr 2	Jul	Aug	Sep	Qtr 3	Oct	Nov	Dec	Qtr 4	YTD
Clifton	2,774	83	65	68	<b>216</b>	83	115	92	<b>290</b>	126	117	121	<b>364</b>	157	113	91	<b>361</b>	<b>1231</b>
Oakland	3,245	94	76	87	<b>257</b>	46	55	49	<b>150</b>	47	52	44	<b>143</b>	51	58	57	<b>166</b>	<b>716</b>
Oradell	3,121	94	58	55	<b>207</b>	59	50	67	<b>176</b>	77	83	66	<b>226</b>	111	98	65	<b>274</b>	<b>883</b>
Orange	2,583	35	26	32	<b>93</b>	53	54	49	<b>156</b>	56	53	64	<b>173</b>	67	52	37	<b>156</b>	<b>578</b>
<b>North</b>	<b>11,723</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>772</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>957</b>	<b>3408</b>
E. Jersey	1,503	72	57	44	<b>173</b>	51	37	46	<b>134</b>	46	61	31	<b>138</b>	45	36	33	<b>114</b>	<b>559</b>
Harrison	1,355	87	59	65	<b>211</b>	73	52	39	<b>164</b>	45	41	48	<b>134</b>	83	45	46	<b>174</b>	<b>683</b>
Summit	3,243	67	33	37	<b>137</b>	24	33	31	<b>88</b>	54	49	52	<b>155</b>	78	58	38	<b>174</b>	<b>554</b>
<b>Central</b>	<b>6,101</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>427</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>1796</b>
Audubon	2,670	82	43	41	<b>166</b>	86	67	61	<b>214</b>	70	80	100	<b>250</b>	128	134	118	<b>380</b>	<b>1010</b>
Burlington	3,052	20	19	35	<b>74</b>	33	30	31	<b>94</b>	29	33	53	<b>115</b>	19	11	10	<b>40</b>	<b>323</b>
N. Bruns.	3,395	39	18	12	<b>69</b>	18	24	19	<b>61</b>	19	24	30	<b>73</b>	30	24	15	<b>69</b>	<b>272</b>
Plainfield	3,250	35	36	24	<b>95</b>	29	41	30	<b>100</b>	17	24	27	<b>68</b>	23	22	35	<b>80</b>	<b>343</b>
Trenton	4,071	68	35	39	<b>142</b>	34	30	43	<b>107</b>	36	41	54	<b>131</b>	55	45	25	<b>125</b>	<b>505</b>
<b>South</b>	<b>16,438</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>576</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>2453</b>
<b>State</b>	<b>34,262</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>1840</b>	<b>589</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>1734</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>658</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>1970</b>	<b>847</b>	<b>696</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>2113</b>	<b>7657</b>

**2008 Markout Success Rate**

Location	Jan-08	Feb-08	Mar-08	Qtr 1	Apr-08	May-08	Jun-08	Qtr 2	Jul-08	Aug-08	Sep-08	Qtr 3	Oct-08	Nov-08	Dec-08	Qtr 4	YTD
Clifton	99.92%	99.96%	99.90%	99.92%	99.94%	99.93%	100.00%	99.95%	99.78%	99.74%	99.94%	99.82%	99.86%	99.84%	99.91%	99.87%	99.90%
Oakland	99.88%	99.73%	99.83%	99.82%	99.64%	99.57%	99.65%	99.62%	99.56%	99.54%	99.73%	99.61%	99.68%	99.79%	99.81%	99.74%	99.69%
Oradell	99.80%	99.92%	99.76%	99.82%	99.92%	99.84%	99.84%	99.87%	99.65%	99.78%	99.80%	99.74%	99.89%	99.81%	99.89%	99.87%	99.82%
Orange	99.84%	99.95%	99.91%	99.90%	99.86%	99.83%	99.92%	99.87%	99.85%	99.84%	99.83%	99.84%	99.91%	99.92%	99.94%	99.92%	99.88%
Metropolitan																	
<b>Northern Total</b>	<b>99.86%</b>	<b>99.90%</b>	<b>99.85%</b>	<b>99.86%</b>	<b>99.85%</b>	<b>99.81%</b>	<b>99.85%</b>	<b>99.84%</b>	<b>99.72%</b>	<b>99.73%</b>	<b>99.83%</b>	<b>99.76%</b>	<b>99.85%</b>	<b>99.84%</b>	<b>99.89%</b>	<b>99.86%</b>	<b>99.83%</b>
East Jersey	99.85%	99.73%	99.63%	99.75%	99.47%	99.73%	99.55%	99.58%	99.79%	99.91%	99.74%	99.82%	99.90%	99.79%	100.00%	99.89%	99.76%
Summit	99.79%	99.79%	99.62%	99.72%	99.85%	99.53%	99.42%	99.62%	99.39%	99.26%	99.49%	99.39%	99.34%	99.64%	99.87%	99.57%	99.57%
Palisades																	
Harrison	99.59%	99.88%	99.85%	99.78%	99.83%	99.91%	99.84%	99.86%	99.88%	99.93%	99.88%	99.90%	99.84%	99.59%	99.89%	99.78%	99.83%
<b>Central Total</b>	<b>99.74%</b>	<b>99.81%</b>	<b>99.71%</b>	<b>99.75%</b>	<b>99.73%</b>	<b>99.71%</b>	<b>99.61%</b>	<b>99.68%</b>	<b>99.68%</b>	<b>99.71%</b>	<b>99.70%</b>	<b>99.70%</b>	<b>99.71%</b>	<b>99.68%</b>	<b>99.93%</b>	<b>99.76%</b>	<b>99.72%</b>
Audubon	99.60%	99.73%	99.86%	99.74%	99.91%	100.00%	99.92%	99.94%	99.95%	99.92%	99.98%	99.95%	99.86%	99.94%	99.95%	99.91%	99.89%
Burlington	99.80%	99.66%	99.90%	99.81%	99.90%	99.86%	99.87%	99.88%	99.75%	99.78%	99.73%	99.75%	99.91%	99.87%	99.92%	99.90%	99.84%
New Brunswick	99.70%	99.75%	99.87%	99.79%	99.90%	99.75%	99.78%	99.81%	99.75%	99.77%	99.70%	99.74%	99.70%	99.75%	99.95%	99.78%	99.78%
Plainfield	99.85%	99.78%	99.76%	99.79%	99.89%	99.79%	99.74%	99.81%	99.82%	99.74%	99.89%	99.82%	99.84%	99.79%	99.75%	99.80%	99.81%
Trenton	99.86%	99.74%	99.88%	99.84%	99.83%	99.83%	99.82%	99.83%	99.83%	99.59%	99.84%	99.76%	99.87%	99.88%	99.93%	99.89%	99.82%
Central	99.92%	99.91%	100.00%	99.95%	100.00%	99.94%	99.97%	99.97%	100.00%	100.00%	99.97%	99.99%	99.98%	100.00%	100.00%	99.99%	99.98%
Southern Electric	99.78%	99.75%	100.00%	99.86%	99.66%	99.93%	99.92%	99.84%	99.86%	99.67%	100.00%	99.85%	99.92%	100.00%	100.00%	99.96%	99.87%
<b>Southern Total</b>	<b>99.79%</b>	<b>99.76%</b>	<b>99.88%</b>	<b>99.82%</b>	<b>99.88%</b>	<b>99.86%</b>	<b>99.85%</b>	<b>99.86%</b>	<b>99.85%</b>	<b>99.76%</b>	<b>99.86%</b>	<b>99.82%</b>	<b>99.87%</b>	<b>99.87%</b>	<b>99.92%</b>	<b>99.88%</b>	<b>99.85%</b>
<b>Gas Delivery</b>	<b>99.80%</b>	<b>99.81%</b>	<b>99.84%</b>	<b>99.82%</b>	<b>99.85%</b>	<b>99.83%</b>	<b>99.82%</b>	<b>99.83%</b>	<b>99.79%</b>	<b>99.75%</b>	<b>99.82%</b>	<b>99.79%</b>	<b>99.84%</b>	<b>99.83%</b>	<b>99.91%</b>	<b>99.86%</b>	<b>99.82%</b>

**Number of Units 2008**

Location	Jan-08	Feb-08	Mar-08	Qtr 1	Apr-08	May-08	Jun-08	Qtr 2	Jul-08	Aug-08	Sep-08	Qtr 3	Oct-08	Nov-08	Dec-08	Qtr 4	YTD
Clifton	2,560	2,292	4,156	9,008	6,358	4,370	3,236	13,964	3,712	2,694	3,276	9,682	3,630	2,510	2,306	8,446	41,100
Oakland	2,531	1,854	2,863	7,248	4,134	3,245	3,145	10,524	2,715	2,608	2,617	7,940	2,797	1,903	1,549	6,249	31,961
Oradell	3,566	2,624	3,809	9,999	5,197	5,094	4,445	14,736	4,229	4,022	4,009	12,260	4,529	3,104	2,754	10,387	47,382
Orange	2,574	1,842	3,208	7,624	4,222	3,634	3,654	11,510	3,440	3,090	2,952	9,482	3,452	2,590	1,734	7,776	36,392
Metropolitan				0				0				0				0	0
<b>Northern Total</b>	<b>11,231</b>	<b>8,612</b>	<b>14,036</b>	<b>33,879</b>	<b>19,911</b>	<b>16,343</b>	<b>14,480</b>	<b>50,734</b>	<b>14,096</b>	<b>12,414</b>	<b>12,854</b>	<b>39,364</b>	<b>14,408</b>	<b>10,107</b>	<b>8,343</b>	<b>32,858</b>	<b>156,835</b>
East Jersey	2,676	1,878	2,142	6,696	2,464	2,246	2,022	6,732	1,922	2,344	2,268	6,534	2,954	2,372	2,124	7,450	27,412
Summit	1,873	1,409	2,363	5,645	3,263	2,548	2,593	8,404	2,613	2,305	2,568	7,486	2,581	1,959	1,537	6,077	27,612
Palisades				0				0				0				0	0
Harrison	2,432	2,534	2,724	7,690	2,416	2,148	2,516	7,080	2,586	2,696	2,492	7,774	3,138	2,170	1,834	7,142	29,686
<b>Central Total</b>	<b>6,981</b>	<b>5,821</b>	<b>7,229</b>	<b>20,031</b>	<b>8,143</b>	<b>6,942</b>	<b>7,131</b>	<b>22,216</b>	<b>7,121</b>	<b>7,345</b>	<b>7,328</b>	<b>21,794</b>	<b>8,673</b>	<b>6,501</b>	<b>5,495</b>	<b>20,669</b>	<b>84,710</b>
Audubon	3,502	2,996	4,160	10,658	5,436	5,020	4,802	15,258	4,056	3,650	4,164	11,870	4,424	3,168	3,974	11,566	49,352
Burlington	2,937	2,365	4,157	9,459	5,234	4,914	4,781	14,929	4,465	4,044	4,523	13,032	4,499	3,006	2,553	10,058	47,478
New Brunswick	2,328	2,008	3,180	7,516	3,972	3,627	3,557	11,156	3,257	3,487	3,374	10,118	3,688	3,179	2,153	9,020	37,810
Plainfield	3,316	2,716	4,187	10,219	5,282	4,788	5,338	15,408	4,938	3,820	4,542	13,300	4,282	2,892	2,807	9,981	48,908
Trenton	4,251	3,433	5,723	13,407	6,962	6,990	7,800	21,752	7,642	6,313	6,712	20,667	6,349	4,318	4,358	15,025	70,851
Central	2,636	2,246	2,997	7,879	3,571	3,130	3,375	10,076	3,289	2,885	3,189	9,363	4,289	2,606	2,062	8,957	36,275
Southern Electric	924	807	1,172	2,903	1,465	1,474	1,331	4,270	1,425	1,208	1,313	3,946	1,189	751	698	2,638	13,757
<b>Southern Total</b>	<b>19,894</b>	<b>16,571</b>	<b>25,575</b>	<b>62,040</b>	<b>31,922</b>	<b>29,943</b>	<b>30,984</b>	<b>92,849</b>	<b>29,072</b>	<b>25,407</b>	<b>27,817</b>	<b>82,296</b>	<b>28,720</b>	<b>19,920</b>	<b>18,605</b>	<b>67,245</b>	<b>304,430</b>
<b>Gas Delivery</b>	<b>38,106</b>	<b>31,004</b>	<b>46,840</b>	<b>115,950</b>	<b>59,976</b>	<b>53,228</b>	<b>52,595</b>	<b>165,799</b>	<b>50,289</b>	<b>45,166</b>	<b>47,999</b>	<b>143,454</b>	<b>51,801</b>	<b>36,528</b>	<b>32,443</b>	<b>120,772</b>	<b>545,975</b>

**Number of Damages 2008**

Location	Jan-08	Feb-08	Mar-08	Qtr 1	Apr-08	May-08	Jun-08	Qtr 2	Jul-08	Aug-08	Sep-08	Qtr 3	Oct-08	Nov-08	Dec-08	Qtr 4	YTD
Clifton	2	1	4	7	4	3	0	7	8	7	2	17	5	4	2	11	42
Oakland	3	5	5	13	15	14	11	40	12	12	7	31	9	4	3	16	100
Oradell	7	2	9	18	4	8	7	19	15	9	8	32	5	6	3	14	83
Orange	4	1	3	8	6	6	3	15	5	5	5	15	3	2	1	6	44
Metropolitan				0				0				0				0	0
<b>Northern Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>269</b>
East Jersey	4	5	8	17	13	6	9	28	4	2	6	12	3	5	0	8	65
Summit	4	3	9	16	5	12	15	32	16	17	13	46	17	7	2	26	120
Palisades				0				0				0				0	0
Harrison	10	3	4	17	4	2	4	10	3	2	3	8	5	9	2	16	51
<b>Central Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>236</b>
Audubon	14	8	6	28	5	0	4	9	2	3	1	6	6	2	2	10	53
Burlington	6	8	4	18	5	7	6	18	11	9	12	32	4	4	2	10	78
New Brunswick	7	5	4	16	4	9	8	21	8	8	10	26	11	8	1	20	83
Plainfield	5	6	10	21	6	10	14	30	9	10	5	24	7	6	7	20	95
Trenton	6	9	7	22	12	12	14	38	13	26	11	50	8	5	3	16	126
Central	2	2	0	4	0	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	9
Southern Electric	2	2	0	4	5	1	1	7	2	4	0	6	1	0	0	1	18
<b>Southern Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>462</b>
<b>Gas Delivery</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>967</b>

**2008 Gas Leaks Responded to Within 60 Min**

Level	Jan-08	Feb-08	Mar-08	Qtr 1	Apr-08	May-08	Jun-08	Qtr 2	Jul-08	Aug-08	Sep-08	Qtr 3	Oct-08	Nov-08	Dec-08	Qtr 4	YTD
CLIFTON	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
OAKLAND	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.82%	100.00%	100.00%	99.94%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.99%
ORADELL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.88%	99.87%	100.00%	99.92%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.98%
ORANGE	100.00%	99.89%	100.00%	99.96%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.60%	99.86%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.96%
<b>Northern Division</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99.97%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99.99%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99.93%</b>	<b>99.96%</b>	<b>99.89%</b>	<b>99.93%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99.98%</b>
J/C	99.91%	100.00%	100.00%	99.97%	100.00%	99.87%	100.00%	99.96%	99.73%	100.00%	100.00%	99.91%	99.91%	99.66%	99.92%	99.83%	99.91%
HARRISON	100.00%	99.77%	100.00%	99.93%	100.00%	100.00%	99.65%	99.90%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.77%	100.00%	99.93%	99.94%
SUMMIT	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.82%	99.94%	100.00%	99.85%	100.00%	99.96%	99.97%
<b>Central Division</b>	<b>99.96%</b>	<b>99.95%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99.97%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99.94%</b>	<b>99.93%</b>	<b>99.96%</b>	<b>99.87%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99.94%</b>	<b>99.94%</b>	<b>99.96%</b>	<b>99.74%</b>	<b>99.96%</b>	<b>99.89%</b>	<b>99.94%</b>
AUDUBON	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.68%	99.65%	100.00%	99.79%	99.94%
BURLINGTON	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.70%	99.90%	100.00%	99.68%	100.00%	99.90%	100.00%	99.77%	100.00%	100.00%	99.96%
N. BRUNSWICK	99.86%	100.00%	99.81%	99.89%	99.80%	100.00%	100.00%	99.93%	99.77%	100.00%	100.00%	99.93%	99.85%	100.00%	99.85%	99.90%	99.91%
PLFD.	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.73%	99.70%	100.00%	99.81%	100.00%	99.65%	99.70%	99.79%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.92%
TRENTON	99.46%	99.84%	99.81%	99.68%	100.00%	100.00%	99.59%	99.86%	99.60%	100.00%	100.00%	99.86%	99.85%	100.00%	100.00%	99.95%	99.84%
<b>Southern Division</b>	<b>99.85%</b>	<b>99.96%</b>	<b>99.92%</b>	<b>99.91%</b>	<b>99.91%</b>	<b>99.95%</b>	<b>99.85%</b>	<b>99.90%</b>	<b>99.85%</b>	<b>99.89%</b>	<b>99.95%</b>	<b>99.90%</b>	<b>99.87%</b>	<b>99.93%</b>	<b>99.97%</b>	<b>99.92%</b>	<b>99.91%</b>
Gas Delivery	99.94%	99.96%	99.97%	99.96%	99.97%	99.97%	99.94%	99.96%	99.89%	99.95%	99.93%	99.92%	99.95%	99.91%	99.98%	99.95%	99.95%

