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October 29, 2013

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265

Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

OCT 292013

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION SECRETARY'S BUREAU

RE: SBG Management Services, Inc. (and related entities) v. PGW, Docket Nos. C-2012-2304167; C-2012-2304183; C-2012-2304215; C-2012-2304303; C-2012-2304324; C-2012-2308454; C-2012-2308462; C-2012-2308465; and C-2012-2334253

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:
On behalf of the Complainants in the above-refcrenced matters ("Complainants"), enclosed for filing is the original of its Motion to Dismiss Philadelphia Gas Works' ("PGW") Objections and Compel Response to its Set II Interrogatories to PGW along with the electronic filing confirmation with regard to the abovereferenced matter. Copies to be served in accordance with the attached Certificate of Service.

If you have questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 215-2604562 or as described in the contact information, below. Your assistance in this matter is appreciated.


General Counsel, SBG Management Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 549, Abington, PA 19001
c: 215-260-4562
e: boone@sbgmanagement.com or Booneft@aol.com

Enclosure
cc: ALJ Eranda Verso (by email and/or regular mail)
Laureto Farinas, Esquire, Philadelphia Gas Works (by email and/or regular mail)
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COMPLAINANTS', SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC., COLONIAL GARDEN REALTY CO. (I and II), FAIRMOUNT REALTY CO., SIMON GARDENS, ELRAE GARDEN REALTY, MARCHWOOD REALTY, FERNROCK REALTY, OAK LANE REALTY CO., L.P., AND MARSHALL SQUARE REALTY ("COMPLAINANTS"), MOTION TO DISMISS PGW'S OBJECTIONS AND COMPEL RESPONSES TO COMPLAINANTS' REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND INTERROGATORIES ADDRESSED TO RESPONDENT PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS, SET II

Pursuant to 52 Pa . Code Sections 5.342 and 5.321 (c), Complainants, by their undersigned counsel, hereby move to dismiss the Objections (individually, "Objection" or collectively, "Objections") of Philadelphia Gas Works ("PGW" or "Respondent"), which are attached hereto as Exhibit "A", and compel PGW to answer Complainants' Requests for Production of Documents and Interrogatories Addressed to Respondent PGW, Set II (individually, "Interrogatory" or collectively,"Interrogatories" or "Interrogatories, Set II") as propounded by Complainant to Respondent, in this matter, and as attached hereto as "Appendix "A" to Exhibit "A".

## I. SUMMARY

Interrogatories are governed by 52 Pa . Code Section 5.321 (c), which provides:
(c) Scope. Subject to this subchapter, a party may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action, whether it relates to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or to the claim or defense of another party, including the existence, description, nature, content, custody, condition and location of any books, documents, or other tangible things and the identity and location of persons having knowledge of a discoverable matter. It is not ground for objection that the information sought will be inadmissible at hearing if the information sought is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. 52 Pa . Code Section 5.321 (c).

In the Objections, Respondent raises twenty-three (23) objections, as set forth in Exhibit "A", to all or a part of all the Interrogatories, except Interrogatory 41. Yet, none of the Objections meet the full criteria of 52 Pa . Code Section 5.321 (c), or the other applicable case and statutory law. Accordingly, the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (hereafter, the "Commission") should dismiss the Objections and compel Respondent to answer the Interrogatories, here. (Complainant will discuss the Interrogatories and Objections, in detail, below).

A preliminary review reveals that the twenty-three Objections fall into five (5) categories:

1. The request is overbroad and beyond the scope of the litigation ("Category 1");
2. The request is burdensome and requires Respondent to make a list of documents or parties or other information that Respondent is using to prepare for or is using as an exhibit or evidence in the proceedings ("Category 2");
3. The request is burdensome and requires Respondent to produce previously provided (through testimony or prior discovery) information or "to-beprovided" information that Respondent will produce in its Prefiled Testimony or as an exhibit at the upcoming hearings ("Category 3");
4. The request is one that rises to the level of a management audit and does not involve the issues in this matter, a billing dispute ("Category 4"); and
5. The request seeks information that is beyond the authority of the Commission because it relates to or involves municipal liens ("Category 5").

In the July 17, 2012 Order of Administrative Law Judge Eranda Vero on
Respondent's Preliminary Objections, at page 12 ALJ Vero indicated that SBG's
significant concerns with regard to the accuracy of billing, validity of the meter readings and/or estimates and the calculation of interest and penalties assessed by PGW do fall squarely within the purview of the Commission's jurisdiction and are rightfully brought before the Commission for adjudication.

The Complaints and the Interrogatories seek information on how PGW calculated, requested payment for and attempted collection on bills for gas usage connected with properties that are owned by Complainants. Every interrogatory seeks relevant and discoverable information related to these issues.

Category 1 Objections: With respect to the claims set forth in the Category 1 Objections, Respondent alleges but fails to show these Interrogatories are beyond the scope of this litigation. To the contrary, the Interrogatories seek information on seminal issues in this matter: SBG's significant concerns with regard to the accuracy of billing, validity of the meter readings and/or estimates and the calculation of interest and penalties assessed by PGW (See the July 17, 2012 Order of ALJ Vero). These Interrogatories may also ask "who, how, when, why, and where", as permitted by Section 5.321 (c), especially in connection with the accuracy of the billing, the validity of meter readings and/or estimates and the calculation of interest and penalties assessed by PGW and persons or parties with information regarding the same.

Applicable case and statutory law also provide as follows:
66 Pa.C.S. Section 1303. "Adherence to tariffs. No public utility shall, directly or indirectly, by any device whatsoever, or in any wise, demand or receive from any person, corporation, or municipal corporation a greater or less rate for any service rendered or to be rendered by such public utility applicable thereto. The rates specified in such tariffs shall be the lawful rates of such public utility until changed, as provided in this part. Any public utility, having more than one rate applicable to service rendered to a patron, shall, after notice of service conditions, compute bills under the rate most advantageous to the patron."

In the case of PPL Electric Utilities Corp. v. Pa. PUC, 912 A.2d 386; 2006 Pa.
Commw. LEXIS 665 (2006), the Commonwealth Court held:
"A tariff is a set of operating rules imposed by the State that a public utility must follow if it wishes to provide services to customers. It is a public document, which sets forth the schedule of rates and services and rules, regulations, and practices regarding those services. It is well settled that public utility tariffs must be applied consistently with their language." See 66 Pa.C.S. Section 1303.

Further, no public utility may receive a greater or lesser rate than the one set forth in its tariff on file with this Commission. See 66 Pa.C.S. Section 1303; further, a public utility may not unreasonably discriminate for or against a particular customer by establishing a special rate for them." See 66 Pa.C.S. Section 1304 (See Dierich v. PECO, 2012 Pa. PUC LEXIS 517 (2012).

Requests for information on documents and on the addresses, age and names of individuals who either prepared the responses to the discovery requests or the underlying bills, payment requests and/or responses to billing inquiries, disputes and complaints, as well as individuals who have knowledge or information concerning the same, are all relevant. Information on the individuals who created, prepared and have knowledge of this information is relevant to the issues in this proceedings: individuals take action, including but not limited to programming, inputting into and obtaining information from computers, files, databases and records and providing to and obtaining information from other individuals; individuals also testify and sign verifications as to the truth the Respondent's statements and allegations of the events in these cases. If no one's name is provided, then Complainants cannot properly and fully confirm or even investigate the responses or allegations of the Respondent either related to its discovery responses or its
exhibits and statements at the hearings. Such Objections avoid producing relevant evidence and getting to the truth of the facts in the cases. Similarly, home addresses are needed because individuals/employees may leave or have left PGW who were personally involved in the facts underlying this case and who may or can no longer be reached at PGW (i.e. John Dunn, who testified at the first set of hearings is no longer employed by PGW). We requested the ages of the individuals to confirm that those responding to the interrogatories are of majority age and/or have the appropriate capacity to answer the discovery requests. These discovery requests are not beyond the scope of these proceedings and PGW should be forced to supply the requested discovery responses or sanctioned for its failure to do so.

Category 2 and Category 3 Objections: These objections allege that Complainants' requests require Respondent provide a list or list its responses or to provide previously submitted information or information to be submitted at the later hearings on these cases. These Category 2 and Category 3 Objections fail in the face of 52 Pa . Code Section 5.342, which states that:
(a) Form. Answers to Interrogatories must:
(1) Be in writing.
(2) Identify the name and position of the individual who provided the answer.
(3) Be submitted as an answer and may not be submitted as an exhibit or in another form.
(4) Answer each interrogatory fully and completely unless an objection is made.
(5) Restate the interrogatory which is being answered or be inserted in the spaces provided in the interrogatories.
(6) Be verified in accordance with Section 1.36 (relating to verification).