**2008 Total Leaks**

Level	Jan-08	Feb-08	Mar-08	Qtr 1	Apr-08	May-08	Jun-08	Qtr 2	Jul-08	Aug-08	Sep-08	Qtr 3	Oct-08	Nov-08	Dec-08	Qtr 4	YTD
CLIFTON	1,201	949	1,016	3,166	797	683	705	2,185	735	758	752	2,245	1,237	1,215	1,315	3,767	11,363
OAKLAND	865	688	619	2,172	558	525	592	1,675	569	550	601	1,720	815	746	889	2,450	8,017
ORADELL	979	813	830	2,622	790	658	692	2,140	866	742	753	2,361	1,077	1,001	1,130	3,208	10,331
ORANGE	1,023	951	783	2,757	705	748	686	2,139	693	697	744	2,134	1,085	977	1,159	3,221	10,251
<b>Northern Division</b>	<b>4,068</b>	<b>3,401</b>	<b>3,248</b>	<b>10,717</b>	<b>2,850</b>	<b>2,614</b>	<b>2,675</b>	<b>8,139</b>	<b>2,863</b>	<b>2,747</b>	<b>2,850</b>	<b>8,460</b>	<b>4,214</b>	<b>3,939</b>	<b>4,493</b>	<b>12,646</b>	<b>39,962</b>
J/C	1,165	956	863	2,984	810	786	681	2,277	747	779	794	2,320	1,176	1,166	1,199	3,541	11,122
HARRISON	538	431	437	1,406	408	322	287	1,017	315	388	390	1,093	540	438	482	1,460	4,976
SUMMIT	737	606	558	1,901	526	492	496	1,514	473	522	557	1,552	780	689	778	2,247	7,214
<b>Central Division</b>	<b>2,440</b>	<b>1,993</b>	<b>1,858</b>	<b>6,291</b>	<b>1,744</b>	<b>1,600</b>	<b>1,464</b>	<b>4,808</b>	<b>1,535</b>	<b>1,689</b>	<b>1,741</b>	<b>4,965</b>	<b>2,496</b>	<b>2,293</b>	<b>2,459</b>	<b>7,248</b>	<b>23,312</b>
AUDUBON	741	579	533	1,853	478	453	398	1,329	419	378	479	1,276	625	574	697	1,896	6,354
BURLINGTON	528	449	429	1,406	337	341	334	1,012	335	313	319	967	472	448	528	1,448	4,833
N. BRUNSWICK	710	639	531	1,880	491	459	485	1,435	438	425	492	1,355	688	664	689	2,041	6,711
PLFD.	593	484	472	1,549	376	331	339	1,046	343	284	336	963	579	518	646	1,743	5,301
TRENTON	744	607	527	1,878	522	451	483	1,456	502	407	473	1,382	665	604	719	1,988	6,704
<b>Southern Division</b>	<b>3,316</b>	<b>2,758</b>	<b>2,492</b>	<b>8,566</b>	<b>2,204</b>	<b>2,035</b>	<b>2,039</b>	<b>6,278</b>	<b>2,037</b>	<b>1,807</b>	<b>2,099</b>	<b>5,943</b>	<b>3,029</b>	<b>2,808</b>	<b>3,279</b>	<b>9,116</b>	<b>29,903</b>
Gas Delivery	9,824	8,152	7,598	25,574	6,798	6,249	6,178	19,225	6,435	6,243	6,690	19,368	9,739	9,040	10,231	29,010	93,177

**2008 Leaks > 60**

Level	Jan-08	Feb-08	Mar-08	Qtr 1	Apr-08	May-08	Jun-08	Qtr 2	Jul-08	Aug-08	Sep-08	Qtr 3	Oct-08	Nov-08	Dec-08	Qtr 4	YTD
CLIFTON	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OAKLAND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
ORADELL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
ORANGE	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	4
<b>Northern Division</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>
J/C	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	1	4	1	6	10
HARRISON	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
SUMMIT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	2
<b>Central Division</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15</b>
AUDUBON	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4	4
BURLINGTON	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
N. BRUNSWICK	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	6
PLFD.	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
TRENTON	4	1	1	6	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	11
<b>Southern Division</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>27</b>
Gas Delivery	6	3	2	11	2	2	4	8	7	3	5	15	5	8	2	15	49

**OSHA Index, 2008**

Category	Jan-08	Feb-08	Mar-08	Apr-08	May-08	Jun-08	Jul-08	Aug-08	Sep-08	Oct-08	Nov-08	Dec-08	YTD
Clifton Total	5.48	6.32	6.37	5.69	11.81	0.00	0.00	6.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.32
Oakland Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.85	15.31	0.00	8.58	7.46	6.42	0.00	0.00	3.87
Oradell Total	6.52	14.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.07	6.81	0.00	0.00	5.14	0.00	0.00	3.93
Orange Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.43
Northern Staff	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Northern Division</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>5.52</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>1.67</b>	<b>6.87</b>	<b>6.55</b>	<b>1.72</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>1.63</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>3.35</b>
Jersey City Total	0.00	13.52	0.00	6.08	12.87	0.00	0.00	6.78	0.00	10.11	6.48	0.00	4.68
Harrison Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.70
Summit Total	0.00	0.00	7.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.45	6.90	5.65	7.45	0.00	2.86
Central Staff	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Central Division</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>4.92</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>2.22</b>	<b>4.65</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>4.86</b>	<b>2.31</b>	<b>5.57</b>	<b>4.73</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2.80</b>
Audubon Total	7.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.64
Burlington Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.49	0.00	0.00	8.22	9.25	8.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.63
N. Brunswick Total	0.00	8.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.23
Plainfield Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75
Trenton Total	7.37	0.00	8.04	7.51	7.73	14.03	7.52	0.00	0.00	13.88	9.04	7.77	9.10
Southern Staff	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Southern Division</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>1.70</b>	<b>1.65</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>1.53</b>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>1.65</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>1.76</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>2.95</b>
Gas Delivery Support	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GSOC / M&R / Plants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Gas Delivery</b>	<b>2.12</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>1.78</b>	<b>2.17</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>1.64</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>1.66</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>1.81</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>2.85</b>



**2009 Leak Repairs per Mile.**

District	Jan	Feb	Mar	Qtr 1	Apr	May	Jun	Qtr 2
Clifton	0.030	0.029	0.020	<b>0.079</b>	0.021	0.030	0.036	<b>0.087</b>
Oakland	0.027	0.023	0.021	<b>0.071</b>	0.009	0.011	0.014	<b>0.033</b>
Oradell	0.024	0.015	0.012	<b>0.051</b>	0.008	0.008	0.011	<b>0.027</b>
Orange	0.016	0.015	0.012	<b>0.043</b>	0.010	0.011	0.025	<b>0.046</b>
<b>North</b>	<b>0.024</b>	<b>0.021</b>	<b>0.017</b>	<b>0.062</b>	<b>0.012</b>	<b>0.014</b>	<b>0.021</b>	<b>0.047</b>
E. Jersey	0.038	0.030	0.018	<b>0.086</b>	0.023	0.019	0.027	<b>0.070</b>
Harrison	0.052	0.048	0.031	<b>0.131</b>	0.025	0.020	0.019	<b>0.065</b>
Summit	0.015	0.015	0.015	<b>0.046</b>	0.009	0.007	0.013	<b>0.029</b>
<b>Central</b>	<b>0.029</b>	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.074</b>	<b>0.016</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.018</b>	<b>0.047</b>
Audubon	0.030	0.024	0.023	<b>0.076</b>	0.012	0.016	0.016	<b>0.044</b>
Burlington	0.008	0.013	0.010	<b>0.031</b>	0.013	0.008	0.013	<b>0.035</b>
N. Bruns.	0.009	0.013	0.015	<b>0.037</b>	0.006	0.003	0.006	<b>0.016</b>
Plainfield	0.015	0.015	0.018	<b>0.048</b>	0.006	0.007	0.004	<b>0.017</b>
Trenton	0.010	0.008	0.006	<b>0.024</b>	0.009	0.003	0.006	<b>0.018</b>
<b>South</b>	<b>0.014</b>	<b>0.014</b>	<b>0.014</b>	<b>0.041</b>	<b>0.009</b>	<b>0.007</b>	<b>0.008</b>	<b>0.025</b>
<b>State</b>	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.018</b>	<b>0.016</b>	<b>0.054</b>	<b>0.011</b>	<b>0.011</b>	<b>0.014</b>	<b>0.036</b>

Miles=Jan 09 Inventory, subject to change and update

District	Miles	Jan	Feb	Mar	Qtr 1	Apr	May	Jun	Qtr 2
Clifton	2,756.2	83	80	55	<b>218</b>	57	82	100	<b>239</b>
Oakland	3,255.0	88	75	68	<b>231</b>	29	36	44	<b>109</b>
Oradell	3,127.6	75	47	39	<b>161</b>	26	24	33	<b>83</b>
Orange	2,593.3	41	39	32	<b>112</b>	25	28	66	<b>119</b>
<b>North</b>	<b>11,732.1</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>550</b>
E. Jersey	1,491.6	56	45	27	<b>128</b>	34	29	41	<b>104</b>
Harrison	1,346.1	70	65	42	<b>177</b>	34	27	26	<b>87</b>
Summit	3,263.7	50	49	50	<b>149</b>	29	23	43	<b>95</b>
<b>Central</b>	<b>6,101.4</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>286</b>
Audubon	2,635.3	79	62	60	<b>201</b>	31	43	41	<b>115</b>
Burlington	3,071.9	24	40	30	<b>94</b>	40	26	40	<b>106</b>
N. Bruns.	3,409.9	30	45	51	<b>126</b>	22	10	22	<b>54</b>
Plainfield	3,271.0	50	48	59	<b>157</b>	20	22	14	<b>56</b>
Trenton	4,094.5	42	32	26	<b>100</b>	38	12	23	<b>73</b>
<b>South</b>	<b>16,482.6</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>678</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>404</b>
<b>State</b>	<b>34,316.1</b>	<b>688</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>1854</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>1240</b>

**2009 Markout Success Rate**

Location	Jan-09	Feb-09	Mar-09	Qtr 1	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Qtr 2
Clifton	100.00%	99.91%	99.96%	<b>99.96%</b>	99.91%	99.89%	99.91%	<b>99.90%</b>
Oakland	99.85%	100.00%	99.77%	<b>99.85%</b>	99.78%	99.80%	99.66%	<b>99.75%</b>
Oradell	99.88%	99.92%	99.87%	<b>99.89%</b>	99.87%	99.90%	99.92%	<b>99.89%</b>
Orange	100.00%	99.82%	100.00%	<b>99.95%</b>	99.88%	100.00%	99.91%	<b>99.93%</b>
Metropolitan								
<b>Northern Total</b>	<b>99.94%</b>	<b>99.91%</b>	<b>99.90%</b>	<b>99.91%</b>	<b>99.86%</b>	<b>99.90%</b>	<b>99.85%</b>	<b>99.87%</b>
East Jersey	99.69%	99.94%	99.91%	<b>99.85%</b>	99.76%	99.83%	99.46%	<b>99.69%</b>
Summit	99.78%	100.00%	99.86%	<b>99.88%</b>	100.00%	99.74%	99.62%	<b>99.79%</b>
Palisades								
Harrison	99.81%	99.84%	99.77%	<b>99.80%</b>	99.76%	99.83%	99.87%	<b>99.82%</b>
<b>Central Total</b>	<b>99.76%</b>	<b>99.92%</b>	<b>99.84%</b>	<b>99.84%</b>	<b>99.84%</b>	<b>99.80%</b>	<b>99.65%</b>	<b>99.77%</b>
Audubon	99.91%	99.97%	100.00%	<b>99.96%</b>	99.92%	99.84%	99.97%	<b>99.91%</b>
Burlington	99.91%	99.89%	99.95%	<b>99.92%</b>	99.78%	99.91%	99.89%	<b>99.86%</b>
New Brunswick	99.79%	99.83%	99.89%	<b>99.85%</b>	99.86%	99.92%	99.80%	<b>99.86%</b>
Plainfield	99.82%	99.87%	99.84%	<b>99.84%</b>	99.88%	99.68%	99.83%	<b>99.80%</b>
Trenton	99.76%	99.87%	99.92%	<b>99.86%</b>	99.87%	99.94%	99.93%	<b>99.91%</b>
Central	100.00%	99.84%	99.93%	<b>99.93%</b>	100.00%	100.00%	99.93%	<b>99.98%</b>
Southern Electric	100.00%	99.88%	100.00%	<b>99.96%</b>	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Southern Total</b>	<b>99.86%</b>	<b>99.88%</b>	<b>99.93%</b>	<b>99.89%</b>	<b>99.88%</b>	<b>99.89%</b>	<b>99.90%</b>	<b>99.89%</b>
<b>Gas Delivery</b>	<b>99.86%</b>	<b>99.90%</b>	<b>99.91%</b>	<b>99.89%</b>	<b>99.87%</b>	<b>99.88%</b>	<b>99.85%</b>	<b>99.87%</b>

**Number of Units 2009**

Location	Jan-09	Feb-09	Mar-09	Qtr 1	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Qtr 2
Clifton	2,532	2,194	2,822	<b>7,548</b>	4,254	3,570	3,330	<b>11,154</b>
Oakland	1,314	1,499	2,596	<b>5,409</b>	3,185	2,949	2,966	<b>9,100</b>
Oradell	2,489	2,491	3,799	<b>8,779</b>	4,680	3,940	3,576	<b>12,196</b>
Orange	1,838	1,708	2,648	<b>6,194</b>	3,394	3,456	3,162	<b>10,012</b>
Metropolitan				<b>0</b>				<b>0</b>
<b>Northern Total</b>	<b>8,173</b>	<b>7,892</b>	<b>11,865</b>	<b>27,930</b>	<b>15,513</b>	<b>13,915</b>	<b>13,034</b>	<b>42,462</b>
East Jersey	1,926	1,778	2,262	<b>5,966</b>	2,488	2,350	2,044	<b>6,882</b>
Summit	1,391	1,401	2,152	<b>4,944</b>	2,384	2,286	2,351	<b>7,021</b>
Palisades				<b>0</b>				<b>0</b>
Harrison	2,054	1,922	2,622	<b>6,598</b>	2,546	2,378	2,234	<b>7,158</b>
<b>Central Total</b>	<b>5,371</b>	<b>5,101</b>	<b>7,036</b>	<b>17,508</b>	<b>7,418</b>	<b>7,014</b>	<b>6,629</b>	<b>21,061</b>
Audubon	3,328	3,066	3,988	<b>10,382</b>	4,860	3,754	3,886	<b>12,500</b>
Burlington	2,256	2,743	3,989	<b>8,988</b>	4,973	5,614	4,749	<b>15,336</b>
New Brunswick	2,432	2,347	3,634	<b>8,413</b>	4,290	3,865	3,961	<b>12,116</b>
Plainfield	2,727	2,390	3,848	<b>8,965</b>	4,300	4,064	4,072	<b>12,436</b>
Trenton	4,224	4,542	6,140	<b>14,906</b>	7,067	6,525	7,208	<b>20,800</b>
Central	2,078	1,884	2,986	<b>6,948</b>	3,614	2,795	2,836	<b>9,245</b>
Southern Electric	736	834	1,246	<b>2,816</b>	1,255	1,227	1,240	<b>3,722</b>
<b>Southern Total</b>	<b>17,781</b>	<b>17,806</b>	<b>25,831</b>	<b>61,418</b>	<b>30,359</b>	<b>27,844</b>	<b>27,952</b>	<b>86,155</b>
<b>Gas Delivery</b>	<b>31,325</b>	<b>30,799</b>	<b>44,732</b>	<b>106,856</b>	<b>53,290</b>	<b>48,773</b>	<b>47,615</b>	<b>149,678</b>

**Number of Damages 2009**

Location	Jan-09	Feb-09	Mar-09	Qtr 1	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Qtr 2
Clifton	0	2	1	<b>3</b>	4	4	3	<b>11</b>
Oakland	2	0	6	<b>8</b>	7	6	10	<b>23</b>
Oradell	3	2	5	<b>10</b>	6	4	3	<b>13</b>
Orange	0	3	0	<b>3</b>	4	0	3	<b>7</b>
Metropolitan				<b>0</b>				<b>0</b>
<b>Northern Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>54</b>
East Jersey	6	1	2	<b>9</b>	6	4	11	<b>21</b>
Summit	3	0	3	<b>6</b>	0	6	9	<b>15</b>
Palisades				<b>0</b>				<b>0</b>
Harrison	4	3	6	<b>13</b>	6	4	3	<b>13</b>
<b>Central Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>49</b>
Audubon	3	1	0	<b>4</b>	4	6	1	<b>11</b>
Burlington	2	3	2	<b>7</b>	11	5	5	<b>21</b>
New Brunswick	5	4	4	<b>13</b>	6	3	8	<b>17</b>
Plainfield	5	3	6	<b>14</b>	5	13	7	<b>25</b>
Trenton	10	6	5	<b>21</b>	9	4	5	<b>18</b>
Central	0	3	2	<b>5</b>	0	0	2	<b>2</b>
Southern Electric	0	1		<b>1</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Southern Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Gas Delivery</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>197</b>

**2009 Gas Leaks Responded to Within 60 Min**

Location	Jan-09	Feb-09	Mar-09	Qtr 1	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Qtr 2
CLIFTON	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.86%	100.00%	100.00%	99.95%
OAKLAND	99.90%	100.00%	100.00%	99.96%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
ORADELL	99.92%	100.00%	100.00%	99.97%	100.00%	100.00%	99.86%	99.95%
ORANGE	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.86%	100.00%	100.00%	99.95%
<b>Northern Division</b>	<b>99.96%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99.98%</b>	<b>99.93%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99.96%</b>	<b>99.96%</b>
J/C	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.89%	100.00%	99.60%	99.83%
HARRISON	99.81%	100.00%	99.73%	99.85%	99.74%	100.00%	100.00%	99.90%
SUMMIT	99.87%	100.00%	100.00%	99.95%	100.00%	99.79%	99.54%	99.79%
<b>Central Division</b>	<b>99.92%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99.94%</b>	<b>99.95%</b>	<b>99.89%</b>	<b>99.94%</b>	<b>99.67%</b>	<b>99.83%</b>
AUDUBON	99.85%	100.00%	100.00%	99.94%	99.14%	100.00%	100.00%	99.66%
BURLINGTON	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.49%	100.00%	100.00%	99.81%
N. BRUNSWICK	99.88%	100.00%	99.64%	99.85%	100.00%	99.53%	99.58%	99.72%
PLFD.	99.84%	99.80%	100.00%	99.87%	99.15%	99.70%	99.44%	99.43%
TRENTON	99.87%	99.82%	99.82%	99.84%	100.00%	99.05%	99.55%	99.56%
<b>Southern Division</b>	<b>99.89%</b>	<b>99.93%</b>	<b>99.87%</b>	<b>99.90%</b>	<b>99.57%</b>	<b>99.65%</b>	<b>99.71%</b>	<b>99.64%</b>
<b>Gas Delivery</b>	<b>99.93%</b>	<b>99.98%</b>	<b>99.95%</b>	<b>99.95%</b>	<b>99.80%</b>	<b>99.87%</b>	<b>99.80%</b>	<b>99.82%</b>

**2009 Total Leaks**

Location	Jan-09	Feb-09	Mar-09	Qtr 1	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Qtr 2
CLIFTON	1,394	973	917	3,284	731	673	685	2,089
OAKLAND	958	734	655	2,347	561	607	552	1,720
ORADELL	1,233	905	810	2,948	743	665	732	2,140
ORANGE	1,173	884	744	2,801	703	627	612	1,942
<b>Northern Division</b>	<b>4,758</b>	<b>3,496</b>	<b>3,126</b>	<b>11,380</b>	<b>2,738</b>	<b>2,572</b>	<b>2,581</b>	<b>7,891</b>
J/C	1,219	893	907	3,019	891	771	748	2,410
HARRISON	535	397	368	1,300	389	301	328	1,018
SUMMIT	754	556	523	1,833	499	471	435	1,405
<b>Central Division</b>	<b>2,508</b>	<b>1,846</b>	<b>1,798</b>	<b>6,152</b>	<b>1,779</b>	<b>1,543</b>	<b>1,511</b>	<b>4,833</b>
AUDUBON	689	521	499	1,709	579	470	439	1,488
BURLINGTON	621	484	397	1,502	392	334	322	1,048
N. BRUNSWICK	810	648	551	2,009	531	430	480	1,441
PLFD.	629	491	400	1,520	355	330	360	1,045
TRENTON	794	570	544	1,908	493	419	445	1,357
<b>Southern Division</b>	<b>3,543</b>	<b>2,714</b>	<b>2,391</b>	<b>8,648</b>	<b>2,350</b>	<b>1,983</b>	<b>2,046</b>	<b>6,379</b>
<b>Gas Delivery</b>	<b>10,809</b>	<b>8,056</b>	<b>7,315</b>	<b>26,180</b>	<b>6,867</b>	<b>6,098</b>	<b>6,138</b>	<b>19,103</b>

**2009 Leaks > 60**

Location	Jan-09	Feb-09	Mar-09	Qtr 1	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Qtr 2
CLIFTON	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
OAKLAND	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
ORADELL	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
ORANGE	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
<b>Northern Division</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>
J/C	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4
HARRISON	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	1
SUMMIT	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	3
<b>Central Division</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>
AUDUBON	1	0	0	1	5	0	0	5
BURLINGTON	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
N. BRUNSWICK	1	0	2	3	0	2	2	4
PLFD.	1	1	0	2	3	1	2	6
TRENTON	1	1	1	3	0	4	2	6
<b>Southern Division</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Gas Delivery</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>34</b>

**OSHA Index. 2009**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Jan-09</b>	<b>Feb-09</b>	<b>Mar-09</b>	<b>Apr-09</b>	<b>May-09</b>	<b>Jun-09</b>
Clifton Total	5.64	6.25	6.58	0.00	0.00	6.06
Oakland Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Oradell Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Orange Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Northern Staff	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Northern Division</b>	<b>1.62</b>	<b>1.79</b>	<b>1.85</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.77</b>
Jersey City Total	12.40	6.86	0.00	0.00	7.14	0.00
Harrison Total	0.00	4.37	0.00	0.00	18.80	0.00
Summit Total	20.13	11.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Central Staff	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Central Division</b>	<b>10.89</b>	<b>7.24</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>7.57</b>	<b>0.00</b>
Audubon Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Burlington Total	0.00	4.73	0.00	9.05	0.00	0.00
N. Brunswick Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.30
Plainfield Total	8.49	4.65	0.00	0.00	9.34	0.00
Trenton Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Southern Staff	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Southern Division</b>	<b>1.52</b>	<b>1.66</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>1.69</b>	<b>1.49</b>
Gas Delivery Support	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GSOC / M&R / Plants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Gas Delivery</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>1.11</b>



PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
PERCEPTION SURVEYS

QUESTION:

Please provide a detailed description of the Perception Surveys, including but not limited to the sample size, the time period in which these surveys are given, how the targets are selected, and how PSE&G uses the results of this survey to improve service to its customers.

ANSWER:

PSE&G measures the perception of all three of its customer segments - residential, small business and large business -- continually throughout the year. The survey is conducted via telephone with randomly selected customers who may or may not have had a specific transaction with PSE&G. Perception survey results are monitored monthly with formal reporting and analysis each quarter. The sample size for each segment is shown in the table below.

Customer Segment	Sample Size
Residential Customers	300 interviews per quarter or 1200 annually
Small Business Customers	225 interviews per quarter or 900 annually
Large Business Customers	150 interviews per quarter or 600 annually

PSE&G measures and sets targets for overall customer perception of the company via the Customer Perception Index (CPI) -- an index of 3 overall questions -- overall satisfaction with the company, how well the company is meeting expectations and how the company compares to the ideal utility. CPI is measured for all 3 customer segments: residential, small business and large business customers. The CPI for residential customers is comparable to the American Customer Satisfaction Index.

While the CPI is PSE&G's overall balanced scorecard target, the Perception Survey measures customer perceptions of many different areas including, but not limited to, the reliability of electric and gas service, power outage restoration and communications, price and value, trust, corporate citizenship and community involvement, telephone service, field service, environmental and energy efficiency efforts, experience with PSE&G employees and customer communications.

PSE&G also has developed a key driver model for each of its customer segments to help us understand the different factors impacting perception, determine the key drivers for PSE&G customers and prioritize improvements and initiatives which would most impact perception. It provides an interactive simulation tool to support what-if analysis, a national benchmarking database of 80+ companies and line of sight for all employees as to how they impact perception.

Targets are set each year by analyzing historical trend, PSE&G's benchmark position against the 80+ utilities on the 3 CPI questions, and any external or internal factors or events which could

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE

REQUEST: RCR-CI-7

WITNESS(S):

PAGE 2 OF 2

RATE CASE 2009

impact customers such as the economy and commodity prices. Targets are set in the first quartile of the benchmark companies.

PSE&G has a robust and structured approach to process improvement which it has used. It includes the following phases:

- Development/Monitoring of Customer Measures
- Selection of Key Focus Areas for Improvement
- Establishment of a Process Improvement Structure
- Implementation of the Process Improvement Initiatives

Each year, PSE&G chooses key areas of focus to improve customer satisfaction based on the key drivers of satisfaction, performance trends in all customer satisfaction measures and benchmark performance relative to a national panel of utilities. Cross-functional teams are established in each of those key areas. In order to maintain focus on customer satisfaction, monthly customer results and team initiatives are reviewed on monthly webcasts with the Customer Perception Steering Committee. The Committee includes the President of PSE&G and his Senior Leadership Team.

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
 REQUEST: RCR-CI-9  
 WITNESS(S):  
 PAGE 1 OF 1  
 RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
SHUT-OFF NOTICES

QUESTION:

Please provide the number of shut-off or service disconnection notices issued by PSE&G for gas and electric service separately for each month from 2006 through the most current month available in 2009.

ANSWER:

Below are the total shut-off notices by month from 2006 thru June 2009. The information is not available broken out by electric and gas.

<u>2006</u>	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Apr</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Aug</u>	<u>Sept</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>
Notices	274,320	291,670	299,473	295,774	304,269	277,430	273,411	266,086	291,364	302,714	290,053	277,444
<u>2007</u>	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Apr</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Aug</u>	<u>Sept</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>
Notices	283,863	295,507	296,726	316,392	323,931	304,436	292,443	288,513	291,269	295,471	294,243	287,358
<u>2008</u>	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Apr</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Aug</u>	<u>Sept</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>
Notices	291,710	316,818	322,356	326,261	318,846	303,155	287,104	290,516	304,174	322,589	328,859	323,717
<u>2009</u>	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Apr</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Aug</u>	<u>Sept</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>
Notices	363,061	387,774	394,192	417,112	443,244	416,734						

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-CI-12  
WITNESS(S):  
PAGE 1 OF 2  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
CALL CENTER STATISTICS

QUESTION:

Regarding the two centralized call centers cited in Mr. LaRossa's direct testimony at p. 8, lines 17-19, please provide the following data for each month from 2006 to the most recent month in 2009 for which data are available:

- (a) The average speed of answer, defined as the percentage of calls answered by a representative within 30 seconds after the customer indicates the desire to speak to a representative.
- (b) The abandoned call percentage, defined as the percentage of calls to the IVR system that are terminated by the caller before reaching the selected destination, whether a department or a representative.

ANSWER:

a) Average Speed of Answer percentages

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
<b>Jan</b>	69.0%	64.6%	71.7%	78.5%	69.2%
<b>Feb</b>	64.7%	77.1%	66.5%	74.8%	62.7%
<b>Mar</b>	65.5%	75.9%	59.0%	78.3%	71.5%
<b>Apr</b>	69.8%	84.7%	69.2%	79.2%	58.6%
<b>May</b>	80.3%	83.9%	79.1%	78.5%	56.8%
<b>Jun</b>	64.6%	80.7%	80.2%	79.3%	58.1%
<b>Jul</b>	64.2%	64.7%	82.3%	75.7%	
<b>Aug</b>	63.0%	65.8%	73.4%	81.1%	
<b>Sep</b>	83.8%	69.9%	79.6%	75.1%	
<b>Oct</b>	69.5%	72.0%	80.5%	65.5%	
<b>Nov</b>	76.7%	77.7%	82.4%	70.2%	
<b>Dec</b>	75.1%	75.7%	81.8%	67.2%	
<b>YTD</b>	70.3%	74.4%	75.4%	75.1%	62.8%

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-CI-12  
WITNESS(S):  
PAGE 2 OF 2  
RATE CASE 2009

b) Abandoned Call Percentages

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
<b>Jan</b>	17.6%	6.4%	7.7%	3.8%	7.6%
<b>Feb</b>	22.0%	7.2%	2.8%	6.1%	9.5%
<b>Mar</b>	18.8%	7.3%	2.7%	7.6%	6.5%
<b>Apr</b>	10.8%	7.8%	1.7%	6.7%	24.9%
<b>May</b>	14.4%	3.7%	2.5%	5.1%	17.5%
<b>Jun</b>	12.2%	7.9%	3.5%	3.7%	18.0%
<b>Jul</b>	13.7%	7.3%	7.6%	5.5%	
<b>Aug</b>	10.8%	9.4%	4.2%	6.4%	
<b>Sep</b>	5.1%	3.3%	5.4%	3.6%	
<b>Oct</b>	6.9%	7.9%	4.1%	2.8%	
<b>Nov</b>	4.6%	6.1%	3.2%	3.2%	
<b>Dec</b>	6.0%	6.1%	3.7%	2.6%	
<b>YTD</b>	11.9%	6.7%	4.1%	4.6%	14.0%

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-CI-13  
WITNESS(S):  
PAGE 1 OF 3  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
CALL CENTER MEASURES

QUESTION:

Please provide a copy of the AGAEEI Data Source for 2006 through 2008 for Call Center measures, including but not limited to Call Answer Time, Complaints and any other measures of performance that PSE&G tracks and measures.

ANSWER:

AGA/EEI DataSource benchmarking data for Service Level and Average Speed of Answer is attached. The respective utility Companies are not identified pursuant to the terms of participating in the benchmarking studies conducted by AGA EEI which maintain the Identity of the participating utilities as Confidential. Benchmarking data for regulatory complaints is unavailable.

2008		
Company	* 80,582. Please specify your Actual 2008 Percentage of Calls Offered Answered by REP within 30 Seconds.	* 80,584. Please specify your Actual 2008 Average Speed of Answer for REP calls.
Company A	53	47
Company B	79	38
Company C	83	16.6
Company D	23.6	209
Company E	64	107
Company F	66.5	46
Company G	78.2	72
Company H	Not Applicable	43
Company I	74.4	37.2
Company J	38.5	Not Applicable
Company K	51	127.9
Company L	54.1	85.2
Company M	76.2	165.9
Company N	62.5	207
Company O	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Company P	Not Applicable	98.2
Company Q	Not Applicable	71
Company R	66	76
Company S	69	50
Company T	76	41
Company U	80	32
Company V	79	28
Company W	81	37
Company X	74.2	33
Company Y	97.9	Not Applicable
Company Z	83.5	11
Company AA	42	60
Company BB	82.2	21
Company CC	29	211
Company DD	32	408
Company EE	80.2	25
Company FF	100	1.2
Company GG	68.8	63
Company HH	56.3	86
Company II	58.1	89
Company JJ	50	90
Company KK	89	4
Company LL	83.5	17
Company MM	85.4	17
Company NN	76	44
Company D3	82.8	23.3
Company PP	65	56
Company QQ	75	67
Company RR	63.9	60
Company SS	78	31.2
Company TT	85.4	27
Company UU	Not Applicable	75
Company VV	Not Applicable	153
Company WW	Not Applicable	7
Company XX	66.3	49.5
Company YY	76.6	36
Company ZZ	89.7	16
Company A1	69	50
Company B1	86.8	86.8

2007		
Company	* 80,582. Please specify your Actual 2007 Percentage of Calls Offered Answered (by IVR or Rep) within 30 Seconds.	* 80,583. Please specify your Actual 2007 Average Speed of Answer for ALL CALLS (IVR and Rep handled).
Company A	58.7	44
Company B	65	92
Company Q1	66.4	65
Company C	88	22
Company D	87.3	26
Company R1	Not Applicable	90
Company S1	Not Applicable	135.3
Company T1	77	22
Company U1	76	23
Company V1	70	25
Company F	72.3	22
Company W1	85	18
Company G	75.6	69
Company H	80.7	33
Company I	86	25.8
Company X1	78	61
Company Y1	66	92
Company Z1	66	92
Company A2	73	40
Company B2	66	42
Company C2	25	1
Company K	68.5	52
Company D2	55	107
Company L	78.6	30.6
Company M	Not Applicable	69
Company N	62.5	61
Company P	82	56.8
Company Q	90	41.5
Company R	81.6	36
Company S	81	31
Company E2	87	17
Company F2	75	44
Company T	71.9	39
Company U	78	32
Company V	80	26
Company W	79	50
Company X	93.8	11
Company Y	98.7	4
Company Z	77.1	13
Company G2	70	45
Company BB	82.7	17.3
Company EE	85.8	28
Company FF	100	1.3
Company GG	71	41
Company HH	48.6	99.4
Company II	55.5	87.7
Company H2	54	243
Company JJ	50	260
Company KK	89	4
Company LL	84	16
Company I2	94	33
Company MM	54.2	112
Company NN	100	23
Company J2	45	67

2006		
Company	* 80,582. Please specify your Actual 2006 Percentage of Calls Answered (by IVR or Rep) within 30 Seconds. (WE ARE	* 80,583. Please specify your Actual 2006 Average Speed of Answer for ALL CALLS (IVR and Rep handled).
Company U2	80	37
Company A	63.2	39
Company B	67	53
Company Q1	25	101
Company C	68	41
Company D	86	29
Company T1	62	37
Company U1	56	41
Company V1	58	57
Company F	100	29
Company W1	86	23
Company G	Not Applicable	52
Company H	82.4	22.5
Company J	64.8	35
Company W2	40	278
Company C2	25	2.5
Company K	68.7	37
Company D2	55	96
Company L	81.8	24.6
Company M	67.7	124
Company N	63	65
Company P	55.5	164.5
Company Q	82	51.8
Company E2	79	39
Company F2	75	44
Company T	79.3	31
Company X2	81	40.1
Company U	81	33
Company V	64	135
Company W	87	30
Company X	74.8	15
Company Y	94.3	7
Company Z	77.1	21
Company BB	87.3	16.5
Company CC	37	97
Company EE	87.2	25
Company FF	100	3.5
Company GG	78	51
Company HH	52.4	92
Company A3	54.7	111
Company B3	10.7	73
Company C3	94.1	127
Company II	54.9	110
Company JJ	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Company LL	45.1	94
Company MM	40.9	98
Company D3	51	115
Company E3	86.1	14.3
Company J2	45	77
Company K2	75	22
Company L2	75	40
Company RR	69.1	46
Company SS	75.3	29.8
Company TT	83	26

2005		
Company	* 80,582. Please specify your Actual 2005 Percentage of Calls Answered (by IVR or Rep) within 30 Seconds. (WE ARE	* 80,583. Please specify your Actual 2005 Average Speed of Answer for ALL CALLS (IVR and Rep handled).
Company A	60.1	50
Company B	67	67
Company Q1	100	158
Company C	84	12
Company D	97	28
Company U1	57	55
Company F	100	43
Company W1	76.5	30
Company G	Not Applicable	52
Company I	94	10
Company C2	Not Applicable	6.1
Company N3	79	39
Company K	67.9	80
Company D2	55	78
Company L	82.8	20.7
Company M	74.9	48
Company N	63	67
Company P	51.3	111
Company Q	72.1	62.7
Company X2	80	60
Company U	77	49
Company V	34	312
Company W	72	54
Company X	74	19
Company Y	87.7	11
Company Z	84.3	16
Company BB	85.4	21
Company CC	51	97
Company EE	87.1	24
Company FF	54	2.6
Company GG	77.8	51
Company HH	51.6	75
Company A3	49	115
Company II	51	80
Company JJ	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Company LL	63.5	52
Company MM	41.2	99
Company D3	51	115
Company J2	40	57
Company K2	75	20
Company L2	80	81
Company RR	57	74
Company SS	74.8	27.6
Company TT	80	35
Company O3	80	21
Company XX	36.5	22.8
Company G3	74	260
Company P3	81	37
Company H3	84	41
Company ZZ	Not Applicable	310
Company A1	89	92
Company M2	24	148
Company N2	80	21
Company B1	88.1	15