Instead of complying with Section 5.342, above, Respondents allege that they may have previously provided or will provide this information and/or Complainants can
make their own list. Neither Section 5.342, nor any other section of the statute, supports these Objections. Discovery permits a party to obtain just those documents now, which may be (or in some cases may not be) admissible at trial/hearing later. There is no right to "wait until the hearing or until the prefiled testimony is submitted"-and Respondent has not produced any case or statutory law to support these Category 2 and 3 Objections. To the contrary, discovery is encouraged so that the parties may dispose of any or as many issues as possible, prior to trial or hearing. Through discovery, the parties may discover that certain issues are "resolvable" or not in dispute and avoid wasting precious judicial time and resources.

With respect to the Objections that Respondents provided statements of accounts and (by Respondent's own admission) "exhibits" in prior proceedings, these documents have not been organized or presented in a manner that specifically answers or responds to the Interrogatories as required by Section 5.342. Respondent's Objections would essentially require Complainants to guess which persons or documents or exhibits are responsive to any or some part of each Interrogatory. There is no statutory or case law to support these Objections-objections that encourage or create confusion, but do not meet the spirit or the strict criteria of the applicable discovery laws and rules. Respondent needs to answer each Interrogatory specifically, fully and completely as required by law and we respectfully request that the Commission compel PGW to do so.

Category 4 Objections: These objections assume that the discovery requests seeking information on the training, policies, procedures-essentially the how and why Respondent's employees or related parties have taken certain actions in this matter-constitute a "management audit". Complainants have never used the term or requested a
"management audit". The Complainants have requested during the first two sets of consolidated hearings that the Commission consider the imposition of a penalty against PGW for its numerous violations and repeated and egregious acts and omissions that have caused damages and harm to the Complainants. Per the Complaints, Respondent repeatedly failed to adequately explain or respond to Complainants' inquiries, complaints, disputes, and requests for information on gas usage bills and payments and sought payment or failed to provide refunds for gas usage which was not due or improperly billed, demanded and/or collected by Respondent from Complainants. The violations of the tariffs, as claimed by Complainants, include those that govern "service" and "rates" (or billing and payments for gas usage), which have consistently been held by the Commission to be within the Commission's purview and authority. Complainants seek information on how such bad service and improper rates were imposed on Complainants. Is it a single employee or is it an institutional problem? What guidance do PGW employees, directors, and management receive on providing good service and appropriate rates/billings to customers and on how to interpret or to implement the requirements of the tariff and applicable rules and regulations? Information on the policies, procedures, training, and practices that are taught, encouraged, distributed and enforced throughout PGW are relevant to the underlying litigation as such information goes to how pervasive, numerous and potentially repetitive are PGW's errors in dealing with its customers and relevant to the need for the Commission to impose an appropriate penalty against PGW to discourage and end such bad acts and/or harmful failures to act.

The Commission has consistently held that matters involving rates, service, and billing and payments of gas usage bills are within the purview and the authority of the Commission. Pursuant to 52 Pa . Code Section 5.321(c):
"...a party may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action, whether it relates to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or to the claim or defense of another party, including the existence, description, nature, content, custody, condition and location of any books, documents, or other tangible things and the identity and location of persons having knowledge of a discoverable matter."

Here, the Interrogatories seek information that is relevant to this proceeding and that is further defined as discoverable at Section 5.321 (c), above. Accordingly, the Commission should dismiss Respondent's Objections and compel Respondent to answer the Interrogatories, here.

## Category 5 Objections: Similarly to Category 1 Objections, Category 5

 Objections allege that Complainants seek information beyond the scope of these proceedings, but because they relate to municipal liens. ALJ Vero and the Commission have consistently held that the Commission has authority over the calculation and accuracy of the bills for gas usage. Complainants seek information on the calculation and accuracy of the gas usage bills underlying the municipal liens. Complainants' Interrogatories do not seek information on whether the Commission has authority over the right of the PGW to impose municipal liens. These are two separate issues and should not be confused to avoid complying with permissible discovery requests. The information requested if highly relevant. Complainants cannot calculate, dispute or even agree with Respondent's bills or calculations of debt due without information on how, when, and why those bills or debts are calculated, including those now subject to a municipal lien. Also, it should not be burdensome to explain a bill, unless the partyissuing the bill has or had no good or reasonable explanation for the bill at the time of demanding payment or even to date. During the first two sets of consolidated hearings, there was testimony of differing interest rates in the statement of accounts. Accordingly, just giving the statement of accounts to Scott DeBroff, Esquire, without explaining the algorithm or methodology for calculating the bills is insufficient. This information was not previously provided and we are requesting it now. Accordingly, the Commission should dismiss Respondent's Objections and Compel Answers to the Interrogatories, promptly.
II. THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS TO DISMISS OBJECTIONS AND COMPEL RESPONSE TO THE INTERROGATORIES

In support of this Motion, Complainants aver as follows:

1. The above-referenced consolidated Complaints were commenced by the filing Complaints and Amended Complaints. Respondents subsequently filed Answers and Amended Answers to the Amended Complaints.
2. Complainants, by its former counsel, Scott DeBroff, Esquire, served discovery requests upon counsel for Respondent.
3. Complainants, by its current counsel, subsequently served a second set of discovery requests, Interrogatories, Set II, on October 9, 2013, a copy of which is attached hereto as "Appendix " A " to Exhibit " A ".
4. Answers to Set II are due on October 29, 2013 and have been received to date.
5. On October 21, 2013, Respondent served Objections to Interrogatories, Set II, which are attached hereto as Exhibit "A".
6. Twenty-three Objections to the Interrogatories were filed by Respondent, as responded to by Complainants in detail below:
(1) Set II, No. 1: Essentially, Interrogatory \#1 seeks basic contact information on the parties who have relevant information and knowledge to provide in these proceedings as they are preparing/will prepare the responses. Home addresses and telephone numbers are needed as these individuals may leave or have left PGW and Complainants must be able to contact these individuals, if needed, in connection with these matters. For example, a principal witness in the first set of hearings is John Dunn, who no longer works at PGW, but who has relevant and important personal information and knowledge of key facts in these cases. Complainants will agree to keep all such contact information confidential and to only use it in connection with PGW proceedings. The age of the parties is sought to confirm that the responses are prepared by those who have the capacity to answer; Respondent may simply state the individual is of majority age. Finally, it is not burdensome to provide a list of names: if Respondent provides the names of those who prepared the responses in a logical and organized matter, then essentially, it will be providing the requested "list" information and complying with 52 Pa. Code Section 5.321 (c) and 52 Pa. Code Section 5.342.
(2) Set II, No. 2 in neither overbroad, burdensome or beyond the scope. To the contrary, pursuant to 52 Pa . Code Section 5.321 (c) and 52 Pa . Code Section 5.342, Respondent is required to specifically answer each interrogatory and to provide the information in a specific and detailed manner. If Respondent's intent is to just provide a bunch of documents that do not specifically respond to each interrogatory, then those answers are non-responsive and Respondent should be
ordered to respond as required by Sections 5.321 and 5.342, as stated herein. It is only burdensome if Respondent does not intend to respond or comply with the applicable statutes.
(3) Set II, No. 3 is not overbroad as written, but simply requires the Respondent to produce those documents relied on in preparing its responses to the Interrogatories. If Respondent is reviewing documents that contain information relevant to these proceedings to answer the Interrogatories, then Complainant has a right to inspect and/or receive a copy of those documents pursuant to Sections 5.321 and 5.342 , even if such documents are inadmissible. The fact that Respondent admits a need to review such documents supports Complainants discovery requests, here, for these documents under Sections 5.321 and 5.342. 52 Pa. Code Section 5.349 does not bar the identification, inspection and production of relevant documents for these proccedings in response to the Interrogatories. Further, Respondent can simply produce and provide copies of all such documents to Complainants, in lieu of producing them for "inspection".
(4) Set II, No. 4: The Objections to Set II, No. 4 should be dismissed for the same reasons set forth in the Responses to the Objections to Nos. 1 and 2. Persons with personal knowledge of this matter and who prepared the responses should be identified and their contact information should be made available, in the event that Complainants seek or need to review, to depose/subpeona or to obtain other evidence or testimony from them. Respondent is trying to obstruct and prevent Complainants from fully investigating and prosecuting their claims and rights to pursue discovery in these proceedings. Further, it is not burdensome to make a list of those who have knowledge of
the facts or who prepared the answers to Interrogatories, Set II, unless Respondent does not know who is answering these responses, which would raise questions on Respondent's responses and verifications, here, and in the proceedings.
(5) Set II, No. 5: The Objection to No. 5 is that it is "Overbroad and 'seems to request information that has been previously provided in discovery 11 months ago'". First, this objection is not definitive, since it uses the words-"seems". It is essentially an admission that the responses delivered to Mr. DeBroff may not satisfy the Interrogatories, here. These Interrogatories, Set II, asked for specific information and specific answers must be provided to satisfy the strict criteria of Sections 5.321 and 5.342. Further, Respondent produced numerous exhibits at the first set of hearings that contained substantially more documents, correspondence, and data on the account history, billing, meter, and payment issues in this matter than the documents provided to Mr. DeBroff, which leads one to conclude that the documents produced by PGW for Mr. DeBroff would not and can not be responsive to the Interrogatories, Set II. If Respondent disagrees, then Respondent should show in detail how each document provided to Mr . DeBroff individually responds to Interrogatories, Set II, including how it contains Melita notes, correspondence from the various PGW departments charged with responding to and answering Complainants' inquiries, disputes and complaints surrounding the bills an payments, which are at the heart of these proceedings.
(6) Set II, Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10: In the Objections to Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9 , and 10 , Respondent claims the Interrogatories "rise[s] to the level of a management/training audit and not that of the customer dispute issues raised by the Complainant". Respondent also claims that the testimony to date is only on a few
disputed issues with bills. These objections are disingenuous and improper. The testimony in the first set of hearings shows a repeated behavior at various levels of PGW that arguably violates the tariff and applicable laws and regulations. Complainants stated they intend to request the issuance of a penalty against PGW. Training information will confirm whether the individual employees are acting ultra vires or whether PGW has a system-wide problem with its bills/payments/collections. This issue is discussed in greater detail in the Category 4 Objection section on pages 8-9, above.
(7) Set II, Nos. 11, 12, and 13: The objection to Nos. 11, 12, and 13 should be dismissed as the Interrogatories are not overbroad and have not been previously answered by Respondent. If previously provided, then Respondent should use those prior responses (including allegedly responsive testimony) specifically and individually to show how each specifically and fully responded to the Interrogatories, Set
II. Respondent does not do so, because Respondent cannot. Respondent produced a minimal amount of information to Mr. DeBroff that in no way meets the requirements of the Interrogatories, Set II. Further, to the extent that Respondent argues it produced some or similar documents at the first set of hearings as exhibits or to defend itself, then the requested information is readily within PGW's access and cannot be beyond the scope, overbroad, or burdensome, to produce here, for Interrogatories, Set II. To avoid responding to these Interrogatories based on these objections, violates the statutes, rules and regulations governing discovery. The objections should be dismissed and Respondent should be subject to sanctions by the Commission to prevent PGW's obstruction of discovery and attempts to hide relevant documents and information from the other party to the proceedings. Further, Respondent provided no such testimony, documents,
correspondence, MELITA records or other such information for the last three cases at all. Further, no such Melita data, or correspondence, docs, emails or letters from PGW departments/units were provided to Scott DeBroff, Esquire, in earlier discovery. Only PGW knew the existence of these documents; PGW only revealed these documents/records and sources during the initial hearings for its defense. PGW relied on these kind of documents as exhibits in the prior proceedings-so these kinds of documents are relevant to issues in this case and were not too burdensome to produce as exhibits by PGW for PGW's defense. Accordingly, the objections to Interrogatories, Set II, should be dismissed.
(8) Set Il, Nos. 14, 15, and 16: Respondent claims these Interrogatories are overbroad and the information previously provided. These objections should be dismissed for the reasons set forth in Responses (1), (2) and (4) and in Category 1, 2, and 3 Objections, above. Further, PGW has not provided "Contact" information in testimony or in previous discovery. Testimony may not cover all documents, information, or persons who have relevant knowledge or information on the key facts in this case. The Interrogatories must be and are required to be specifically and individually answered. It is not Complainants' duty to guess what testimony responds fully and with particularity-that is Respondents' duty to provide answers and to verify the truth of those answers. The objections should not be used to avoid the requirements and obligations of the applicable discovery rules and statutes. Further, it is nonresponsive for PGW "to the extent it can, PGW will "provide an explanation of the policies for recording telephone cases made to the CSR and the time for which they have kept." Complainants requested copies of the written records of telephone conversations
through its Melita notes and internal notes/documents and through confirming emails with PGW employees/related parties and with others, including Complainants. This type of information and this form of such documents were used as exhibits in the earlier proceedings. Complainants cannot on its own verify that Respondent produced all such documents relevant to the proceedings and responsive to the Interrogatories. If others exist, Respondents must produce those "new" documents and confirm which and how any exhibits used at the prior proceedings, if at all, fulfill the discovery requests in Interrogatories, Set II. The Commission should impose sanctions against PGW for its failure to produce documents and information requested here, including but not limited to prohibiting PGW from using any such documents as evidence in the remaining hearings. Finally, no expansion is involved here. We seek information limited to and on the disputed payments, accounts, properties, SAs, and meters as condensed and set forth in the Appendix A-all of which are at the core of the billing/payment issues for this case. For example, Complainants were admonished during the first set of hearings to refrain from referring to acts by PGW at properties not listed in the Complaint. The Interrogatories, Set II, only go to issues, properties, accounts, and billings, which are the subject of this litigation.
(9) Set II, Nos. 17, 18, and 19: Respondent claims these Interrogatories are overbroad and burdensome and the information was previously provided. These objections should be dismissed for the reasons set forth in Responses (1), (2), (4), (7) and (8) and in Category 1, 2, 3, and 5 Objections, above. Further, PGW objects that the Interrogatories seek an explanation for the calculation of the bills, payments, gas usage debts, and resulting arrearages-including those underlying
outstanding liens. As discussed, above, and as applicable here, the specific requested information was not previously provided and if so, then Respondent should produce and show how those responses specilically and fully respond to the Interrogatories, Set II, here. Respondent has not done so, because the "previously provided" information does not fully and specifically respond as required by the applicable discovery rules and laws. Further, to the contrary, the calculation of the debt and required/requested payments underlying the liens are within the purview of the Commission. Complainants are not asking the Commission to rule on whether PGW can impose a lien, but asking for an accounting, a payment/billing history of each such alleged debt. To do otherwise is run the risk that the internal calculations and algorithms are incorrect and risk that the customer is paying more for gas usage than permitted under the tariff. This is a critical issue in the proceedings-whether PGW is charging the correct amount of interest on "open accounts" that are subject to a municipal lien. It is relevant to these proceedings that PGW explain the basis for its calculations, so that the customer and the Commission can confirm whether PGW is acting in accordance with the tariff or not. At the first set of hearings, Complainants discovered that some liens covered the same account, same meter, but for varying and overlapping periods of time. The statements of accounts fail to explain or confirm the debt, payment and billing history, or arrearages claimed by PGW, and underlying these lien accounts. How can it be burdensome for PGW to explain the basis of its bills/debt claims/charges, unless PGW has no good faith basis or reasonable explanation for these charges!
(10) Set II, Nos. 20: Respondent claims these Interrogatories are overbroad and burdensome, and the information was previously provided. These
objections should be dismissed for the reasons set forth in Responses (1), (2),(4), (7) and (8) and in Category 1, 2, and 3 Objections, above. Respondent further claims it will explain PGW's mistakes/errors in these cases through previously produced or in prefiled testimony. Respondent fails to cite and there are no discovery rules or statutes to support this Objection. No discovery statute requires a party to wait until a hearing or the filing of prefiled testimony to obtain discoverable information now. Further, PGW's argument and ability to produce such documents, information, and evidence as prefiled testimony shows a willful intent to unlawfully withhold information that the applicable discovery rules require PGW to produce now and shows the need to impose sanctions against PGW for this obstructionist behavior.
(11) Set II, No. 21: Respondent claims these Interrogatories are overbroad and burdensome, and the information was previously provided. These objections should be dismissed for the reasons set forth in Responses (1), (2) and (4) and in Category 1, 2, and 3 Objections, above. SBG is disputing bills issued by PGW, including the calculation and accuracy of those bills. During the testimony, it was clear that varying interest rates were applied to all or part of the bills. Some of the rates did not appear to comply with the tariff rate of pre-judgment or post-judgment interest rates. As set forth in earlier responses, the applicable discovery statutes and rules, require Respondent to specifically and fully respond to each Interrogatory. PGW has not done so, here, and can not cite where and how these "previous responses" do so. No specific references to testimony or to particular discovery documents are provided in the objections, except that Respondent provided statements of account, which were the subject of varying interest rates that may deviate from the interest rates permitted by the
tariff and other statutes governing pre-judgment and post-judgment interest. Respondent has not provided extensive answers to prior discovery. Voluminous documents produced as "exhibits" by PGW for PGW's benefit in the first two sets of proceedings, included correspondence, MELITA notes, and internal documents on the seminal issues in this case; these kinds of documents were never produced for Mr. DeBroff and more of the same may be in PGW's books and records. But PGW did not provide an affirmation or verification, under oath, that all such documents have been produced and turned over to SBG. In fact, the record proves the opposite: the documents identified as PGW's Exhibits for the first two sets of hearings all contained information on the billing records and history that were not provided to SBG. These relevant and admissible documents could have been, but were never even referred to by PGW until just days before or during the actual hearings. One of the key issues in the case is that PGW is non-responsive to customer claims, disputes, and inquiries. These Objections underscore PGW's refusal to explain and justify the calculation and accuracy of its bills and duty to confirms that PGW's service, rates, billing and collection actions comply with the tariffs, laws, regulations, and even the internal training policies and procedures of this particular utility. Therefore, we seek sanctions against PGW for its unwarranted refusal to comply with the discovery requests here and the laws governing discovery.
(12) Set II, Nos. 22, 23, and 24: Respondent claims these Interrogatories are overbroad and the information was previously provided. These objections should be dismissed for the reasons set forth in Responses (1), (2) (4), (7) and (8) and in Category 1, 2, and 3 Objections, above. Further, PGW's books and records containing information on communication/attempted communication between parties on
collection/billing/disputes are relevant to these proceedings. Pursuant to the applicable discovery laws (See Responses (7) and (8), above), this objection fails to show that PGW specifically and fully responded (previously) to the Interrogatories, Set II. Simply saying the information was given without showing and providing the specific proof of the same is insufficient. Further, Complainants disagree that the requested information was provided and strict proof to support these Objections is demanded.
(13) Set II, No. 25: Respondent claims these Interrogatories are overbroad and the information was previously provided. These objections should be dismissed for the reasons set forth in Responses (1), (2) (4), (7) and (8) and in Category 1,2 , and 3 Objections, above. The Interrogatories seek information that was not previously providing and information related to the subject matter of these proceedings, specifically-including but not limited to the billing, payment and meter history for the properties that are the subject of the Complaints. An unusual bill today may be based on a bad meter or meter reading from a prior year. The meter history is relevant to determining whether the bills, in dispute, are correct. There is no expansion of issues. The Interrogatories seek information and documents that are directly related and relevant to these proceedings. To limit this discovery is to prevent or obstruct Complainants' access to documents that are relevant to the dispositive issues in these cases. The first set of hearings exposed the kind of meter errors and meter information that are not set forth in documents previously provided to Mr. DeBroff. PGW provided no proof that "previously provided" documents/information fully and specifically satisfy Interrogatories, Set II.
(14) Set II, Nos. 26 and 27: Respondent claims these Interrogatories are overbroad and the information was previously provided. These objections should be
dismissed for the reasons set forth in Responses (1), (2) (4), (7) (8), (12) and (13) and in Category 1, 2, and 3 Objections, above. To the contrary, these Interrogatories are relevant and go directly to seminal issues in this case. The requested information relate to complaints and billing disputes, which continue to be the subject of these proceedings. Further, Complainants disagree that the information was previously provided and provided in a manner that specifically and fully satisfies the requirements of Sections 5.321 and 5.342 .
(15) Set II, Nos. 28, 29, 30 and 31: In these Objections, Respondent claims the Interrogatories "rises to the level of a management audit and not that of the customer dispute issues raised by the Complainant". Respondent also claims that the testimony to date is only on a few disputed issues with bills. These objections are disingenuous and improper. The Interrogatorics seek information that is not beyond the scope of these proceedings. The testimony in the first set of hearings shows repeated behavior at various levels of PGW that arguably violates the tariff and applicable laws and regulations, regarding service and rates by a public utility. Complainants stated they intend to request the issuance of a penalty against PGW. Training information will confirm whether the individual employees are acting ulira vires or whether PGW has a system-wide problem with its bills/payments/collections. This issue is discussed in greater detail in the Category 4 Objection section on pages 8-9, above.
(16) Set II, No. 32. Respondent claims that this Interrogatory is burdensome and overbroad because it seeks names of all PGW employces responsible for applying Complainants payments to its accounts and that the system is "automated". Nevertheless, certain persons are authorized or have been authorized to adjust