2008		
Company	* 80,582. Please specify your Actual 2008 Percentage of Calls Offered Answered by REP within 30 Seconds.	* 80,584. Please specify your Actual 2008 Average Speed of Answer for REP calls.
Company C1	84.5	Not Applicable
Company D1	79.8	118.9
PSE&G	61	47
Company E1	75.5	37
Company F1	85	13
Company G1	71	85
Company H1	Not Applicable	237
Company I1	51	195
Company J1	32.3	162
Company K1	90	13
Company L1	93.6	12
Company M1	74.2	165.4
Company N1	67	71
Company O1	79.4	23
Company P1	72.1	135.6

2007		
Company	* 80,582. Please specify your Actual 2007 Percentage of Calls Offered Answered (by IVR or Rep) within 30 Seconds.	* 80,583. Please specify your Actual 2007 Average Speed of Answer for ALL CALLS (IVR and Rep handled).
Company K2	75	24
Company L2	63	42
Company RR	62.2	59
Company SS	81.6	23.3
Company TT	84.6	26
Company XX	43.9	26.7
Company ZZ	Not Applicable	15
Company A1	85	20
Company M2	23.7	216
Company N2	82.5	24
Company B1	86.8	Not Applicable
Company C1	81	82
Company D1	Not Applicable	20.9
PSE&G	75.4	36
Company E1	25	29
Company F1	86	9
Company G1	74	50
Company O2	53	58
Company I1	84	47
Company P2	Not Applicable	221
Company J1	Not Applicable	78
Company Q2	68	60
Company K1	90	11
Company R2	77.4	46.6
Company L1	18.1	14
Company M1	Not Applicable	75
Company S2	56	240
Company T2	46	126
Company N1	68	60
Company O1	80.3	21
Company P1	Not Applicable	55.2

2006		
Company	* 80,582. Please specify your Actual 2006 Percentage of Calls Answered (by IVR or Rep) within 30 Seconds. (WE ARE	* 80,583. Please specify your Actual 2006 Average Speed of Answer for ALL CALLS (IVR and Rep handled).
Company XX	47	30.7
Company F3	75	40
Company G3	74	45
Company H3	82	45
Company ZZ	Not Applicable	310
Company M2	24	210
Company I3	70.6	129
Company N2	79.4	30
Company D1	Not Applicable	18.8
PSE&G	70.4	38
Company F1	81	19
Company G1	74	51
Company H1	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Company O2	Not Applicable	32
Company I1	85	47
Company P2	Not Applicable	253
Company J1	80	82
Company K1	85	24
Company R2	70	73
Company L1	19.8	47
Company M1	79.3	41
Company S2	56	240
Company K3	52	113
Company L3	65	68
Company O1	85	17
Company P1	75.5	26.3

2005		
Company	* 80,582. Please specify your Actual 2005 Percentage of Calls Answered (by IVR or Rep) within 30 Seconds. (WE ARE	* 80,583. Please specify your Actual 2005 Average Speed of Answer for ALL CALLS (IVR and Rep handled).
Company C1	83	22
Company D1	88.8	13.4
Company T3	75	44
PSE&G	70.4	56
Company F1	65	42
Company G1	71.3	40
Company U3	81	19
Company H1	Not Applicable	204
Company O2	Not Applicable	56
Company I1	70	133
Company J1	80	93
Company V3	85	24
Company R2	80	49.7
Company L1	Not Applicable	205
Company M1	65.3	68
Company S2	63	180
Company L3	Not Applicable	44.2
Company O1	78	26

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-CI-15  
WITNESS(S):  
PAGE 1 OF 3  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
CUSTOMER COMPLAINTS

QUESTION:

Please provide the number of PSE&G complaints to the BPU and the number of 3<sup>rd</sup> party complaints separately for each month from 2006 through the most current month in 2009 for which this information is available. Please include in your response the root cause categories for these complaints, e.g. billing, collection, service, etc.

ANSWER:

Attached are the complaints to the BPU from 2006 through 2009.

Line of Business	2006												2006	2007												2007
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Electric Delivery	16	23	23	5	19	32	33	73	20	29	47	30	<b>350</b>	21	6	16	14	25	17	26	24	21	10	22	15	<b>217</b>
Gas Delivery	14	13	11	11	13	9	11	15	21	19	19	21	<b>177</b>	13	16	7	12	15	9	6	5	10	18	14	18	<b>143</b>
Other	10	19	14	5	4	5	6	4	6	6	7	5	<b>91</b>	4	3	6	5	11	7	12	10	4	13	22	14	<b>111</b>
Meter Reading	9	17	30	19	20	6	9	16	7	9	13	9	<b>164</b>	15	14	32	26	36	10	15	10	13	15	12	17	<b>215</b>
Customer Service Center	0	4	6	10	5	5	0	4	3	3	4	3	<b>47</b>	4	7	5	1	8	4	6	8	7	6	6	2	<b>64</b>
Inquiry	5	12	10	5	4	12	6	9	9	11	8	8	<b>99</b>	12	8	11	11	4	4	7	10	7	19	14	11	<b>118</b>
Construction Inquiry	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	<b>7</b>	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	4	1	<b>11</b>
Billing	109	98	132	100	89	76	85	100	96	83	63	50	<b>1081</b>	78	102	105	120	111	83	95	78	37	38	31	32	<b>910</b>
Payment Center	1	1	1	5	2	4	5	6	2	4	4	0	<b>35</b>	6	6	5	9	11	5	2	10	4	1	2	2	<b>63</b>
Revenue Integrity Department	2	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	<b>13</b>	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	<b>12</b>
<b>Non-Collection Sub-Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>2064</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>1864</b>
<b>Collection</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>3636</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>3933</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>589</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>5700</b>	<b>417</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>677</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>497</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>5797</b>

Line of Business	2008												2008 YTD	2009												2009 YTD
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Electric Delivery	11	10	30	17	14	83	33	27	20	10	9	17	<b>281</b>	11	13	8	10	9	15						<b>66</b>	
Gas Delivery	7	6	5	5	7	14	11	9	8	12	13	19	<b>116</b>	15	33	8	22	7	17						<b>102</b>	
Other	13	8	11	10	11	12	7	8	6	10	10	4	<b>110</b>	16	14	16	11	10	15						<b>82</b>	
Meter Reading	20	29	34	26	26	27	16	17	20	21	13	14	<b>263</b>	37	69	43	39	18	24						<b>230</b>	
Customer Service Center	9	3	6	9	1	7	9	9	6	5	2	5	<b>71</b>	6	6	10	3	5	2						<b>32</b>	
Inquiry	18	12	16	11	5	9	10	10	9	10	9	15	<b>134</b>	27	68	22	78	62	40						<b>297</b>	
Construction Inquiry	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	4	1	2	<b>15</b>	1	2	0	2	1	1						<b>7</b>	
Billing	40	33	44	39	26	27	35	42	33	30	24	43	<b>416</b>	62	63	65	80	57	106						<b>433</b>	
Payment Center	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	8	1	<b>16</b>	1	2	5	11	17	21						<b>57</b>	
Revenue Integrity Department	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		0	1	0	1	<b>4</b>	2	0	0	1	0	0						<b>3</b>	
<b>Non-Collection Sub-Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>1426</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1309</b>	
<b>Collection</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>574</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>4486</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>482</b>						<b>2455</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>559</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>533</b>	<b>499</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>677</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>5912</b>	<b>499</b>	<b>657</b>	<b>654</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>723</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3764</b>

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-CI-16 (UPDATE)  
WITNESS(S):  
PAGE 1 OF 1  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
RESIDENTIAL METER READ PERCENTAGE

**QUESTION:**

Please provide the percentage of residential meters that are read by PSE&G each month from 2006 to the present.

**ANSWER:**

The following is the residential meter read percentage, updated for 6 months of actual data through June 2009.

<b>Read Percentage</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>	<b>Mar</b>	<b>Apr</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>June</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>Aug</b>	<b>Sept</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>
2006	88.0%	87.9%	88.9%	89.4%	89.6%	89.7%	90.3%	89.7%	89.9%	89.9%	90.0%	90.2%
2007	90.1%	88.4%	89.2%	89.7%	90.2%	90.3%	90.1%	89.9%	90.3%	90.5%	90.3%	89.9%
2008	90.2%	88.8%	90.2%	90.5%	89.6%	89.5%	89.7%	89.8%	89.7%	90.1%	90.1%	88.0%
2009	87.3%	88.1%	89.3%	88.7%	87.6%	88.9%						

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-CI-19  
WITNESS(S):  
PAGE 1 OF 2  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY

REBILLS

QUESTION:

Please provide PSE&G's number of rebills per 1,000 customers for each month from 2006 through the most current month the data are available in 2009. Rebills are defined as all bills mailed to customers that are later adjusted, cancelled, or re-issued for any amount or reason.

ANSWER:

**REBILLS**

<b>MONTH</b>	<b>ADJUSTMENTS</b>	<b>#CUSTS</b>	<b>ADJ/PER 1,000 CUSTS</b>
Jan-06	52,504	2,383,134	22.03
Feb-06	50,787	2,384,293	21.30
Mar-06	48,363	2,386,123	20.27
Apr-06	53,330	2,385,789	22.35
May-06	60,482	2,388,625	25.32
Jun-06	61,969	2,384,905	25.98
Jul-06	51,962	2,390,467	21.74
Aug-06	49,395	2,390,981	20.66
Sep-06	54,645	2,390,550	22.86
Oct-06	58,289	2,388,844	24.40
Nov-06	55,993	2,396,773	23.36
Dec-06	48,686	2,396,343	20.32
Jan-07	47,895	2,402,082	19.94
Feb-07	48,570	2,397,878	20.26
Mar-07	50,868	2,404,919	21.15
Apr-07	50,714	2,404,727	21.09
May-07	58,911	2,404,971	24.50
Jun-07	50,180	2,405,072	20.86
Jul-07	45,251	2,406,494	18.80
Aug-07	44,118	2,410,021	18.31
Sep-07	48,803	2,409,925	20.25
Oct-07	50,994	2,412,506	21.14
Nov-07	46,673	2,414,123	19.33
Dec-07	47,953	2,418,425	19.83
Jan-08	51,704	2,421,478	21.35
Feb-08	47,549	2,421,492	19.64
Mar-08	48,514	2,421,480	20.03
Apr-08	56,487	2,421,015	23.33
May-08	57,947	2,414,772	24.00
Jun-08	58,812	2,421,916	24.28
Jul-08	58,492	2,423,630	24.13

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE

REQUEST: RCR-CI-19

WITNESS(S):

PAGE 2 OF 2

RATE CASE 2009

<b>MONTH</b>	<b>ADJUSTMENTS</b>	<b>#CUSTS</b>	<b>ADJ/PER 1,000 CUSTS</b>
Aug-08	53,833	2,424,319	22.21
Sep-08	55,452	2,424,678	22.87
Oct-08	55,840	2,427,132	23.01
Nov-08	49,197	2,428,419	20.26
Dec-08	47,374	2,432,320	19.48
Jan-09	57,166	2,432,788	23.50
Feb-09	55,465	2,432,730	22.80
Mar-09	56,635	2,433,291	23.28
Apr-09	53,025	2,474,365	21.43
May-09	55,161	2,305,131	23.93
Jun-09	56,281	2,478,987	22.70

---

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-CI-30  
WITNESS(S):  
PAGE 1 OF 1  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
AVERAGE SPEED OF ANSWER

QUESTION:

Reference PSE&G's response to RCR-CI-12. Please explain all the reasons why the Average Speed of Answer (ASA) dropped in 2009 and please explain what initiatives PSE&G is implementing to increase the ASA in 2009.

ANSWER:

In RCR-CI-12, ASA was defined as the percentage of calls answered by a representative within 30 seconds after the customer indicates their desire to speak to a representative. (On PSE&G Call Center scorecards, this definition is our Service Level metric)

ASA decreased with the implementation of our new customer information system on March 30, 2009. This decrease was due to two factors – increased call volume and the length of time to handle the calls. The increase in call volume associated with implementation of the new Customer Care System was exacerbated by the declining economy and associated inquiries by our customers. There are many initiatives underway to improve the ASA, including training, system refinements, data conversion clean-up efforts, reducing billing exception backlogs and hiring temporary employees to augment the call center staff. The training includes using internal and consultant personnel to develop additional training modules and to conduct full day one on one training sessions with each call center representative in an effort to accelerate them along the learning curve. It is yielding significant results. There were 30 additional call center representatives hired during the summer and another 50 are being hired during October and November to return the ASA to pre implementation levels.

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-CI-32  
WITNESS(S):  
PAGE 1 OF 1  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
ABANDONED CALL PERCENTAGES

QUESTION:

Reference PSE&G's response to RCR-CI-12. Please explain all the reasons why the company's abandoned call percentages (ACP) increased in 2009, particularly in April, May, and June, and please explain what initiatives PSE&G is implementing to reduce the ACP in 2009.

ANSWER:

The abandoned call percentage increased when we moved to the new customer information system (SAP) on 3/30/09. The ACP went up due to two factors, call volume increased and the length of time to handle the call also increased. Increases in call volume and handle time were projected to occur at Go Live - the magnitude of the anticipated increase was difficult to estimate. The increase in call volume associated with the implementation of the new Customer Care System, was exacerbated by the declining economy and associated inquiries by our customers.

There are many initiatives underway to reduce the abandoned call percentage. The major ones are: training and system enhancements to make the call quicker; system fixes, data conversion clean up efforts and the reduction of billing exception backlogs to reduce the call volume and additional temporary hiring to augment the call center staff. These efforts are yielding results as the abandoned call percentage in the last half of October is under 10%.

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE

REQUEST: RCR-CI-44

WITNESS(S):

PAGE 1 OF 5

RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
NEW CUSTOMER INFORMATION SYSTEM - SCORECARD IMPROVEMENTS

QUESTION:

In its response to RCR-CI-22, PSE&G states: "Service improvements gained by the new Customer Information System and other aforementioned systems will be measured using the Company's balanced scorecard approach to managing business results." Please cite each element of the scorecard that reflects the service improvements gained by the new CIS and please describe the results in 2009, year to date as provided in the scorecard.

ANSWER:

Service Improvements gained by the new Customer Care System will be measured using the identified elements on the Company's Balanced Scorecards. The elements are highlighted in green (        ), in the "Year to Date" section of each scorecard. Year to date results for 2009 are included in the attachment: PSE&G Balanced Scorecard, Customer Operations Balanced Scorecard, Electric Distribution Balanced Scorecard, and the Gas Distribution Balanced Scorecard.

PSE&G  
2009 Balanced Scorecard

September YTD

PEOPLE providing	PSE&G								
	L/H	Sep 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	PSE&G	Cust Ops	Gas	Electric	Other
OSHA Recordable Incidence Rate	L	2.06	1.80	↑	1.63	1.25	1.87	1.71	
OSHA Days Away Rate (Severity)	L	8.41	7.94	↓	18.01	21.77	14.73	18.79	
Motor Vehicle Accident Rate	L	4.76	3.42	↓	5.21	5.09	4.00	6.71	8.68
Availability - Illness	H	96.5%	97.3%	↓	96.5%	95.7%	96.8%	96.7%	97.8%
Overtime	L	16.2%	11.3%	↓	15.6%	12.3%	13.4%	19.7%	
Staffing Levels - Permanent	L	6,315	6,502	↑	6,367	1,522	2,055	2,725	65
Employee Development - MAST	H	24.0%	95.0%	↑	70.0%	72.8%	72.6%	69.0%	51.4%
Succession Planning	H	64.6%	73.8%	↑	73.0%				
Corporate Culture for Ethics and Compliance	H		66%	↔	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual	
Employee Technical Training - BU	H	64.3%	100.0%	↑	78.3%	102.0%	65.5%	83.0%	
Fringe Benefit Rate	L	30.9%	50.5%	↑	48.5%				

SAFE, RELIABLE	PSE&G								
	L/H	Sep 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	PSE&G	Cust Ops	Gas	Electric	Other
SAIFI	L	0.55	0.72	↑	0.53			0.53	
MAIFI	L	1.04	1.25	↑	0.94			0.94	
CAIDI	L	64.1	66.5	↑	64.2			64.2	
CEMI	L	1.2%	2.3%	↑	0.6%			0.6%	
Gas Leak Reports per Mile	L	0.186	0.222	↑	0.155		0.155		
Damages per 1,000 Locate Requests	L	1.86	1.97	↑	1.46		2.21	0.66	
Leak Response Rate	H	99.9%	99.9%	↑	99.9%		99.9%		
Fix It Right									
Percent of Actual Meters Read	H	88.4%	90.1%	↓	88.8%	88.8%			
Gen'l Inquiry Service Level (30 sec.)	H	77.9%	51.0%	↑	61.1%	61.1%			
First Contact Resolution									
BPU Inquiry Rate-Collection	L	1.20	1.25	↓	2.08	2.08			
BPU Inquiries - Non-Collection	L	1,113	1,500	↓	2,056	1,671	139	114	132
Perception Survey (Res/Sm Business)	H	75	76	↓	74				
Perception Survey (Large Business)	H	76	77	↓	76				
Moment of Truth Survey	H	8.9	9.0	↓	8.7	8.2	9.1	8.8	
New Business Construction Survey	H	8.5	8.6	↓	8.4	8.1	8.6	8.2	

ECONOMIC	PSE&G								
	L/H	Sep 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	PSE&G	Cust Ops	Gas	Electric	Other
Total CapEx (\$M)	L	574.7	965.8	↑	627.1	36.7	154.7	435.6	0.0
Accountability O&M (\$M)	L	531.1	784.5	↑	568.2	131.2	175.3	238.1	23.5
Controllable O&M (\$M)	L	685.6	991.4	↑	711.1				
Net Write-Off (\$)/\$100 billed	L	0.83	0.82	↓	0.88	0.88			
Days Sales Outstanding	L	35.6	34.5	↓	35.6	35.6			
Current Capital Performance	H		1.00	↑	1.03	0.90		1.07	
ROIC	H	7.0%	6.2%	↑	6.1%				
Funds from Operations/Debt	H	21.2%	19.5%	↑	24.0%				
(Societal) Cost (\$) of PSE&G Solar Loan Program	L		1,939	↑	1,529				1,529
EE-Productivity Measure (carbon abatement)	L		0.26	↔	0.34				0.34
Capital Projects' Results	H	70.3%	82.9%	↔	69.4%	99.9%	64.6%	47.1%	

GREEN ENERGY	PSE&G								
	L/H	Sep 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	PSE&G	Cust Ops	Gas	Electric	Other
Fleet MPG	H	8.89	8.90	↑	9.01				
Renewable Energy Generated (kWh)	H		8,479,000	↓	3,414,197				3,414,197
Non-Hazardous Waste	H	96.8%	96.9%	↑	97.9%	73.1%	99.0%	96.8%	
Energy Efficiency Energy Savings (kWh equivalent)	H		30,373,151	↑	21,569,296				21,569,295
Net Number of New Solar Meters in UEZs	H		6	↑	4				4
Peak Demand Reduction (MW)	H		61.8	↑	61.9				61.9
Hazardous Waste	L	1.44	3.59	↑	2.16				

On track to meet Target ↑ Meeting Target at risk ↔ Not expected to meet Target ↓ iPower

Month of September

PEOPLE providing	PSE&G								
	L/H	Sep 08	2009 Target	Monthly / Quarterly Status	PSE&G	Cust Ops	Gas	Electric	Other
OSHA Recordable Incidence Rate	L	1.22	1.80	+	1.04	0.73	0.00	2.02	
OSHA Days Away Rate (Severity)	L	5.17	7.94	-	26.75	30.86	29.58	23.02	
Motor Vehicle Accident Rate	L	5.80	3.42	-	5.83	4.88	3.86	8.61	0.00
Availability - Illness	H	96.9%	97.3%	-	97.0%	96.0%	97.2%	97.3%	97.0%
Overtime	L	17.2%	11.3%	-	16.6%	11.2%	17.2%	20.0%	

SAFE, RELIABLE	PSE&G								
	L/H	Sep 08	2009 Target	Monthly / Quarterly Status	PSE&G	Cust Ops	Gas	Electric	Other
SAIFI	L	0.08	0.05	-	0.06			0.06	
MAIFI	L	0.13	0.11	+	0.09			0.09	
CAIDI	L	65.6	68.2	-	75.3			75.3	
CEMI	L	0.0%	0.0%	o	0.0%			0.0%	
Gas Leak Reports per Mile	L	0.020	0.018	-	0.028		0.028		
Damages per 1,000 Locate Requests	L	1.75	1.97	-	2.09		3.20	0.91	
Leak Response Rate	H	99.9%	99.9%	-	99.7%		99.7%		
Fix It Right									
Percent of Actual Meters Read	H	88.3%	90.1%	-	89.3%	89.3%			
Gen'l Inquiry Service Level (30 sec.)	H	75.1%	51.0%	+	55.3%	55.3%			
First Contact Resolution									
BPU Inquiry Rate-Collection	L	1.30	1.25	+	1.12	1.12			
BPU Inquiries - Non-Collection	L	105	103	-	248	205	13	12	18
Perception Survey (Res/Sm Business)	H	76	76	-	74				
Perception Survey (Large Business)	H	74	77	o	77				
Moment of Truth Survey	H	8.9	9.0	-	8.7	8.0	9.2	8.7	
New Business Construction Survey	H	8.5	8.6	-	8.4	7.7	8.6	8.3	

ECONOMIC	PSE&G								
	L/H	Sep 08	2009 Target	Monthly / Quarterly Status	PSE&G	Cust Ops	Gas	Electric	Other
Total CapEx (\$M)	L	71.6	89.3	+	79.6	4.1	23.8	51.6	0.0
Accountability O&M (\$M)	L	52.2	65.3	+	60.9	14.0	17.9	26.2	2.9
Controllable O&M (\$M)	L	72.0	83.7	+	73.4				
Net Write-Off (\$)/\$100 billed	L	0.67	0.82	o	0.82	0.82			
Days Sales Outstanding	L	34.7	34.5	-	41.2	41.2			

GREEN ENERGY	PSE&G								
	L/H	Sep 08	2009 Target	Monthly / Quarterly Status	PSE&G	Cust Ops	Gas	Electric	Other
Fleet MPG	H	9.16	8.90	+	10.18				
Renewable Energy Generated (kWh)	H		8,479,000	o	542,681				542,681
Non-Hazardous Waste	H	96.3%	96.9%	+	98.4%	72.2%	99.5%	97.0%	
Energy Efficiency Energy Savings (kWh equivalent)	H			N/A	13,862,107				13,862,107
Net Number of New Solar Meters in UEZs	H		6	o	2				2

LEGEND: Monthly Status: + = Better than Plan, o = On Plan, - = Worse than Plan, iPower

PSE&G – Customer Operations  
2009 Balanced Scorecard

September YTD

PEOPLE (providing)	Customer Operations												
	L/H	Sept 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	Cust Ops	Cust Cost	Dist Ops	Billing & Rev Ops	Com Rel & CSC	LCS & AD	UM	RPA	VP & Support
OSHA Recordable Incidence Rate	L	1.50	1.15	↑	1.25	0.48	3.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OSHA Days Away Rate (Severity)	L	2.20	1.61	↓	21.77	0.00	0.00	30.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Motor Vehicle Accident Rate	L	4.26	3.21	↔	5.09	9.08	5.64	0.00	13.73	0.00	0.00	12.65	0.0
Availability - Illness	H	95.6%	97.3%	↓	95.7%	94.3%	97.3%	96.1%	92.9%	97.7%	98.6%	99.9%	97.9%
Staffing Levels - Permanent	L	1,701	1,489	↔	1,522	461	532	203	193	52	31	11	39
Overtime	L	4.8%	2.6%	↓	12.3%	20.4%	6.8%	16.2%	9.3%	0.5%	3.2%	0.0%	4.2%
Employee Technical Training - BU	H	90%	100%	↑	102%								
Employee Development - MAST	H	14.1%	95.0%	↑	72.8%	69.7%	91.7%	62.4%	62.4%	73.9%	85.0%	82.3%	62.8%
Corporate Culture for Ethics and Compliance	H	NA	62%	↑	Annually								

SAFE (reliable)	Customer Operations												
	L/H	Sept 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	Cust Ops	Cust Cost	Dist Ops	Billing & Rev Ops	Com Rel & CSC	LCS & AD	UM	RPA	VP & Support
Percent of Actual Meters Read	H	90.0%	90.1%	↓	88.8%			88.8%					
Meters Not Read >7 Months (K)	L	64.3	55.2	↑									
MR Errors/10,000 Reads	L	4.1	3.9	↑									
Gen'l Inquiry Service Level (30 sec.)	H	77.9%	51.0% <sup>2</sup>	↓	61.1%	61.1%							
Abandonment Rate - Inbound Collections	L	10.6%	10.9%	↓	17.2%	17.2%							
First Contact Resolution	H	n/a	Tracking	↑									
Accounts Converted to Bills and Printed (%)	H	98.6%	98.8%	↑									
Billing Exception Time	L	4.0	3.6	↔									
Payments Deposited within 1 Bus Day (%)	H	95.4%	96.5%	↑	98.7%			98.7%					
Participation in Auto-Pay	H	115,028	126,994	↑	112,015						112,015		
Cashier Errors	L	0.0	3.7	↔									
BPU Inquiry Rate-Collection	L	1.25	1.25	↓	2.08								
BPU Inquiries - Non-Collection	L	711	1038	↓	1671	432	291	910	38				
Perception Survey (Res/Sm Business)	H	75	76	↓	74								
Perception Survey (Large Business)	H	76	77	↔	76								
Moment of Truth Survey	H	8.7	8.7	↓	8.2	8.1			8.5				
New Business Construction Survey-CO	H	8.3	8.4	↓	8.1	8.1							
Client Value Assessment	H	8.1%	8.4	↑	8.9						8.9		
Constituent Satisfaction Index	H	6.8	7.2	↑	7.1				6.6		7.5		
SOX Test Failure	L	0	2	↓	5				5				

<sup>1</sup> Beginning April 2009, the data source for Percent Meters Read has changed.

<sup>2</sup> Excluding first 10 Days after the iPower 'Go-Live'

ECONOMIC	Customer Operations												
	L/H	Sept 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	Cust Ops	Cust Cost	Dist Ops	Billing & Rev Ops	Com Rel & CSC	LCS & AD	UM	RPA	VP & Support
CapEx (\$M)	L	\$48.8	\$5.8	↔	\$1.7								\$1.7
iPower CapEx (\$M)	L	\$35.8	\$11.1	↓	\$35.0								\$35.0
Accountability O&M (\$M)	L	\$121.3	\$175.5	↓	\$131.2	\$24.2	\$27.6	\$24.4	\$12.3	\$3.8	\$7.8	\$1.0	\$30.2
Net Write-Off (\$) /\$100 billed	L	\$0.83	\$0.82	↓	\$0.88			\$0.88					
Days Sales Outstanding	L	35.6	34.5	↓	35.6			35.6					
Aged Receivables >90 Days (%) <sup>1</sup>	L	14.1%	14.5%	↓	18.2%			18.2%					
Notice Dollars Collected on RNP (%)	H	70.0%	70.1%	↑									
Dollars Treated by Field Collections	H	\$195.2	\$251.5	↑									
Unbilled Revenue Recovery (\$M)	H	\$24.3	\$34.1	↑									
Delinquent Accounts Covered By Deposit	H	23.0%	23.0%	↓	19.4%			19.4%					
LCS Outdoor Lighting Sales (\$M)	H	\$3.7	\$3.6	↔	\$1.4				\$1.4				
Contract Revenue (\$M)	H	\$59.8	\$85.3	↑	\$66.0					\$66.0			
AWH Revenue (\$M)	H	\$10.9	\$15.5	↔	\$10.4					\$10.4			
HVAC Revenue (\$M)	H	\$18.4	\$29.1	↓	\$15.0					\$15.0			
Payment Assistance-# Of Accounts	H	254,675	267,185	↑	284,785				284,785				
Payment Assistance-Dollars (\$M)	H	\$0.0	\$167.8	↑	\$174.5				\$174.5				
Capital Projects' Results	H	NA	95.0%	↑	99.9%								

<sup>1</sup> YTD Based on a rolling 12 months.

GREEN (ENERGY)	Customer Operations												
	L/H	Sept 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	Cust Ops	Cust Cost	Dist Ops	Billing & Rev Ops	Com Rel & CSC	LCS & AD	UM	RPA	VP & Support
Web Transactions (%)	H	1.4%	3.0%	↑	19.5%	19.5%							
Paperless Billing (%)	H	NA	2.5%	↓	1.0%			1.0%					
Solar Loan Program Applications (MW)	H	NA	19.0	↓	9.45								
Cost Per Tier 1 Audit (Whole House Efficiency Sub-Prog)	L	NA	\$184	↔	\$221								
Carbon Abatement Committed Contracts for Warehouses and Hospitals (\$M)	H	NA	\$12.0	↔	\$7.85								
Fleet MPG	L	8.89	8.90	↑	9.01								
Non-Hazardous Waste	H	70.2%	69.5%	↑	73.1%								

Expected to meet or exceed goal ↑ Achievement of goal not yet assured ↔ Not expected to meet goal ↓ Reports under development

Month of September

PEOPLE (providing)	Customer Operations												
	L/H	September 08	2009 Target	Monthly / Quarterly Status	Cust Ops	Cust Cost	Dist Ops	Billing & Rev Ops	Com Rel & CSC	LCS & AD	UM	RPA	VP & Support
OSHA Recordable Incidence Rate	L	0.76	1.15	+	0.73	0.00	2.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OSHA Days Away Rate (Severity)	L	0.00	1.61	-	30.86	0.00	0.00	90.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Motor Vehicle Accident Rate	L	11.99	3.21	-	4.88	0.00	6.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0
Availability - Illness	H	96.3%	97.3%	-	96.0%	94.1%	98.4%	95.9%	93.1%	97.4%	96.5%	100.0%	97.9%
Staffing Levels - Permanent	L	1701	1485	-	1522	461	532	203	193	52	31	11	39
Overtime	L	7.0%	2.6%	-	11.2%	21.7%	4.1%	15.3%	5.7%	0.3%	2.1%	0.0%	1.9%
Employee Technical Training - BU	H	102%	83%	+	102%								
Employee Development - MAST	H	14.1%	60.0%	+	72.8%	69.7%	91.7%	62.4%	62.4%	73.9%	85.0%	82.3%	62.8%
Corporate Culture for Ethics and Compliance	H	Annually	Annually		Annually								

SAFE (reliable)	Customer Operations												
	L/H	September 08	2009 Target	Monthly / Quarterly Status	Cust Ops	Cust Cost	Dist Ops	Billing & Rev Ops	Com Rel & CSC	LCS & AD	UM	RPA	VP & Support
Percent of Actual Meters Read	H	89.9%	90.1%	-	89.3%			89.3%					
Meters Not Read >7 Months (K)	L	64.3	55.2										
MR Errors/10,000 Reads	L	4.3	3.9										
Gen'l Inquiry Service Level (30 sec.)	H	75.1%	51.0%	+	55.3%	55.3%							
Abandonment Rate - Inbound Collections	L	11.7%	10.9%	-	21.4%	21.4%							
First Contact Resolution	H	87.9%	Tracking										
Accounts Converted to Bills and Printed (%)	H	98.7%	98.8%										
Billing Exception Time	L	3.2	3.6										
Payments Deposited within 1 Bus Day (%)	H	94.5%	96.5%	+	100.0%			100.0%					
Participation in Auto-Pay	H	115,028	125,345	-	112,015						112,015		
Cashier Errors	L	0.0	3.7										
BPU Inquiry Rate-Collection	L	1.30	1.25	+	1.12								
BPU Inquiries - Non-Collection	L	71	77	-	205	45	25	133	2				
Perception Survey (Res/Sm Business)	H	76	76	-	74								
Perception Survey (Large Business)	H	74	77	o	77								
Moment of Truth Survey	H	8.6	8.7	-	8.0	7.9			8.4				
New Business Construction Survey-CO	H	8.0	8.4	-	7.7	7.7							
Client Value Assessment	H	Semi-Annual	8.4		SemiAnnual								
Constituent Satisfaction Index	H	Semi-Annual	7.2		SemiAnnual								
SOX Test Failure	L	0	0	-	2				2				

ECONOMIC	Customer Operations												
	L/H	September 08	2009 Target	Monthly / Quarterly Status	Cust Ops	Cust Cost	Dist Ops	Billing & Rev Ops	Com Rel & CSC	LCS & AD	UM	RPA	VP & Support
CapEx (\$M)	L	\$0.8	\$1.0	+	\$0.1								\$0.1
iPower CapEx (\$M)	L	-\$3.7	\$0.0	-	\$4.0								\$4.0
Accountability O&M (\$M)	L	\$13.9	\$15.8	+	\$14.0	\$2.7	\$3.0	\$2.5	\$1.4	\$0.3	\$0.8	\$0.1	\$3.2
Net Write-Off (\$) /\$100 billed	L	\$0.67	\$0.82	+	\$0.82								
Days Sales Outstanding	L	34.7	34.5	-	41.2								
Aged Receivables >90 Days (%) <sup>1</sup>	L	14.6%	14.5%	-	22.1%								
Notice Dollars Collected on RNP (%)	H	71.1%	70.1%										
Dollars Treated by Field Collections	H	\$20.5	\$21.5										
Unbilled Revenue Recovery (\$M)	H	\$2.7	\$2.6										
Delinquent Accounts Covered By Deposit	H	23.0%	23.0%	-	19.4%			19.4%					
LCS Outdoor Lighting Sales (\$M)	H	\$0.3	\$0.3	-	\$0.2				\$0.2				
Contract Revenue (\$M)	H	\$6.8	\$7.0	+	\$7.5					\$7.5			
AWH Revenue (\$M)	H	\$1.3	\$1.2	-	\$1.1					\$1.1			
HVAC Revenue (\$M)	H	\$1.7	\$2.6	-	\$2.0					\$2.0			
Payment Assistance-# Of Accounts	H	244,695	237,260	+	283,028				283,028				