Complainants' accounts. If certain individuals have/did have this authority at PGW, then those names should be provided. Billing may be automated, but an adjustment to an account or the application of a payment to an account is decided by a person of particular authority. The Interrogatory seeks the names of those authorized to make and then implement these adjustments and applications of payments, accounts, meters, etc.
(17) Set II, Nos. 33 and 34: Respondent claims these Interrogatories are overbroad and burdensome and the information was previously provided. These objections should be dismissed for the reasons set forth in Responses (1), (2), (4), (7) and (8) and in Category 1, 2, and 3 Objections, above. Further, PGW objects that the Interrogatories seek the "'methodology used in by Respondent, to calculate and apply charges for 'makeup' bills for or relations to all or any Customer Accounts'." As discussed, above, and as applicable here, the specific requested information was not previously provided and if so, then Respondent should produce and show how those responses specifically and fully respond to the Interrogatories, Set II, here. Respondents have not done so, because the "previously provided" information does not fully and specifically respond as required by the applicable discovery rules and laws. Complainant seeks relevant information on and of an accounting, a payment/billing history of each such debt, and a statement of the basis and methods of calculating the bills/payments. Complainants argue that PGW did not comply with the tariffs in its service and rates. Looking up the applicable tariff will show what PGW "ought to do" to comply with the tariff. The Interrogatories seek information on what PGW actually did in its bills and billing. If the internal calculations and algorithms are incorrect, then PGW subjected the customer to paying more for gas usage than permitted under the tariff. It is relevant to
these proceedings that PGW explain the basis for its calculations, so that the customer and the Commission can confirm whether PGW is acting in accordance with the tariff or not. How can it be burdensome for PGW to explain the basis of its bills/debt claims/charges, unless PGW has no good faith basis or reasonable explanation for these bills and charges!
(18) Set II, Nos. 35, 36 and 37: Respondent claims these