**ELECTRIC DELIVERY**  
2009 Balanced Scorecard

**SEPTEMBER YTD**

PEOPLE PROVIDING	ELECTRIC DELIVERY												
	L/H	Sep 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	Electric Delivery	Central	Metro	Pal	South	TC&M	UOS	DPCG	VP & Other
OSHA Recordable Incidence Rate	L	1.65	1.39	↓	1.71	2.98	1.82	1.33	2.69	0.00	1.04	0.00	0.00
OSHA Days Away Rate (Severity)	L	12.75	6.96	↓	18.79	59.42	35.04	0.00	12.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Motor Vehicle Accident Rate	L	6.53	3.88	↓	6.71	6.29	9.64	14.01	4.75	2.71	5.62	2.00	3.83
Availability - Illness	H	96.7%	97.3%	↓	96.7%	96.6%	96.6%	96.8%	95.8%	97.3%	96.7%	98.0%	97.5%
Overtime	L	23.4%	15.4%	↓	19.7%	19.4%	28.9%	27.2%	21.3%	32.2%	6.2%	17.2%	3.7%
Staffing Levels - Permanent	L	2,647	2,702	↑	2,725	508	465	446	444	69	399	207	187
Corporate Culture for Ethics and Compliance	H	Annual	72.0%	↑									
Employee Development - MAST	H	25.2%	95.0%	↑	69.0%	67.9%	77.1%	65.7%	68.4%	60.6%	67.8%	64.9%	71.5%
Employee Technical Training - BU	H	52.9%	100.0%	↑	83.0%	65.7%	76.2%	72.1%	90.4%	155.2%	77.6%	165.8%	
Hours To Work	L		NT	↑	2.3%	2.1%	1.9%	6.0%	5.6%	3.8%			

SAFE, RELIABLE	ELECTRIC DELIVERY											
	L/H	Sep 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	Electric Delivery	Central	Metro	Pal	South	TC&M	UOS	DPCG
SAIFI	L	0.55	0.72	↑	0.53	0.48	0.45	0.54	0.67			
MAIFI	L	1.04	1.25	↑	0.94	0.78	0.68	1.08	1.23	0.04		
CAIDI	L	64.1	66.5	↑	64.2	65.6	64.2	59.1	67.7			
CEMI	L	1.2%	2.3%	↑	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	0.6%	1.4%			
Forced Automatic Outage Rate (Trans)	L	0.0408	0.0541	↑	0.0265					0.0265		
Police & Fire Response Rate	L	53.0%	53.3%	↑	57.8%	62.1%	49.3%	53.7%	60.9%			
Mean Time to Service	H	38.1	39.6	↑	42.2						42.2	
Perception Survey (Res/Sm Business)	H	75	76	↓	74							
% STLT Trouble Orders ≤ 4 Days	H	84%	84%	↑	86%	84%	87%	90%	83%			
Moment of Truth Survey	H	8.8	9.0	↓	8.8	8.6	8.9	8.6	8.8			8.0
New Business Construction Survey	H	8.4	8.5	↓	8.2	8.1	8.0	8.4	8.1			
Number of Regulatory Inquiries	L	245	219	↑	114	48	33	20	11	2		0

ECONOMIC	ELECTRIC DELIVERY												
	L/H	Sep 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	Electric Delivery	Central	Metro	Pal	South	TC&M	UOS	DPCG	VP & Other
Total CapEx (\$M)	L	371.1	588.2	↑	435.6	44.7	58.5	54.9	49.2	6.3	11.4	194.5	15.8
Accountability O&M (\$M)	L	228.9	336.1	↑	238.1	22.3	24.7	18.5	26.6	5.5	20.3	1.2	119.0
Transmission Plant Additions and CWIP (\$M)	H		263.0	↑	197.8							197.8	
Total Average Inventory (\$M)	L	61.0	64.0	↓	66.3	7.3	9.1	6.6	6.6	3.4	66.3	0.5	
Capital Projects' Results	H	72.3%	86.8%	↓	47.1%							97.0%	0.0%
Current Capital Performance	H		1.00	↑	1.07							1.07	

GREEN ENERGY	ELECTRIC DELIVERY												
	L/H	Sep 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	Electric Delivery	Central	Metro	Pal	South	TC&M	UOS	DPCG	VP & Other
Fleet MPG	H	8.9	8.9	↑	9.0						9.0		
Non-Hazardous Waste	H	89.7%	93.8%	↑	96.8%	93.4%	95.2%	94.3%	93.9%	99.6%	73.4%		23.4%

LEGEND: Expected to meet or exceed goal ↑ Achievement of goal not yet assured ↔ Not expected to meet goal ↓

**Month of SEPTEMBER**

PEOPLE PROVIDING	ELECTRIC DELIVERY												
	L/H	Sep-08	2009 Plan	Monthly Status	Electric Delivery	Central	Metro	Pal	South	TC&M	UOS	DPCG	VP & Other
OSHA Recordable Incidence Rate	L	1.15	1.39	-	2.02	2.43	4.63	0.00	2.17	0.00	3.15	0.00	0.00
OSHA Days Away Rate (Severity)	L	11.54	6.96	-	23.02	65.60	0.00	0.00	64.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Motor Vehicle Accident Rate	L	7.55	3.91	-	8.61	9.83	21.96	4.26	5.27	10.12	0.00	5.15	10.89
Availability - Illness	H	97.0%	97.3%	o	97.3%	97.3%	97.7%	96.3%	96.9%	96.9%	97.0%	99.6%	98.5%
Overtime	L	29.1%	15.4%	-	20.0%	18.9%	28.0%	28.4%	22.0%	32.9%	5.8%	21.1%	3.0%
Staffing Levels - Permanent	L	2,647	2,702	-	2,725	508	465	446	444	69	399	207	187
Corporate Culture for Ethics and Compliance	H		72.0%	o									
Employee Development - MAST	H	11.0%	23.8%	-	69.0%	67.9%	77.1%	65.7%	68.4%	60.6%	67.8%	64.9%	71.5%
Employee Technical Training - BU	H	1.6%	33.3%	+	31.2%	65.5%	70.8%	4.5%	5.9%	0.0%	1.1%	28.4%	
Hours To Work	L												

SAFE, RELIABLE	ELECTRIC DELIVERY											
	L/H	Sep-08	2009 Plan	Monthly Status	Electric Delivery	Central	Metro	Pal	South	TC&M	UOS	DPCG
SAIFI	L	0.08	0.05	o	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.06	0.11			
MAIFI	L	0.13	0.11	-	0.09	0.09	0.03	0.10	0.14	0.04		
CAIDI	L	65.6	68.2	+	75.3	82.7	54.7	62.2	85.4			
CEMI	L											
Forced Automatic Outage Rate (Trans)	L	0.0272	0.0135	-	0.0000					0.0000		
Police & Fire Response Rate	L	54.0%	53.3%	+	64.5%	58.7%	84.4%	69.2%	52.4%			
Mean Time to Service	H	38.8	39.6	+	40.4						40.4	
Perception Survey (Res/Sm Business)	H	75	76	-	74							
% STLT Trouble Orders ≤ 4 Days	H	83%	84%	+	81%	74%	80%	92%	74%			
Moment of Truth Survey	H	8.7	9.0	-	8.7	8.5	8.9	8.8	8.3			8.1
New Business Construction Survey	H	8.5	8.5	-	8.3	7.9	8.0	8.6	8.6			
Number of Regulatory Inquiries	L	20	15	+	12	4	2	4	2	0		0

ECONOMIC	ELECTRIC DELIVERY												
	L/H	Sep-08	2009 Plan	Monthly Status	Electric Delivery	Central	Metro	Pal	South	TC&M	UOS	DPCG	VP & Other
Total CapEx (\$M)	L	52.3	46.4	+	51.6	5.5	6.2	6.2	7.0	1.4	0.8	21.8	2.8
Accountability O&M (\$M)	L	21.6	27.9	+	26.2	2.3	2.9	1.9	2.2	0.6	2.1	0.1	14.2
Transmission Plant Additions and CWIP (\$M)	H		6.8	+	14.0							14.0	
Total Average Inventory (\$M)	L	64.6	64.0	-	70.1	7.8	9.8	7.1	6.3	3.6	70.1	0.5	
Capital Projects' Results	H												
Current Capital Performance	H		1.00	+	1.07							1.07	

GREEN ENERGY	ELECTRIC DELIVERY												
	L/H	Sep-08	2009 Plan	Monthly Status	Electric Delivery	Central	Metro	Pal	South	TC&M	UOS	DPCG	VP & Other
Fleet MPG	H		8.9	-	10.2						10.2		
Non-Hazardous Waste	H	79.6%	93.8%	-	97.0%	93.1%	96.8%	95.6%	97.3%	99.4%	80.4%		29.0%

LEGEND: Monthly Status: + = Better than Plan, o = On Plan, - = Worse than Plan

## Gas Delivery 2009 Balanced Scorecard

### September YTD

PEOPLE (providing)	Gas Delivery									
	L/H	Sept 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	Gas Delivery	Northern	Central	Southern	GSOC M&R	VP & Support
OSHA Recordable Incidence Rate	L	2.98	2.09	↔	1.87	1.81	3.14	1.40	0.00	0.00
OSHA Days Away Rate (Severity)	L	6.88	9.36	↔	14.73	18.86	15.70	13.12	0.00	0.00
Motor Vehicle Accident Rate	L	3.51	2.98	↓	4.00	2.66	6.16	3.74	3.63	5.15
Staffing Levels - Permanent	L	1,993	2,097	↑	2,055	667	490	751	69	78
Availability - Illness	H	97.2%	97.3%	↔	96.8%	97.0%	96.4%	96.9%	95.7%	98.6%
Overtime	L	17.3%	12.27%	↔	13.37%	12.92%	17.65%	13.16%	3.12%	2.59%
Corporate Culture for Ethics and Compliance	H	N/A	68%	↑	N/A					
Employee Development - MAST	H	33.0%	95.0%	↑	72.6%	70.7%	75.8%	77.0%	58.4%	75.9%
Employee Technical Training - BU	H	60.4%	100.0%	↑	65.5%					

SAFE and RELIABLE	Gas Delivery									
	L/H	Sept 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	Gas Delivery	Northern	Central	Southern	GSOC M&R	VP & Support
Gas Leak Reports Per Mile	L	0.186	0.222	↑	0.155	0.202	0.198	0.105		
Leak Response Rate	H	99.9%	99.9%	↑	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	99.8%		
Appointment Kept	H	95.3%	95.1%		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
BPU Inquiries - Non-Collection	L	72	141	↓	139	41	55	41		
Perception Survey (Res/Sm Business)	H	74	76	↔	74	73	75	75		
Moment of Truth Survey	H	9.3	9.3	↔	9.1	9.1	8.9	9.3		
Damages Per 1,000 Locate Requests	L	1.86	1.97	↑	1.46	1.38	2.04	1.35		
Gas Damages Per 1,000 Locate Requests	L	2.83	2.96	↑	2.21	2.10	2.75	2.08		
Elect. Damages Per 1,000 Locate Requests	L	0.84	0.93	↑	0.66					
Workhrs/Unit Tariff	L	0.51	0.51		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Workhrs/Unit Comp. Services	L	0.43	0.43		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Open Leaks	L	2,599	2,400	↑	2,222	1,227	396	599		
Open Class 2 Leaks	L	1,315	1,300	↑	1,108	573	178	357		
New Business Construction Survey	H	8.6	8.7	↑	8.6	8.5	8.6	8.7		
% Regulatory Compliance	H	99.5%	100.0%	↑	80.6%	63.3%	74.9%	90.4%	100.0%	

ECONOMIC	Gas Delivery									
	L/H	Sept 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	Gas Delivery	Northern	Central	Southern	GSOC M&R	VP & Support
Total CapEx (\$M)	L	\$162.9	\$257.2	↑	\$154.7	\$54.7	\$39.5	\$56.6	\$2.8	\$1.1
Capital Projects' Results	H	11.8%	82.4%	↔	64.6%					
Accountability O&M (\$M)	L	\$158.0	\$236.6	↔	\$175.3	\$48.1	\$34.9	\$55.1	\$8.0	\$9.7
Gross Margin Competitive Serv. (\$M)	H	\$43.1	\$61.7	↔	\$39.9	\$13.7	\$6.7	\$18.2		
Fully Loaded \$/Unit - New Main	L	\$47.89	\$49.58	↔	\$53.25	\$68.93	\$80.13	\$43.73		
Fully Loaded \$/Service - New Service	L	\$3,511	\$4,606	↔	\$5,649	\$5,993	\$6,894	\$4,948		
Fully Loaded \$/Unit - Repl. Main	L	\$129.40	\$161.41	↑	\$139.10	\$126.44	\$170.80	\$140.15		
Fully Loaded \$/Service - Repl. Service	L	\$4,034	\$4,759	↔	\$5,257	\$4,885	\$6,470	\$4,880		

GREEN (ENERGY)	Gas Delivery									
	L/H	Sept 08 YTD	2009 Target	YE Forecast	Gas Delivery	Northern	Central	Southern	GSOC M&R	VP & Support
Fleet MPG	H	8.9	8.9	↑	9.0					
Non-Hazardous Waste	H	99.2%	99.1%	↑	99.0%	99.2%	99.6%	98.9%	52.3%	98.7%

Expected to meet or exceed goal ↑ Achievement of goal not yet assured ↔ Not expected to meet goal ↓

### Month of September

PEOPLE (providing)	Gas Delivery									
	L/H	Sept 08	2009 Target	Monthly Status	Gas Delivery	Northern	Central	Southern	GSOC M&R	VP & Support
OSHA Recordable Incidence Rate	L	1.66	2.09	+	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OSHA Days Away Rate (Severity)	L	0.00	9.36	-	29.58	41.34	0.00	44.43	0.00	0.00
Motor Vehicle Accident Rate	L	2.93	2.98	-	3.86	3.76	6.43	2.78	0.00	0.00
Staffing Levels - Permanent	L	1,993	2,097	+	2,055	667	490	751	69	78
Availability - Illness	H	97.4%	97.3%	-	97.2%	97.2%	97.4%	97.2%	93.8%	98.8%
Overtime	L	17.5%	10.08%	-	17.17%	17.83%	22.01%	16.27%	2.49%	2.62%

SAFE and RELIABLE	Gas Delivery									
	L/H	Sept 08	2009 Target	Monthly Status	Gas Delivery	Northern	Central	Southern	GSOC M&R	VP & Support
Gas Leak Reports Per Mile	L	0.020	0.222	+	0.028	0.041	0.034	0.017		
Leak Response Rate	H	99.9%	99.9%	-	99.7%	99.9%	99.5%	99.6%		
Appointment Kept	H	95.5%	95.1%	+	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
BPU Inquiries - Non-Collection	L	8	141	+	13	3	5	5		
Perception Survey (Res/Sm Business)	H	74	76	-	74					
Moment of Truth Survey	H	9.4	9.3	-	9.2					
Damages Per 1,000 Locate Requests	L	1.75	1.97	-	2.09	2.04	2.58	1.99		
Gas Damages Per 1,000 Locate Requests	L	2.60	2.96	-	3.20	3.07	3.84	3.05		
Elect. Damages Per 1,000 Locate Requests	L	0.85	0.93	+	0.91					
Workhrs/Unit Tariff	L	0.53	0.51	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Workhrs/Unit Comp. Services	L	0.43	0.43	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Open Leaks	L	2,599	2,400	+	2,222	1,227	396	599		
Open Class 2 Leaks	L	1,315	1,300	+	1,108	573	178	357		
New Business Construction Survey	H	8.6	8.7	-	8.6	8.1	8.8	8.7		

ECONOMIC	Gas Delivery									
	L/H	Sept 08	2009 Target	Monthly Status	Gas Delivery	Northern	Central	Southern	GSOC M&R	VP & Support
Total CapEx (\$M)	L	\$22.3	\$28.7	+	\$23.8	\$8.9	\$5.4	\$8.5	\$0.8	\$0.1
Capital Projects' Results	H	11.8%	82.4%							
Accountability O&M (\$M)	L	\$16.3	\$18.5	+	\$17.9	\$4.8	\$3.7	\$5.6	\$0.7	\$0.5
Gross Margin Competitive Serv. (\$M)	H	\$4.7	\$5.1	+	\$5.2	\$1.8	\$1.0	\$2.3		
Fully Loaded \$/Unit - New Main	L	\$33.98	\$49.70	+	\$45.00	\$25.94	\$315.17	\$39.26		
Fully Loaded \$/Service - New Service	L	\$3,609	\$4,612	+	\$4,015	\$4,283	\$5,238	\$3,454		
Fully Loaded \$/Unit - Repl. Main	L	\$140.58	\$161.41	+	\$107.42	\$136.61	\$78.42	\$98.46		
Fully Loaded \$/Service - Repl. Service	L	\$3,920	\$4,759	+	\$3,276	\$3,034	\$3,919	\$3,200		

GREEN (ENERGY)	Gas Delivery									
	L/H	Sept 08	2009 Target	Monthly Status	Gas Delivery	Northern	Central	Southern	GSOC M&R	VP & Support
Fleet MPG	H	9.2	8.9	+	10.2					
Non-Hazardous Waste	H	99.4%	99.1%	+	99.5%	99.2%	99.7%	99.6%	91.1%	0.0%