Interrogatories are overbroad and burdensome and the information was previously provided. These objections should be dismissed for the reasons set forth in Responses (1), (2), (4), (7), (8), (9) and (11) and in Category 1, 2, 3, and 5 Objections, above. Further, PGW objects that the Interrogatories seek an explanation for the methodology and calculation of the interest on bills, payments, gas usage debts, and resulting arrearages-including those underlying outstanding liens. As discussed, above, and as applicable here, the specific requested information was not previously provided and if so, then Respondent should produce and show how those responses specifically and fully respond to the Interrogatories, Set II, here. Respondents have not done so, because the "previously provided" information does not fully and specifically respond as required by the applicable discovery rules and laws. Further, to the contrary, the calculation of the debt and required/requested payments underlying the liens are within the purview of the Commission. We are not asking the Commission to rule on whether PGW can impose a lien. We are asking for an accounting, a payment/billing history of each such debt. To do otherwise is to run the risk that the internal calculations and algorithms are incorrect and subject the customer to paying more for gas usage or intercst than permitted under the tariff. This is a critical issue in this case-as one of the disputes is whether PGW is
charging the correct amount of interest on "open accounts" that are subject to a municipal lien. It is relevant to these proceedings that PGW explain the basis and methodology for its calculations, so that the customer and the Commission can confirm whether PGW is acting in accordance with the tariff or not. How can it be burdensome for PGW to explain the basis of its bills/debt claims/charges, unless PGW has no good faith basis or reasonable explanation for these charges! PGW should show how and why the bills are accurate, what data is used and how was the tariff applied.
(19) Set II, No. 38: These objections should be dismissed for the reasons set forth in Responses (1), (2), (4), (7), (8), (9) and (11) and in Category 1, 2, 3, and 5 Objections, above. The rationale is also set forth in Response (18) above. Essentially, the Objections would require Claimants to assume that all information on every bill is correct and complete. But the statements of accounts show that PGW makes adjustments to the accounts from time to time for various reasons, from the imposition of interest to "restoring" a removed charge to "re-applying" a "lost" payment. Reading the bill does not fully and specifically provide the information required in the Interrogatories, Set II. Under oath/at the hearings, PGW employees admitted to making mistakes and admitted to later releasing liens that were previously satisfied. Complainants cannot and the discovery rules do not require such "leaps of faith" in reviewing the accuracy of Respondent's bills and billing. Further, it should not be burdensome to explain the basis for and why a public utility seeks payment on a debt from the customer.
(20) Set II, No. 39: This objection seeks information on how debts for liens deemed satisfied were calculated because the liens may cover open or overlapping periods and may cover gas usage periods that are related to or the subject of the current
proceedings. If the underlying debts were not properly calculated, then the debts claimed by PGW on the current matters may actually be less than claimed. If so, this information goes to several dispositive issues in this matter: whether PGW properly calculated Complainants bills, applied their payments, and whether and the amount of refunds owed and due to Complainants, now. The Commission has jurisdiction over these billing/payment issues. This Objection should be dismissed for the foregoing reasons.
(21) Set II, No. 40: Interrogatory \#40 seeks information and basic contact information on the parties or individuals who have relevant information and knowledge of the accounting practices of PGW as related to the debts which are the subject of these proceedings. Home addresses and telephone numbers are needed as these individuals may leave or have left PGW and Complainants must be able to contact these individuals, if needed, in connection with these matters. For example, a principal witness in the first set of hearings is John Dunn, who no longer works at PGW, but who has relevant and important personal information and knowledge of key facts in these cases. Complainants will agree to keep all such contact information confidential and to only use it in connection with PGW proceedings. The age of the parties is sought to confirm that the responses are prepared by those who have the capacity to answer; Respondent may simply state the individual is of majority age. Finally, it is not burdensome to provide a list of names: if Respondent provides the names of those who prepared the responses in a logical and organized matter, then essentially, it will be providing the requested "list" information and complying with 52 Pa . Code Section 5.321 (c) and 52 Pa . Code Section 5.342.
(22) Set II, Nos. 42 and 43: Respondent objects to these Interrogatories because Respondent previously provided the names AND Respondent will provide the names later in prefiled testimony; these two "reasons" are completely contradictory. Either the "previously provided" information responds to Interrogatories Nos. 42 and 43 or not. Respondent also objects because its list of exhibits is not finalized. The discovery rules require a party to provide such evidence as currently in its possession. All expert witnesses and related exhibits that have been identified should be provided. Further, while the list of witnesses was presented in a matrix, the matrix does not fully and specifically respond to the Interrogatories, Set II, as required by 52 Pa . Code Section 5.321 (c) and 52 Pa . Code Section 5.342. Finally, if Respondent fully and specifically responds to these Interrogatories, then a list of the request information will be generated as a logical part of these responses---and it would not be burdensome to do so.
(23) Set II, No. 44. Respondent objects to a request for documents that will be introduced at hearings as "previously given" or "going to be given as prefiled testimony". Respondent, however, provides no case or statutory law to support the implied conclusion that one can ignore a discovery request because the information will be provided later. To the contrary, discovery is conducted outside of and separate from the hearing and trial. In fact, the discovery rules specifically state that one may obtain information in discovery, which may not or is not admissible at trial, but may lead to admissible, relevant evidence. See 52 Pa. Code Section 5.321 (c). Complainants do not have to wait for prefiled testimony to satisfy its discovery requests. The October 2, 2013 Order only related to exhibits to be presented at the hearing. Whether Respondent chooses to use the documents produced in discovery as exhibits later is a separate issue
and has no bearing on the duty to respond fully and specifically to these Interrogatories, Set II, now. Similarly, Respondent failed to show how its "previously provided" "discovery" fully and specifically responds to the Interrogatories, Set II, today. It does not and Complainants demand strict proof that such information was previously provided.
7. Pursuant to 52 Pa . Code Section 5.342 and other applicable case and statutory law, Complainants respectfully request that this Commission compel Respondents to answer said Interrogatories.

## 111. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Complainants respectfully request Your Honor and the Commission:
(1) grant this Motion to Compel;
(2) dismiss PGW's Objections to Set II, Interrogatories 1-40 and 42-44;
(3) compel PGW to answer said Interrogatories and produce full and complete answers and to provide all information requested in Set II, Interrogatories 1 through 44, which were due on 10/29/2013, immediately, and no more than two (2) days of said Order; and
(4) grant any other relief deemed appropriate, including, but not limited to imposing appropriate sanctions for failing to answer the Set II, Interrogatories, by October 29, 2013, as originally due.

Date: October 29, 2013
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OCT 292013

## PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION SECRETARY'S BUREAU

## EXHIBIT "A"

October 21, 2013
Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265

Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
Re: SBG Management Services, Inc v. PGW, Docket No. C - 2012-2304183, C -2012-2304215, C-2012-2304324, C - 2012-2304167, C-2012-2304303, C -2012-2308454, C-2012-2308462, C - 2012-2308465, and C-2012-2334253

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:
Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code $\S \S 1.12$ and $5.342(\mathrm{~d})(1)$, the Philadelphia Gas Works ("PGW") hereby objects timely to the following Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Set II of the Complainants addressed to PGW , that the Complainants, through their counsel have propounded upon PGW in the above captioned matter by letter dated October 9, 2013

If additional information is required, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned. Thank you for your assistance in the matter.

Sincerely,


## Enclosure

```
cc: Administrative Law Judge Eranda Vero (email)
    Francine Thornton Boone, Esq. (email)
    Mr. Philip Pulley (email)
    Ms. Kathy Treadwell (email)
    Anne Marie Cromley (PGW Mail)
    Linda Pereira (PGW Mail)
```



```
SBG Management Services, Inc. / :
Marchwood Realty,
                                    Complainant
    v.
Philadelphia Gas Works,
    Respondent
SBG Management Services, Inc. I
Oak Lane Realty Co., LP,
    Complainant
    v.
Philadelphia Gas Works,
    Respondent :
SBG Management Services, Inc. I :
Fern Rock Realty,
    Complainant
    v.
Philadelphia Gas Works,
    Respondent :
SBG Management Services, Inc. / :
SBG Management Services, Inc. / :
SBG Management Services, Inc. / :
SBG Management Services, Inc. / :
SBG Management Services, Inc. / :
SBG Management Services, Inc. / :
Docket No. C - 2012-2308454
Docket No. C - 2012-2308462
Docket No. C - 2012-2308465
Philadelphia Gas Works'
Objections to the Complainants' Discovery Requests: Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents, Set II
Pursuant to 52 Pa . Code \(\S \S 1.12\) and \(5.342(\mathrm{~d})(1)\), the Philadelphia Gas Works ("PGW") hereby objects timely to the following Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Set II of the Complainants addressed to PGW, that the Complainants, through their counsel have propounded upon PGW in the above captioned matter by letter dated October 9, 2013, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A," and is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth.
```


## PGW's Objections


#### Abstract

Set II, No. 1 PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 1, which seeks a listing of all persons providing information responding to Set II and seeks specific information including, "alias names", "home addresses", "home telephone numbers" and "age" of those preparing the answers to Set II. (See Appendix "A")

PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad in that it is beyond the scope of these proceedings. It seeks the home address, telephone number age of the persons (PGW employees) that provide information to answer Set II. PGW's responses will comply with the requirements of 52 Pa . Code $\S 5.342(2)$ and will identify the name and position (PGW title) of the person preparing the answer to the request on the answer to each request. More information about the home address is beyond the scope of these proceedings. Further to the extent request No. 1 seeks to have a list recreated that contains all who prepared answer to Set II, this request is also burdensome. As the Complainants may make a list from the information contained on each of the answers, it is unnecessarily burdensome for PGW to create such a list for the Complainants.


## Set II, No. 2

PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad in that it is beyond the scope of these proceedings. To the extent request No. 2 seeks to have a list recreated that contains all documents contained in the answers to Set II, this request is also burdensome. (See Appendix " $A$ ") As the Complainants may make a list from the information contained on each of the answers, it is unnecessarily burdensome for PGW to create such a list for the Complainants.

Set II, No. 3

Set II, No. 3 requests that each document "identified and in Respondent's possession..." that are contained in answers to Set II, PGW is requested to produce the
document or make available inspection. PGW objects to this Interrogatory, as it is overbroad, as written. The making available of documents in discovery for inspection is governed by 52 Pa . Code §5.349.

## Set II, No. 4

Similar to its objection to Set II, No. 1, PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 4, which seeks a listing of all persons "known to Respondent to have personal knowledge of any facts or issues involved in this law suit,..." and seeks specific information including, "alias names", "home addresses", "home telephone numbers" and "age" of those who have knowledge about these matters. (See Appendix " $A$ ")

PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad in that it is beyond the scope of these proceedings. It seeks the home address, telephone number age of the persons whether PGW employees or not, that have personal knowledge of these matter. More information is beyond the scope of these proceedings. Further to the extent request No. 4 seeks to have a list recreated that contains all who prepared answer to Set II, and have knowledge about these matters is also burdensome. As the Complainants may make a list from the information contained on each of the answers, it is unnecessarily burdensome for PGW to create such a list for the Complainants.

## Set II, No. 5

PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad and seems to request information that has been previously provided in discovery 11 months ago. Request No. 5 seeks documents "which are utilized to manage the Complainant's Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located..." at the Complainant's properties generally and those referred to in the Set II, Exhibits A-1 through - 8. (See Appendix "A") As the Complainants conducted discovery previously, PGW has provided information that is contained in its Billing Credit and Collection System (BCCS) and its other database containing metering information. PGW has provided extensive account (including "SA" information) and meter records to the Complainants. The last of this information was provided in response to discovery
requests under cover letter dated January 31, 2013 to counsel of record Scott H . Debroff, Esq. of Rhoads \& Simon LLP. To the extent that the Complainants seek to duplicate this information is unnecessarily burdensome for PGW.

## Set II, Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10

PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad requests information that is beyond the scope of these proceedings. Request Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 seek information concerning the documents and persons involved in training for credit and collection matters at PGW. These requests rise to the level of a management/training audit and not that of the customer dispute issues raised by the Complainant. (See Appendix "A") The issues that have been raised in these matters involve some billing disputes dating back several years, the management of commercial account by a particular unit for that purpose and the legally applicable late payment charges/interest rate. Even the testimony provided the Complainants thus far have been confined to specific identified disputes with bills and the Complainants relationship with a particular unit designed for the Complainants commercial accounts. These requests for training information (materials, content, time and duration) on all debt collection activities are beyond the scope of these proceedings.

## Set II, No. 11, 12 and 13

PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 11, which requests description of "...forms of communication or attempted communication with person or other third parties in connection with the collections of accounts..." PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad and seems to request information that has been previously provided in discovery months ago and during the course of the hearings of these proceedings. Request Nos. 11, 12 and 13 seek information pertaining to the Complainant's properties generally and those referred to in the Set II, Exhibits A-1 through - 8. (See Appendix "A") As the Complainants conducted discovery previously, PGW has provided information that is contained in its Billing Credit and Collection System (BCCS) and its other database containing metering information. PGW has provided extensive account (including "SA" information) and meter records to the

Complainants. The last of this information was provided in response to discovery requests under cover letter dated January 31, 2013 to counsel of record Scott H. Debroff, Esq. of Rhoads \& Simon LLP. To the extent that the Complainants seek to duplicate this information is unnecessarily burdensome for PGW.

The issues that have been raised in these matters involve some billing disputes dating back several years, the management of commercial account by a particular unit for that purpose and the legally applicable late payment charges/interest rate. Even the testimony provided the Complainants thus far have been confined to specific identified disputes with bills and the Complainants relationship with a particular unit designed for the Complainants commercial accounts. These requests for training information (materials, content, time and duration) on all debt collection activities are beyond the scope of these proceedings

## Set II, No. 14, 15 and 16

PGW objects to Set II discovery request Nos. 14, 15 and 16 which seeks, among other things, to identify any or all of the Respondent's notes or telephone calls "... with any person from whom they collection debt, and what steps are taken to preserve these recordings." ..." PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad and seems to request information that has been previously provided in discovery months ago and during the course of the hearings of these proceedings. PGW has provided to the Complainants "Contacts" information for each of their accounts in discovery and during the course of testimony. To the extent it can, PGW will provide an explanation of the policies for recording telephone case made to the Customer Service Representatives and the time for which they kept.

The issues that have been raised in these matters involve some billing disputes dating back several years, the management of commercial account by a particular unit for that purpose and the legally applicable late payment charges/interest rate. Even the testimony provided the Complainants thus far have been confined to specific identified disputes with bills and the Complainants relationship with a particular unit designed for the Complainants commercial accounts. Request No. 14, 15 and 16 seek to expand inquiry of these beyond the scope of these proceedings.

Set II, No. 17, 18 and 19
PGW objects to Set II discovery request Nos. 17, 18 and 19 which seek a chronological description of "...the process, the origins, the events, and the circumstances under which the Complainants incurred the arrearages, if any allege due by Respondent, sufficient to warrant the imposition of municipal liens..." and other account information.

PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad, requests an explanation of a resulting situation with the Complainants' accounts that is beyond the Commission's jurisdiction (municipal liens) and seems to request information that has been previously provided in discovery months ago and during the course of the hearings of these proceedings. Request Nos. 17, 18 and 19 seek information pertaining to the Complainant's properties generally and those referred to in the Set II, Exhibits A-1 through - 8. (See Appendix "A") As the Complainants conducted discovery previously, PGW has provided information that is contained in its Billing Credit and Collection System (BCCS) and its other database containing metering information. PGW has provided extensive statement of account (including "SA") information and meter records to the Complainants. The last of this information was provided in response to discovery requests under cover letter dated January 31, 2013 to counsel of record Scott H. Debroff, Esq. of Rhoads \& Simon LLP.

## Set II, No. 20

PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 20, which seeks to describe "each instance of a mistake, error or event requiring a correction by Respondent for which Respondent was responsible..." PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad and burdensome, as it requests an explanation of every mistake on the Complainants' accounts including the accounts appearing on Set II, Exhibit "A-1" through "A-8". To the extent it has provided testimony in these proceedings, PGW has pointed out where there was an error made. Further, PGW's pre-filed testimony in the remaining consolidated proceedings will include an explanation of the account to include whether PGW found any errors.

Set II, No. 21
PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 21, which seeks to describe in detail "each mathematical method, algebraic mean, algorithm and method of calculation used by Respondent to calculate or confirm the accuracy of Complainant's utility bills..." (See Appendix "A") PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad and seems to request information that has been previously provided in discovery 11 months ago. Request No. 21 seeks information that is available to the Complainants' the rates at which the Complainant is charged and the volumes of gas that the Complainants have been billed are readily available on the Complainants' bills and on the documents previously provided in discovery. The Complainants have access to the PGW Tariff as it is contained for public consumption in the PGW website. As the Complainants conducted discovery previously, PGW has provided extensive billing information that is contained in its Billing Credit and Collection System (BCCS). Such information may be derived by the Complainant.

## Set II, No. 22, 23, 24

PGW objects to Set II discovery request Nos. 22, 23 and 24 which request that PGW describe each communication, or attempted communication, between the Respondents and Complainants, made in connection with the collection, billing and disputes involving the Complainants' Customer Accounts. PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad and seems to request information that has been previously provided in discovery months ago and during the course of the hearings of these proceedings. PGW has provided to the Complainants "Contacts" information for each of their accounts in discovery and during the course of testimony.

## Set II, No. 25

PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 25 , which seeks to identify and describe "... the manner and frequency in which Respondent maintains, repairs, inspects, tests, and ensures accuracy or utility meters.."

PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad, requests an explanation of a resulting situation with the Complainants' accounts that is beyond the Commission's jurisdiction (municipal liens) and seems to request information that has been previously provided in discovery months ago and during the course of the hearings of these proceedings. Request Nos. 17, 18 and 19 seek information pertaining to the Complainant's properties generally and those referred to in the Set II, Exhibits A-1 through - 8. (See Appendix "A") As the Complainants conducted discovery previously, PGW has provided information that is contained in its Billing Credit and Collection System (BCCS) and its other database containing metering information. PGW has provided extensive statement of account (including "SA") information and meter records to the Complainants. The last of this information was provided in response to discovery requests under cover letter dated January 31, 2013 to counsel of record Scott H. Debroff, Esq. of Rhoads \& Simon LLP.

The issues that have been raised in these matters involve some billing disputes dating back several years, the management of commercial account by a particular unit for that purpose and the legally applicable late payment charges/interest rate. Even the testimony provided the Complainants thus far have been confined to specific identified disputes with bills and the Complainants relationship with a particular unit designed for the Complainants commercial accounts. Request No. 25 seeks to expand inquiry of these beyond the scope of these proceedings by introducing new issues on metering practices.
$\frac{\text { Set II, Nos. } 26 \text { and } 27}{\quad \text { Similar to its objection to Set II, No. 25, PGW objects to Set II discovery request }}$ Nos. 26, and 27, which seeks to describe "any writings, utility reports, correspondence, letters, memorandums, emails communications, or any other documents Respondents sent, mailed, faxed to Complainants' or the Commission related to the ..." resolution of or filing of an Informal Complaint "including but not limited to the same as located in the books and records of Respondents Dispute Resolution Group...". PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad and seems to request information that has been previously provided in discovery months ago and during the course of the
hearings of these proceedings. PGW has provided to the Complainants "Contacts" information for each of their accounts in discovery and during the course of testimony.