LEGEND: Monthly Status: + = Better than Plan, o = On Plan, - = Worse than Plan

District	Root Causes	2009						2008						Variance	
		SEP 2009 Total	2009 YTD	SEP 2009 Root Cause %	2009 YTD Root Cause %	SEP 2009 On Time %	2009 YTD On Time %	SEP 2008 Total	2008 YTD	SEP 2008 Root Cause %	2008 YTD Root Cause %	SEP 2008 On Time %	2008 YTD On Time %	SEP 2009 to SEP 2008	YTD 2009 to 2008
<b>METER READING</b>															
HARMON COVE	Answer Time Too Long	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Customer Read Not Entered	0	1	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Discourteous Employee	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Estimated Reading	2	31	100.0%	63.3%	50.0%	77.4%	1	24	100.0%	80.0%	100.0%	95.8%	1	7
	High Bill Complaint	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	I-Power Migration	0	13	0.0%	26.5%	0.0%	92.3%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	13
	Meter Read Late	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	100.0%	0	-1
	Mis-Read Index	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	100.0%	0	-1
	Special Appointment Request	0	4	0.0%	8.2%	0.0%	100.0%	0	3	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>83.7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>93.3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>	
NEW BRUNSWICK	Answer Time Too Long	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Customer Read Not Entered	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0	-1
	Discourteous Employee	0	1	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1
	Estimated Reading	1	6	100.0%	42.9%	0.0%	66.7%	0	3	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%	100.0%	1	3
	High Bill Complaint	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	I-Power Migration	0	5	0.0%	35.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	5
	Meter Read Late	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Mis-Read Index	0	2	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	50.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	2
	Special Appointment Request	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>78.6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	
NEWARK	Answer Time Too Long	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0	-1
	Customer Read Not Entered	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Discourteous Employee	0	1	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1
	Estimated Reading	7	31	100.0%	64.6%	85.7%	87.1%	2	36	66.7%	87.8%	100.0%	88.9%	5	-5
	High Bill Complaint	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0	-1
	I-Power Migration	0	10	0.0%	20.8%	0.0%	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	10
	Meter Read Late	0	1	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	100.0%	1	1	33.3%	2.4%	100.0%	100.0%	-1	0
	Mis-Read Index	0	2	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1
	Special Appointment Request	0	3	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>90.2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	
PARAMUS/ GARRET MOUNTAIN	Answer Time Too Long	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Customer Read Not Entered	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Discourteous Employee	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Estimated Reading	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	High Bill Complaint	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	I-Power Migration	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Meter Read Late	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Mis-Read Index	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Special Appointment Request	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
TRENTON	Customer Read Not Entered	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Discourteous Employee	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Estimated Reading	2	11	100.0%	57.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0	3	0.0%	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2	8
	High Bill Complaint	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	I-Power Migration	0	4	0.0%	21.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	4
	Meter Read Late	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	-1
	Mis-Read Index	0	2	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1	1	100.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-1	1
	Special Appointment Request	0	2	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	2
	Answer Time Too Long	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>380.0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	
ROSELAND	Answer Time Too Long	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Customer Read Not Entered	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Discourteous Employee	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Estimated Reading	1	35	50.0%	81.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3	31	100.0%	93.9%	0.0%	0.0%	-2	4
	High Bill Complaint	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	-1
	I-Power Migration	0	6	0.0%	14.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	6
	Meter Read Late	1	1	50.0%	2.3%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	100.0%	1	0
	Mis-Read Index	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Special Appointment Request	0	1	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>32.6%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>15.2%</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>10</b>	

### Customer Contact BPU Inquiry Report - September 2009

District	Root Causes	2009						2008						Variance	
		SEP 2009 Total	2009 YTD	SEP 2009 Root Cause %	2009 YTD Root Cause %	SEP 2009 On Time %	2009 YTD On Time %	SEP 2008 Total	2008 YTD	SEP 2008 Root Cause %	2008 YTD Root Cause %	SEP 2008 On Time %	2008 YTD On Time %	SEP 2009 to SEP 2008	YTD 2009 to 2008
<b>INQUIRY</b>															
NICC	Answer Time Too Long	7	129	17.1%	34.7%	71.4%	89.1%	0	6	0.0%	7.3%	0.0%	100.0%	7	123
	Discourteous Employee	2	9	4.9%	2.4%	50.0%	77.8%	0	5	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	100.0%	2	4
	Employee Error	2	26	4.9%	7.0%	100.0%	73.1%	4	20	57.1%	24.4%	100.0%	100.0%	-2	6
	First Call Not Handled	11	116	26.8%	31.2%	72.7%	82.8%	3	50	42.9%	61.0%	100.0%	96.0%	8	66
	I-Power Migration	19	85	46.3%	22.8%	63.2%	88.2%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19	85
	Supervisor Did Not Call Back	0	4	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	75.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	4
	VRU Issue	0	3	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	100.0%	0	2
	<b>Total</b>		<b>41</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>68.3%</b>	<b>85.5%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>93.9%</b>	<b>34</b>
SIAC	Answer Time Too Long	0	15	0.0%	30.6%	0.0%	93.3%	0	1	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	100.0%	0	14
	Discourteous Employee	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	100.0%	0	-1
	Employee Error	0	3	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	100.0%	1	4	50.0%	23.5%	100.0%	100.0%	-1	-1
	First Call Not Handled	1	24	50.0%	49.0%	100.0%	75.0%	1	10	50.0%	58.8%	100.0%	100.0%	0	14
	I-Power Migration	1	7	50.0%	14.3%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1	7
	Supervisor Did Not Call Back	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	100.0%	0	-1
VRU Issue	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32</b>
TOTAL INQUIRY	Answer Time Too Long	7	144	16.3%	34.2%	71.4%	89.6%	0	7	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	100.0%	7	137
	Discourteous Employee	2	9	4.7%	2.1%	50.0%	77.8%	0	6	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	100.0%	2	3
	Employee Error	2	29	4.7%	6.9%	100.0%	75.9%	5	24	55.6%	24.2%	100.0%	87.5%	-3	5
	First Call Not Handled	12	140	27.9%	33.3%	75.0%	81.4%	4	60	44.4%	60.6%	100.0%	96.7%	8	80
	I-Power Migration	20	92	46.5%	21.9%	65.0%	89.1%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20	92
	Supervisor Did Not Call Back	0	4	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	75.0%	0	1	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0	3
	VRU Issue	0	3	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>69.8%</b>	<b>85.5%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>94.9%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>322</b>
CONSTRUCTION INQUIRY	Answer Time Too Long	0	1	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1
	Customer Responsibility - Beyond	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Discourteous Employee	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	First Call Not Handled	0	4	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	100.0%	0	3
	Inaccurate Order Information	0	1	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	100.0%	0	0
	Issued Wrong Order - Electric	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Issued Wrong Order - Gas	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	I-Power Migration	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Policy Not Followed	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Scheduling Delay - Electric	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2	3	66.7%	37.5%	100.0%	100.0%	-2	-3
	Scheduling Delay - Gas	2	4	100.0%	40.0%	100.0%	100.0%	1	1	33.3%	12.5%	100.0%	100.0%	1	3
	Task Not Completed - Electric	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0
	Task Not Completed - Gas	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	2	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0	-2
<b>Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>2</b>
COLLECTIONS (CCC)	Answer Time Too Long	3	40	0.8%	1.1%	0.0%	87.5%	0	5	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	100.0%	3	35
	Denied Request For Service	6	69	1.5%	1.9%	50.0%	85.5%	18	112	4.3%	3.5%	94.4%	95.5%	-12	-43
	Denied Request to Remove Dep.	10	136	2.5%	3.7%	70.0%	87.5%	16	120	3.8%	3.8%	100.0%	95.8%	-6	16
	Discourteous Employee	0	4	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	100.0%	1	6	0.2%	0.2%	100.0%	100.0%	-1	-2
	Diversion of Service	1	7	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	71.4%	1	9	0.2%	0.3%	100.0%	77.8%	0	-2
	DPA Not Granted	1	13	0.3%	0.4%	100.0%	84.6%	1	7	0.2%	0.2%	100.0%	100.0%	0	6
	Employee Error	0	9	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	77.8%	1	4	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	50.0%	-1	5
	Final Bills	17	142	4.3%	3.9%	70.6%	76.8%	20	150	4.8%	4.8%	80.0%	91.3%	-3	-8
	I-Power Migration	5	24	1.3%	0.7%	40.0%	70.8%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5	24
	Misapplied Payments	2	31	0.5%	0.8%	50.0%	83.9%	1	18	0.2%	0.6%	0.0%	77.8%	1	13
	Received Notice/Reminder	98	1352	24.9%	36.8%	85.7%	91.0%	142	883	33.7%	28.0%	96.5%	98.1%	-44	469
	Shut Off - Non Payment (SONP)	112	1011	28.4%	27.6%	92.0%	96.9%	176	1187	41.8%	37.6%	98.9%	99.2%	-64	-176
	Shut off Concern	136	817	34.5%	22.3%	84.6%	87.0%	43	651	10.2%	20.6%	100.0%	97.1%	93	166
	Shut off in Error	3	12	0.8%	0.3%	66.7%	75.0%	1	3	0.2%	0.1%	100.0%	100.0%	2	9
	Supervisor Did Not Call Back	0	2	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	50.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>394</b>	<b>3669</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>83.8%</b>	<b>90.6%</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>3155</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>96.7%</b>	<b>97.6%</b>	<b>-27</b>	<b>514</b>
<b>TOTAL CUSTOMER CONTACT</b>		<b>439</b>	<b>4100</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>82.5%</b>	<b>90.1%</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>3262</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>96.8%</b>	<b>97.5%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>838</b>

### Revenue Cycle Services BPU Inquiry Report - September 2009

District	Root Causes	2009						2008						Variance			
		SEP 2009 Total	2009 YTD	SEP 2009 Root Cause %	2009 YTD Root Cause %	SEP 2009 On Time %	2009 YTD On Time%	SEP 2008 Total	2008 YTD	SEP 2008 Root Cause %	2008 YTD Root Cause %	SEP 2008 On Time %	2008 YTD On Time%	SEP 2009 to SEP 2008	YTD 2009 to 2008	Goal	Goal Variance
<b>BILLING</b>																	
NORTHERN BILLING	Bill Format	0	14	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	57.1%	0	3	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0	11		
	Dispute Rate Classification	1	4	0.8%	0.5%	100.0%	100.0%	1	8	3.4%	2.9%	100.0%	87.5%	0	-4		
	EPP Dispute	1	21	0.8%	2.7%	100.0%	81.0%	3	12	10.3%	4.3%	100.0%	100.0%	-2	9		
	Final Bills	3	15	2.4%	1.9%	100.0%	80.0%	1	7	3.4%	2.5%	0.0%	57.1%	2	8		
	High Bill Complaint	70	449	56.9%	57.4%	65.7%	77.3%	16	184	55.2%	66.4%	87.5%	91.3%	54	265		
	Inaccurate Bill	18	77	14.6%	9.8%	44.4%	59.7%	5	33	17.2%	11.9%	80.0%	81.8%	13	44		
	I-Power Migration	19	109	15.4%	13.9%	57.9%	67.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19	109		
	Meter Test Request	2	35	1.6%	4.5%	100.0%	97.1%	2	24	6.9%	8.7%	100.0%	100.0%	0	11		
	No Bill Received	7	47	5.7%	6.0%	42.9%	66.0%	0	2	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	50.0%	7	45		
	Request for a Refund	2	11	1.6%	1.4%	50.0%	81.8%	1	4	3.4%	1.4%	100.0%	100.0%	1	7		
<b>Total</b>		<b>123</b>	<b>782</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>61.8%</b>	<b>74.3%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>86.2%</b>	<b>90.3%</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>505</b>		
SOUTHERN BILLING	Bill Format	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0	-1		
	Dispute Rate Classification	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	2	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	100.0%	0	-2		
	EPP Dispute	1	1	20.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0	2	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	50.0%	1	-1		
	Final Bills	0	1	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0		
	High Bill Complaint	3	34	60.0%	64.2%	0.0%	79.4%	2	25	50.0%	59.5%	100.0%	88.0%	1	9		
	I-Power Migration	1	10	20.0%	18.9%	0.0%	60.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1	10		
	Inaccurate Bill	0	3	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%	100.0%	2	6	50.0%	14.3%	100.0%	83.3%	-2	-3		
	Meter Test Request	0	1	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0	0		
	No Bill Received	0	1	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1		
	Request for a Refund	0	2	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	100.0%	0	4	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	75.0%	0	-2		
<b>Total</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>77.4%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>		
TOTAL BILLING	Bill Format	0	14	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	57.1%	0	4	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	100.0%	0	10		
	Dispute Rate Classification	1	4	0.8%	0.5%	100.0%	100.0%	1	10	3.0%	3.1%	100.0%	90.0%	0	-6		
	EPP Dispute	2	22	1.6%	2.6%	50.0%	77.3%	3	14	9.1%	4.4%	100.0%	92.9%	-1	8		
	Final Bills	3	16	2.3%	1.9%	100.0%	81.3%	1	8	3.0%	2.5%	0.0%	50.0%	2	8		
	High Bill Complaint	73	483	57.0%	57.8%	63.0%	77.4%	18	209	54.5%	65.5%	88.9%	90.9%	55	274		
	I-Power Migration	19	87	14.8%	10.4%	42.1%	59.8%	5	33	15.2%	10.3%	80.0%	81.8%	14	54		
	Inaccurate Bill	19	112	14.8%	13.4%	57.9%	67.9%	2	6	6.1%	1.9%	100.0%	83.3%	17	106		
	Meter Test Request	2	36	1.6%	4.3%	100.0%	97.2%	2	25	6.1%	7.8%	100.0%	100.0%	0	11		
	No Bill Received	7	48	5.5%	5.7%	42.9%	66.7%	0	2	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	50.0%	7	46		
	Request for a Refund	2	13	1.6%	1.6%	50.0%	84.6%	1	8	3.0%	2.5%	100.0%	87.5%	1	5		
<b>Total</b>		<b>128</b>	<b>835</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>59.4%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>87.9%</b>	<b>89.3%</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>516</b>		

CPPC	Incorrect Amount Applied	0	6	0.00%	9.84%	0.0%	83.3%	0	2	0.00%	28.57%	0.0%	50.0%	0	4		
	I-Power Migration	2	41	66.67%	67.21%	0.0%	70.7%	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	2	41		
	Payment Misapplied	1	9	33.33%	14.75%	0.0%	88.9%	0	3	0.00%	42.86%	0.0%	100.0%	1	6		
	Payment Not Processed	0	4	0.00%	6.56%	0.0%	75.0%	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0	4		
	Payment Option Not Available	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1	0.00%	14.29%	0.0%	100.0%	0	-1		
	Payment Process Delay	0	1	0.00%	1.64%	0.0%	0.0%	0	1	0.00%	14.29%	0.0%	100.0%	0	0		
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>73.8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>54</b>		

REVENUE INTERGITY	Discourteous Employee	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0		
	Disputes Bill Amount	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0		
	I-Power Migration	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0		
	Non Registering Meter	0	1	0.00%	33.33%	0.0%	100.0%	0	1	0.00%	50.00%	0.0%	100.0%	0	0		
	Rerouted	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0		
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>		

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
SHUT-OFF NOTICE FOR NONPAYMENT

QUESTION:

Please list all the billing events that cause PSE&G to send a notice of discontinuance for nonpayment. Please be specific in defining what is considered an "outstanding bill". For example, when does a bill for which the customer has made a partial payment trigger a notice of discontinuance?

ANSWER:

**All Customer Classes**

A bill is considered outstanding if it is unpaid when the next bill is invoiced. For example, a customer's bill is invoiced on May 1 and not paid by the time they are invoiced on June 1, now totaling two month's of usage. The bill invoiced on May 1 is now outstanding.

Partial payments do not affect discontinuance notices.

Past due bill reminders and discontinuance notices are generated when a customer's internal PSE&G Credit Worthiness Score reaches a designated level. Credit Worthiness Scores, in the form of "points", accumulate under certain conditions such as unpaid bills, returned items and broken installment plans.

**Residential**

Reminders are sent to residential customers with delinquent amounts between \$30 and \$60 and internal PSE&G Credit Worthiness Scores greater than or equal to 0.

Additional reminders are sent when the delinquent amount exceeds \$60 and internal PSE&G Credit Worthiness Scores between 0 and 109.

Discontinuance Notices are sent to residential customers with delinquent amounts greater than \$60 and internal PSE&G Credit Worthiness Scores greater than 109.

**Industrial and Commercial**

Discontinuance Notices are sent to customers with delinquent amounts greater than \$60.

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-CI-59  
WITNESS(S):  
PAGE 1 OF 1  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
INCREASE OF SHUT-OFF NOTICES

QUESTION:

Please reference PSE&G's response to RCR-CI-9, and explain all the reasons why shut-off notices have increased significantly each month in 2009. Please provide documentation for your response.

ANSWER:

Shut-off notices have increased primarily due to the economic recession. This is evidenced by a 65% increase in the New Jersey Unemployment Rate. In September 2008, the rate was 5.9%; this year, the rate is 9.7%. Furthermore, the number of bankruptcies filed increased by 39%.

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-TAR-4  
WITNESS(S): SWETZ  
PAGE 1 OF 1  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
CHECK METERING OVER CHARGING

QUESTION:

Please explain how a tenant receiving a bill for his/her pro-rata share of the PSE&G's charges plus administrative expenses from the landlord/customer-of-record, would determine if he/she were being overcharged.

ANSWER:

A tenant receiving a bill for his/her pro-rata share of the PSE&G's charges plus administrative expenses from the landlord/customer-of-record could determine if he/she were being overcharged by asking the landlord/customer-of-record for the work papers supporting the allocation of expenses to either all tenants or at a minimum the calculation supporting their pro-rata share (e.g. their share of square footage) of the bill.

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
PROPOSED LANGUAGE RESULTING IN CUSTOMER BILLS HIGHER/LOWER VS.  
EXISTING LANGUAGE

QUESTION:

Reference PSE&G's proposed revisions to its Gas Standard Terms and Conditions, §§ 8.3.1 and 8.3.3, and its Electric Standard Terms and Conditions § 9.2.3: (a) please provide specific examples of how the proposed tariffs would result in the tenants of the customer-of-record paying less than they would under PSE&G's existing Standard Terms and Conditions, § 8.3.3 (Gas) and § 9.2.3 (Electric); (b) please provide specific examples of how the proposed tariffs would result in tenants of the customer-of-record paying more than they would under PSE&G's existing Standard Terms and Conditions, § 8.3.3 (Gas) and § 9.2.3 (Electric).

ANSWER:

The intent of the Company's proposal is that landlords be allowed to recover their costs for providing electric and gas service to their tenants. No more and no less. This seems to the Company to be a fair approach. Under the existing language, landlords can make a profit up to the level of the bill that a tenant would have paid as a direct customer of PSE&G. The Company also believes it is unfair to the landlord if his electric and gas bill is higher than that which would have been billed to the individual tenants and thus the landlord has to take a loss on his electric and gas costs. The second significant problem with the present language is that, especially for non-residential tenants, a landlord likely does not have the necessary tenant billing determinants to calculate a theoretical PSE&G bill. For example, billing demands, capacity obligations and transmission obligations are especially difficult without demand measurement of the tenants and detailed knowledge of the PSE&G billing process. Thus under the present tariff it is highly unlikely, especially for a non-residential building for either the landlord or the tenant to know what a theoretical tenant bill would be.

- a. The existing tariff language does not define how the landlord determines the tenant's usage or how the landlord would compute the tenant's PSE&G bill. Therefore, tenant's charges could easily exceed his pro-rata share of the landlord's bill.
- b. The proposed tariff language could result in tenants paying more than under the existing tariff if the landlord's bill is higher than what the individual tenant would have paid if he had been a customer. This assumes that under the present tariff, the landlord could calculate a theoretical tenant bill, does calculate such a bill, calculates a lower bill, and limits his charges to the tenant according to the tariff.

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-TAR-6  
WITNESS(S): SWETZ  
PAGE 1 OF 1  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
PRACTICE OF SUB-METERING

QUESTION:

In the Board's September 19, 2005 sub-metering order (Docket No. AO05080734), it replaced the term "check-metering" with the term "sub-metering" and stated on p. 2 that sub-metering "is the practice whereby the primary consumer of the utility commodity or customer of record, through the use of direct metering devices, monitors, evaluates or measures his own utility consumption or the consumption of a tenant for accounting or conservation purposes." Please explain in detail how PSE&G's proposed Standard Terms and Conditions, § 9.2.3 (Electric) and § 8.3.3 (Gas) are consistent with and in compliance with the Board's September 19, 2005 sub-metering order.

ANSWER:

The subject Board Order did redefine sub-metering. The Company will therefore 1) delete the definition of sub-metering from the proposed tariffs (Elec §9.2.2 and Gas §8.3.2) substitute the term sub-metering for check metering and add the new definition of submetering from the 2005 Board Order, recognizing that in the 2005 Order the Board determined to substitute the term "sub-metering" for what formerly was known as check metering. In this manner, PSE&G's proposed Standard Terms and Conditions §9.2.3 will be consistent with the terminology in the Board's 2005 Order. The Company has been following the terms and conditions of the 2005 Board Order although it hadn't substituted the term "sub-metering" for "check metering."

The tariff changes proposed by the Company are not intended to address residential tenants.

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-TAR-10  
WITNESS(S): SWETZ  
PAGE 1 OF 1  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
LANDLORD DETERMINATION OF TENANT THEORETICAL BILL

QUESTION:

In its Petition to the Board provided as Mr. Swetz's schedules SS-E22 and SS-G23, PSE&G states on page 3 that it "can be virtually impossible for a landlord customer to determine what a tenant would pay under an applicable PSE&G rate schedule since the landlord would have no means to determine all the billing determinants necessary to calculate a theoretical bill." Please provide documentation that demonstrates why a landlord customer of record would not be able to determine what a tenant would pay under an applicable PSE&G rate schedule.

ANSWER:

A landlord can not calculate what a tenant would pay under an applicable PSE&G rate schedule without the billing determinants for the tenant, such as kWh usage, possibly by hour, monthly demand, generation obligation, transmission obligation, monthly therm usage for the most recent 12 month period in order to determine balancing usage and Demand Therms. Metered data would be required on each individual tenant to accurately calculate the billing determinants. Without metered data, it is impossible to accurately determine each required billing determinant or verify any estimates. Furthermore, even if a theoretical bill could be calculated, it may bear no relationship to the landlord-customer's bill which could be from a TPS or based on a different rate schedule compared to the tenant.

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-TAR-13  
WITNESS(S): SWETZ  
PAGE 1 OF 1  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
MONITORING CHECK METERING COMPLIANCE - CURRENT

QUESTION:

Please explain specifically how PSE&G currently verifies that a customer is complying with the terms and conditions spelled out in existing Standard Terms and Conditions, § 9.2.3 (Electric) and § 8.3.3 (Gas).

ANSWER:

PSE&G is unable to verify that a customer is complying with the terms and conditions spelled out in existing Standard Terms and Conditions, § 9.2.3 (Electric) and § 8.3.3 (Gas).

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE  
REQUEST: RCR-TAR-14  
WITNESS(S): SWETZ  
PAGE 1 OF 1  
RATE CASE 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
MONITORING CHECK METERING COMPLIANCE - PROPOSED

QUESTION:

Please explain specifically how PSE&G will verify that a customer is complying with the terms and conditions spelled out in proposed Standard Terms and Conditions, § 9.2.3 (Electric) and § 8.3.3 (Gas).

ANSWER:

PSE&G will not be able to verify that a customer is complying with the terms and conditions spelled out in proposed Standard Terms and Conditions, § 9.2.3 (Electric) and § 8.3.3 (Gas) because PSE&G does not have the requisite information to ascertain whether the customer-of-record is properly charging a tenant.

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
CONCERNED LANDLORD CUSTOMERS

QUESTION:

Please provide the number of “concerned landlord-customers” that PSE&G has received inquiries from about compliance with the check-metering tariff in light of industry changes as referenced on p. 3, paragraph 6 of PSE&G’s January 18, 2007 Petition to the BPU attached as Schedule SS-G23, Exhibit P-9 to the Direct Testimony of Stephen Swetz. Please identify each such “concerned landlord-customer” and provide details of the inquiries received by PSE&G from each. Provide all documents relating to such inquiries.

ANSWER:

PSE&G does not formally track inquiries from “concerned landlord-customers.” However, the Company knows of three instances where commercial customers of record had questions regarding check-metering over the past few years. All three parties are either builder/developers or landlords involved with property management. Without prior consent from the customers, we cannot disclose their names pursuant to N.J.A.C. 14:4-7.8 (a); so they will be referred to as Landlord A, Landlord B, and Landlord C.

Landlords A and B own and manage tenant-occupied commercial properties which are mostly all-electric buildings. The main (or ‘master’) meter in many buildings are either primary LPLP or large (>1,000kW Cap Load) LPLS-H services, with electric commodity provided at BGS-CIEP or TPS rates with hourly pricing.

In 2005, they each approached PSE&G regarding the allocation of their electric costs to their tenants, utilizing private metering which enabled them to measure each tenants’ use and load, and then create a bill so they could test to ensure that they were in compliance with current PSE&G Tariff check-metering language. At that period, the BGS-FP associated with the rates that each tenant would have likely qualified for as a PSE&G customer, was at a lower price than the BGS-CIEP with Retail Margin rate associated with the actual master meter paid by the landlord. The landlords then asked if the ‘reasonable administrative charges’ reference could be applied to make up for the shortfall between the CIEP+Adder they were being charged as the customer of record, and the lower BGS-FP sum their interpretation of the check metering Tariff section was capped at. They were advised to seek Board advice.

Landlord C operates a large retail facility with multiple tenants, and experienced identical allocation shortfall issues as Landlords A and B. PSE&G suggested that Landlord C contact the BPU for guidance.

In none of these cases, did PSE&G get involved with the review, approval, maintenance, installation, calibration, reading or billing, or have any more specific knowledge of how the landlord utilized data obtained from their measurement devices for billing tenants.

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
RESIDENTIAL SUBMETERING

QUESTION:

Reference PSE&G's response to RCR-TAR-3, please explain why the proposed sub-metering tariff changes to §9.2.3 (Electric) and §8.3.3 (Gas) would not apply to residential buildings that are "publicly financed or government owned; or are condominiums or cooperative housing; or are eleemosynary in nature"?

ANSWER:

The Company agrees that the proposed tariff could be interpreted as allowing the apportionment of the landlord's bill, including administrative costs, to also apply to residential tenants. To clarify the tariff, the Company proposes that the words "industrial or commercial" be inserted before first "tenant" in the proposed second paragraph of §9.2.3 (Electric) and third paragraph of §8.3.3 (Gas). Further, the present second paragraphs of §9.2.3 (Electric) and third paragraph of §8.3.3 (Gas) would be retained as the new third and fourth paragraphs with the word "residential" inserted before the first "tenant" in those new paragraphs.

The second and third paragraphs of §9.2.3 (Electric) would now read:

If the customer-of-record charges the industrial or commercial tenant for the usage incurred by the tenant such charges shall not exceed the tenant's share of the customer's bill, based on the tenant's pro-rata share of the total usage, except that reasonable administrative expenses may be added.

If the customer-of-record charges the residential tenant for the usage incurred by the tenant such charges shall not exceed the amount Public Service would have charged such tenant if the tenant had been served and billed directly by Public Service on the most appropriate rate schedule, except that reasonable administrative expenses may be included.

The third and fourth paragraphs of §8.3.3 (Gas) would now read:

If the customer-of-record charges the industrial or commercial tenant for the usage incurred by the tenant, such charges shall not exceed the tenant's share of the customer's bill, based on the tenant's pro-rata share of the total usage, except that reasonable administrative expenses may be added.

If the customer-of-record charges the residential tenant for the usage incurred by the tenant such charges shall not exceed the amount Public Service would have charged each tenant if the tenant had been served and billed directly by Public Service on the most appropriate rate schedule, except that reasonable administrative expenses may be included.

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
DETERMINATION OF SUBMETERING OVERCHARGING

QUESTION:

The Company's response to RCR-TAR-4 states that a tenant could determine if he/she were overcharged by asking the landlord/customer-of-record for the work papers supporting the allocation.

- (a) What recourse would the tenant have if the landlord refused to supply the work papers?
- (b) What information would the tenant need to determine if he/she were being overcharged? As part of your response, please specify whether the tenant would need: tenant need the customer-of record's electric and gas bill(s), the allocation method (if not by individual tenant meter) for determining the tenant's pro rata share, access to the meter readings if allocated by individual meter, calculation and documentation of the administrative costs for the entire building/premise, the landlord/customer of record's accounting records relating to administrative costs, and the method for allocating the administrative costs to each tenant including the tenant in question. Also please specify all other types of information the tenant would need to determine if he/she were being overcharged. Please explain your response.
- (c) Does PSE&G believe that the proposed tariffs should include provisions requiring the landlord/customer-of-record to maintain such records and to make them available to tenants?
- (d) If the answer to (c) above is no, please explain how tenants would be able to determine if they were being overcharged without such a requirement.
- (e) If the answer to (c) above is yes, please provide proposed tariff language to implement such a requirement.
- (f) If the tenant determined he/she were being overcharged, or that the landlord/customer-of-record were making a profit from energy sub-metering, could the tenant submit a complaint to the BPU? Please explain the Board's jurisdiction to resolve such a complaint.

ANSWER:

ANSWER:

- (a) The tenant could file a complaint with the Board as indicated in N.J.A.C § 14:1-5.13. The Board also has a web site for customers with information on how to file a complaint with the Board see (<http://www.state.nj.us/bpu/assistance/complaints/>)
- (b) The tenant would request customer-of-record's actual calculation of tenant's corresponding utility bill(s) and all supporting documentation and calculations. The supporting documentation may include but not limited to the customer's of record utility bill(s) from PSE&G, third party supplier bill(s) if not receiving BGS or BGSS supply, the allocation method (if not allocated by individual tenant meter(s)), supporting calculations for determining the tenant's pro rata share, meter readings if allocated by individual meter, calculation and documentation of the administrative costs for the entire building/premise,

RESPONSE TO ADVOCATE

REQUEST: RCR-TAR-29

WITNESS(S): SWETZ

PAGE 2 OF 2

RATE CASE 2009

the customer of record accounting records relating to administrative costs, and the method for allocating the administrative costs to each tenant.

- (c) Since PSE&G is not privy to agreement between the customer of record and tenant, the Company believes that appropriate recordkeeping should be addressed in the agreement between the tenant and customer-of-record and that the Company's proposed tariff language includes provisions relevant to the Company's providing of its service to the customer-of-record.
- (d) As stated in section (c) of this response, this should be addressed in the agreement between the tenant and the customer of record.
- (e) Not Applicable.
- (f) The Board's jurisdiction to resolve complaints, such as submetering complaints, can be referenced in "N.J.A.C § 14:1-5.13 Informal complaint in lieu of petition".



	Clifton	Oakland	Oradell	Orange	Harrison	Jersey City	Summit	Audubon	Burlington	New Bruns	Plainfield	Trenton
Jan-07	100	100	99.92	100	100	98.11	99.87	100	100	100	99.84	99.85
Feb-07	100	100	99.9	99.9	99.81	100	99.75	100	100	99.72	99.83	100
Mar-07	99.91	100	99.7	100	99.79	99.9	100	100	100	99.85	100	99.84
Apr-07	100	99.87	99.92	100	100	100	100	100	100	99.85	99.64	99.7
May-07	100	100	100	100	100	99.63	100	100	100	99.8	100	100
Jun-07	100	100	100	100	100	99.86	100	100	100	100	99.73	100
Jul-07	100	100	100	100	99.66	100	100	100	100	99.79	100	99.79
Aug-07	100	100	100	100	99.73	100	99.82	100	100	100	100	100
Sep-07	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	99.32	99.38	99.65
Oct-07	100	100	100	100	99.81	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Nov-07	100	100	100	100	100	100	99.64	100	100	100	100	99.88
Dec-07	99.92	100	100	100	100	99.91	100	100	99.62	100	100	100
<b>07 Average</b>	<b>99.98</b>	<b>99.99</b>	<b>99.95</b>	<b>99.99</b>	<b>99.91</b>	<b>99.71</b>	<b>99.91</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>99.96</b>	<b>99.88</b>	<b>99.88</b>	<b>99.89</b>

# **APPENDIX**

## DIAN P. CALLAGHAN

---

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

**Dian P. Callaghan** is an expert in consumer protection for utility services. Ms. Callaghan filed the following direct testimony on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel: I/M/O the Petition of Pivotal Utility Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Elizabethtown Gas for Approval of Increased Base Tariff Rates and Charges for Gas Service and Other Tariff Revisions, BPU Dkt. No. GR09030195 and OAL Dkt. No. PUC-03655-2009N (August 21, 2009); I/M/O the Petition of Public Service Electric and Gas Company (PSE&G) for Approval of a Solar Loan II Program and an Associated Cost Recovery Mechanism, BPU Docket No. EO09030249 (July 31, 2009); I/M/O the Petition of PSE&G for Approval of a Solar Energy Program and an Associated Cost Recovery Mechanism, BPU Docket No. EO07040278 (2007). In both the PSE&G dockets, she addressed the consumer protection issues associated with the solar loan program. In the Elizabethtown Gas case, she also offered a service performance plan for the Company. Also in 2007, she prepared comments for the New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel on proposed rules re: Energy Competition Standards, Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency, specifically (1) anti-slamming (N.J.A.C. 14:4-2), (2) energy licensing and registration rules (N.J.A.C. 14:4-5), and (3) consumer protection (N.J.A.C. 14:4-7). In addition, in 2007 Ms. Callaghan served on a steering committee on behalf of the Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel (“OCC”) to develop the program for the first annual energy conference co-sponsored by the Governor’s Energy Office, the Colorado Public Utilities Commission, and the Office of Consumer Counsel titled: “Colorado’s New Energy Economy: the Path Forward.”

From 1984 through 2004, Ms. Callaghan was the administrative director and senior policy analyst for the State of Colorado, Office of Consumer Counsel. She prepared and submitted comments in numerous rulemaking and adjudicatory proceedings before the Colorado Public Utilities Commission (“PUC” or “Commission”) and the Federal Communications Commission regarding a variety of consumer protection issues, including customer proprietary network information, universal service, operator services, consumer privacy, confidentiality of documents submitted to the Commission, low-income telephone assistance rules, gas utility rules, PUC rules of practice and procedure, telephone service quality and held service order rules, telephone presubscription rules, basic telephone service definition, service discontinuance rules, rules governing slamming, Caller ID, and E9-1-1. She worked with other stakeholders to establish Colorado’s Do Not Call List program before the national list was established. Ms. Callaghan filed testimony in numerous dockets including Docket No. 97A-103T (303 Area Code Relief), Docket No. 90A-665T (U S West Alternative Form of Regulation), Docket No. 96S-257T (U S West Rate Rebalance), Dockets No. 91A-462T and 91S-548T (Caller ID and Call Trace), Docket No. 98S-363T (NOW Communications). Ms. Callaghan assisted in the preparation of the stipulation in the Public Service Company of Colorado performance-based regulation plan, service quality plan, the stipulation in the PUC show cause docket concerning U S West service quality (Docket No. 94C-587T), and the stipulation concerning the sale of Qwest Corporation’s Dex telephone directories.

She designed and helped implement customer education plans and programs for new area code implementation, statewide local calling area changes, 1+ equal access in the intraLATA long-distance market, the 2000-2001 natural gas price increases, and others. Ms. Callaghan also testified in a number of dockets from 1998-2004 concerning service abandonment by competitive local phone companies to protect consumers from loss of service. Her duties at the OCC also included legislative analyst and media relations specialist.

Ms. Callaghan is currently the Vice Chair of the Utility Consumers Board, appointed by the Governor to provide policy guidance to the Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel, and is the current Secretary of the Energy Outreach Colorado Board of Directors, a nonprofit organization providing low-income energy assistance. She previously chaired the Consumer Protection Committee of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, the Legislative Committee of the PUC's 9-1-1 Advisory Task Force, and the Colorado Energy Assistance Foundation Board. Ms. Callaghan also served on the Governor's Energy Assistance Reform Task Force, the Utilities Task Force, and the Area Code Customer Education Committee.

Prior to her position with the OCC, Ms. Callaghan was a management analyst for the Colorado State Patrol, an investment broker with Dain Bosworth, Inc. and held various management and analyst positions with the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice and the National Information Center on Volunteerism.

## **EDUCATION**

Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Trinity College (now Trinity University) in Washington, D.C. Completed most of coursework toward a Masters in Public Administration, University of Colorado at Denver.