Set 11, No. 28, 29, 30 and 31
PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 28, which seeks to describe "Respondent's system of accounts, its policies and practices pertaining to maintaining and ensuring accuracy of customer financial accounts...", No. 29 that seeks a description of PGW's ". . .automated collection policies and practices." (See Appendix "A") Request Nos. 28, 29, 30 and 31 rise to the level of a management audit and not that of the customer dispute issues raised by the Complainant. The issues that have been raised in these matters involve some billing disputes dating back several years, the management of commercial account by a particular unit for that purpose and the legally applicable late payment charges/interest rate. Even the testimony provided the Complainants thus far have been confined to specific identified disputes with bills and the Complainants relationship with a particular unit designed for the Complainants commercial accounts. These requests for explanations of the billing system of accounting activities are beyond the scope of these proceedings.

## Set II, No. 32

PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 32, which seeks a list of all Respondent employees responsible for applying Complainants' payments to the Customer Accounts. As PGW's billing payment and mail receipt is automated, this request for the identity of all PGW employees who are responsible for applying payments is burdensome beyond the scope of these proceedings.

Set II, No. 33 and No. 34
PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 33 and No. 34, which seek to describe "methodology used in by Respondent, to calculate and apply charges for "makeup" bills for or relations to all or any Customer Accounts." PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad and seems to request information that has been previously provided in discovery 11 months ago. Request Nos. 33 and

34 seek information that is available to the Complainants'. The rates at which the Complainant is charged and the volumes of gas that the Complainants have been billed are readily available on the Complainants' bills and on the documents previously provided in discovery. The Complainants have access to the PGW Tariff as it is contained for public consumption in the PGW website. As the Complainants conducted discovery previously, PGW has provided extensive billing information that is contained in its Billing Credit and Collection System (BCCS). Such information may be derived by the Complainant.

## Set II, No. 35, 36 and 37

PGW objects to Set II discovery request Nos. 35 and 36 which seek to describe "methodology used in by Respondent, to calculate and apply interest charges to Complainants' Customer Accounts where liens were filed..." PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad and seems to request information that has been previously provided in discovery 11 months ago. Request Nos. 33 and 34 seek information that is available to the Complainants'. The rates at which the Complainant is charged and the volumes of gas that the Complainants have been billed are readily available on the Complainants' bills and on the documents previously provided in discovery. The Complainants have access to the PGW Tariff as it is contained for public consumption in the PGW website. As the Complainants conducted discovery previously, PGW has provided extensive billing information that is contained in its Billing Credit and Collection System (BCCS) including the assessment of late payment charges. The Complainant has made its own attempt to derive such information and is included on the record of these proceedings. Further, PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad, requests an explanation of a resulting situation with the Complainants' accounts that is beyond the Commission's jurisdiction (municipal liens).

Set II, No. 38
PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 38, which seeks to describe "the billing period and gas usage period covered by each lien filed or imposed on any and all of Complainants' Customer Accounts..."

PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad and seems to request information that has been previously provided in discovery 11 months ago. Request No. 38 seeks information that is available to the Complainants'. The billing period at which the Complainant is charged and the volumes of gas that the Complainants have been billed are readily available on the Complainants' bills and on the documents previously provided in discovery. As the Complainants conducted discovery previously, PGW has provided extensive billing information that is contained in its Billing Credit and Collection System (BCCS). Such information may be derived by the Complainant. Further, PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is beyond the scope of these proceedings in that it requests an explanation of a resulting situation with the Complainants' accounts that is beyond the Commission's jurisdiction (municipal liens).

## Set II, No. 39

PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 39, which seeks to produces all documents the Respondent sent to the Commission and to Complainants indicate that any municipal lines on fuel have been marked satisfied.

PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is beyond the scope of these proceedings in that it requests an explanation of a resulting situation with the Complainants' accounts that is beyond the Commission's jurisdiction (municipal liens).

## Set II, No. 40

PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 40, which seeks to identify all persons known to Respondent to have knowledge of any facts or issues involved in the accounting practices with respect to Respondent PGW's system of accounts.

PGW objects to this discovery request on the grounds that it is overbroad in that it is beyond the scope of these proceedings. It seeks the home address, telephone
number age of the persons whether PGW employees or not, that have personal knowledge of these matter. More information is beyond the scope of these proceedings. Further to the extent request No. 40 seeks to have a list recreated that contains all who prepared answer to Set II, and have knowledge about these matters is also burdensome. As the Complainants may make a list from the information contained on each of the answers, it is unnecessarily burdensome for PGW to create such a list for the Complainants.

## Set II, No. 42 and No. 43

PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 42 and No. 43, which seeks to list all persons the Respondent, intends to call as an expert witness at a trial of this case. Such information has been provided previously to the Complainant or will be provided in connection with PGW's pre-filed testimony, the dead line for which has been set forth by Prehearing Order dated October 2, 2013. The listing of PGW witnesses and related information has not been finalized.

## Set II, No. 44

PGW objects to Set II discovery request No. 44, which seeks to describe "and provide copies of all exhibits Respondent may introduce at the hearing or trial of this matter." Such information has been provided previously to the Complainant or will be provided in connection with PGW's pre-filed testimony, the dead line for which has been set forth by Prehearing Order dated October 2, 2013. The listing of PGW exhibits has not been finalized.

WHEREFORE, for the reasons stated above, PGW respectfully requests that the Commission issue an order sustaining PGW's objections to the Complainants' discovery Set II.

October 21, 2013


## APPENDIX A

# SBG Management Services, Inc. 

P.O. Box 549 • Abington, PA 19001
®ロPhone 215.938.6665
Fax 215.938.7613

## VIA FIRST CLASS U.S. MAIL/OVERNIGHT MAIL

October 9, 2013
Laureto Farinas, Esquire
Senior Attorney, Philadelphia Gas
800 Montgomery Avenue, $4^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19122
Re: SBG Management Services, Inc. et al, v. Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW): Docket No. C-2012-2308465; Docket No. C-2012-2304183; Docket No. C-2012-2304215; Docket No. C-20122304167; Docket No. C-2012-2304303; Docket No. C-2012-2334253; Docket No. C-20122308462; Docket No. C-2012-2308465; and Docket No. C-2012-2308454.

Dear Mr. Farinas:
Enclosed please find the Complainants' Discovery Requests--Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents--that are being served upon the Respondents in the abovereferenced matters, as of today's date.

In accordance with the applicable rules, including 52 Pa . Code Sections 5.342(d) and 5.349(d), the interrogatories are to be answered in writing under oath and documents are to be furnished and served in hand upon the undersigned within twenty (20) days after service of these Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents, which is the time period prescribed by the applicable statute, for the above-referenced dockets.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me on 215-260-4562 or via email at fboone@sbgmanagement.com. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.


[^0]
# SBG Management Services, Inc. <br> P.O. Box 549 Abington, PA 19001 <br> * $\boldsymbol{\text { ® Phone } 2 1 5 . 9 3 8 . 6 6 6 5 ~ F a x ~} 215.938 .7613$ 

## VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL/OVERNIGHT MAIL

October 9, 2013
Ms. Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
P.O. Box 3265

Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
Re: SBG Management Services, Inc. et al, v. Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW): Docket No. C-2012-2308465; Docket No. C-2012-2304183; Docket No. C-2012-2304215; Docket No. C-20122304167; Docket No. C-2012-2304303; Docket No. C-2012-2334253; Docket No. C-20122308462; Docket No. C-2012-2308465; and Docket No. C-2012-2308454.

Dear Ms. Chiavetta:
Enclosed for filing with the Commission is an original and three copies of the Certificate of Service for Discovery requests for Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents, that have been served upon the Respondent and all active parties, in the above-referenced matters, as of today's date.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me on 215-260-4562 or via email at fboone@sbgmanagement.com. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.


Francine Thomson Boone, Esquire
Counsel for Complainants
cc:

Francine Thornton Boone, Esquire
SBG Property Management Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 549

Abington, PA 19001
(215) 260-4562
fax: (215) 938-7613
email: fboone@sbgmanagement.com
Attorney I.D. No. 45118

Attorney for Complainants

## Attor for Complainant

## COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

## SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./

 COLONIAL GARDEN REALTY, LP: DOCKET NO. C-2012-2304183

> V.

PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS
Respondent
SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./ FAIRMOUNT REALTY
: DOCKET NO. C-2012-2304215 Complainant

> V.

PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS Respondent

SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./
SIMON GARDENS REALTY, LP : DOCKET NO. C-2012-2304324
Complainant

> V.

PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS
Respondent
SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./
ELRAE GARDEN REALTY, LP
: DOCKET NO. C-2012-2304167
Complainant
V.

PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS
Respondent
SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./
MARSHALL SQUARE REALTY, LP ..... : DOCKET NO. C-2012-2304303Complainant
V.
PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKSRespondent
SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./ MARCHWOOD REALTY
Complainant
V.
PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKSRespondent
SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./ OAK LANE REALTY CO., LP ..... : DOCKET NO. C-2012-2308462
V.
PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS
Respondent
SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./
FERN ROCK REALTY: DOCKET NO. C-2012-2308465
Complainant
V.
PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS
Respondent
SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./
COLONIAL GARDEN REALTY, LP ..... : DOCKET NO. C-2012-2334253
Complainant
V.
PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS
Respondent

I, FRANCINE THORNTON BOONE, ESQUIRE, do hereby certify that I have served the foregoing Discovery Requests: Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents for Complainants in the above-referenced matter, via first class, U.S. mail and/or by hand-delivery on this day to all the parties as listed below:

Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW)
\% Mr. Laureto Farinas, Esquire Senior Counsel
800 W. Montgomery Avenue, 4th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19122
Mr. Phil Pulley and Ms, Kathy Treadwell
SBG Management Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 459, Abington, PA 19001

Date: October 9, 2013

For Respondent (First Class U.S. Mail)

For Complainants (by hand)
BY: Cultuli:
Frandine Thomton Boone, Esquire
(Attorney I.D. No. 45118)
Attomey for Complainants,
SBG Management Services, Inc., et al
702 N. Marshall Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
T: (215) 260-4562

# SBG Management Services, Inc. <br> P.O. Box 549 Abington, PA 19001 <br> - $\square$ Phone 215.938.6665 Fax 215.938.7613 

## VIA FIRST CLASS USS. MAIL/OVERNIGHT MAIL

October 9, 2013
Laureto Farinas, Esquire
Senior Attorney, Philadelphia Gas
800 Montgomery Avenue, $4^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19122
Re: SBG Management Services, Inc. et al, v. Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW): Docket No. C-2012-2308465; Docket No. C-2012-2304183; Docket No. C-2012-2304215; Docket No. C-20122304167; Docket No. C-2012-2304303; Docket No. C-2012-2334253; Docket No. C-20122308462; Docket No: C-2012-2308465; and Docket No. C-2012-2308454.

Dear Mr. Farinas:
Enclosed please find the Complainants' Discovery Requests--Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents--that are being served upon the Respondents in the abovereferenced matters, as of today's date.

In accordance with the applicable rules, including 52 Pa . Code Sections 5.342 (d) and 5.349(d), the interrogatories are to be answered in writing under oath and documents are to be furnished and served in hand upon the undersigned within twenty (20) days after service of these Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents, which is the time period prescribed by the applicable statute, for the above-referenced dockets.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me on 215-260-4562 or via email at fboone@sbgmanagement.com. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.


Francine Thornton Boone, Esquire
Counsel for Complainants
cc: Rosemary Chiavetti, Secretary, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (who attachments) Phil Pulley (for Complainants) Kathy Treadwell (for Complainants)
Francine Thornton Boone, Esquire Attorney for Complainants
SBG Property Management Services, Inc.
702 N. Marshall Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
(215) 260-4562fax: (215) 938-7613
email: Booneft@aol.com
Attorney I.D. No. 45118
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIAPENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./
COLONIAL GARDEN REALTY, LP ..... : DOCKET NO. C-2012-2304183 Complainant
V.
PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS
Respondent
SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./
FAIRMOUNT REALTY ..... : DOCKET NO. C-2012-2304215
Complainant
V.
PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS
Respondent
SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./
SIMON GARDENS REALTY, LP ..... : DOCKET NO. C-2012-2304324
Complainant
V.
PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS ..... :
Respondent
SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./
ELRAE GARDEN REALTY, LP ..... : DOCKET NO. C-2012-2304167
Complainant
V.
PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS
Respondent
SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./
MARSHALL SQUARE REALTY, LP: DOCKET NO. C-2012-2304303
Complainant
V.

| PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS <br> Respondent | $:$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC./ |  |
| MARCHWOOD REALTY |  |
| Complainant |  |$\quad$ : DOCKET NO. C-2012-2308454

Respondent

TO: RESPONDENTS
PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS (PGW)
\% MR. LAURETO FARINAS, ESQ.
SENIOR ATTORNEY, PGW
800 W. Montgomery Avenue, 4th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19122
COMPLAINANTS', SBG MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC., COLONIAL GARDEN REALTY
CO. (1), COLONIAL GARDEN REALTY CO. (II), FAIRMOUNT REALTY CO., SIMON
GARDENS, ELRAE GARDEN REALTY, MARCHWOOD REALTY, FERNROCK REALTY, OAK LANE REALTY CO., L.P., AND MARSHALL SQUARE REALTY,

# REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND INTERROGATORIES ADDRESSED TO RESPONDENT PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS, SET II 


#### Abstract

Pursuant to 52 Pa . Code Sections $5.341,5.342$ and 5.349 and the applicable Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure, Colonial Garden Realty Co. (I) ("Colonial I), Colonial Garden Realty Co. (II) ("Colonial II") (the two Colonial cases, hereafter collectively referred to as, "Colonial"), SBG Management Services, Inc. ("SBG"), Fairmount Realty Co. ("Fairmount"), Simon Gardens ("Simon"), Elrae Garden Reaity ("Elrae"), Marchwood Realty ("Marchwood"), Fernrock Realty ("Femrock"), Oak Lane Realty Co., L.P. ("Oak Lane"), and Marshall Square Realty ("Marshall") (hereafter, individually "Complainant" and collectively, "Complainants") hereby propound the following interrogatories and requests for documents upon Philadelphia Gas Works ("Respondent" or "PGW") to be answered by those officers, employees or agents of PGW as may be cognizant of the requested information and who are authorized to answer on behalf of PGW. These interrogatories and requests for documents are propounded on a continuing basis so as to require you to submit supplemental answers and/or documents should additional information become known that would have been includable in your answers and document production had they been known or available, or should information and/or documents supplied in the answers or production prove to be incorrect or incomplete and to supply the same within the time periods required by the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure and Section 5 of Chapter 52 of the Pennsylvania Code. Complainants reserve the right to propound additional interrogatories and to request additional documents as and if additional information is required. In accordance with 52 Pa . Code Sections 5.342 (d) and 5.349 (d), the interrogatories are to be answered in writing under oath and documents are to be furnished and served in hand upon the undersigned within twenty (20) days after service of these Interrogatories and Requests for Production, which is the time period prescribed by the applicable statutes, for the above-referenced dockets.


These Interrogatories are addressed to you as a party to this action; your answers shall be based upon information known to you or in the possession, custody or control of you, your attomey or other representative acting on your behalf whether in preparation for litigation or otherwise. These Interrogatories must be answered completely and specifically by you in writing and must be verified. The fact that
investigation is continuing or that discovery is not complete shall not be used as an excuse for failure to answer each interrogatory as completely as possible. The omission of any name, fact, or other item of information from the Answers shall be deemed a representation that such name, fact, or other item was not known to Respondent, their counsel, or other representatives at the time of service of the Answers.

## Additional Instructions

1. Any references to "Respondent", "Respondents", "Respondent's" or "Respondent(s)" shall be treated as referring to Philadelphia Gas Works ("PGW") as named within this lawsuit, individually and collectively, as may be appropriate.
2. This request applies to all documents in Respondent's possession, custody or control or in the possession, custody or control of persons acting or purporting to act on your behalf, including, but not limited to, your present and former managers, officers, directors, agents, servants, contractors, employees, accountants, attorneys, investigators, indemnitors, insurers, consultants and sureties.
3. If any objection is made to any of the following interrogatories or discovery requests, the Respondent shall make any such objection and state the relevant legal basis for such objection. If any objection is made based upon a claim of privilege as to any response, Respondent shall state the legal basis for the privilege Respondent is invoking and provide a detailed privilege log to support the invocation of such privilege.
4. Each and every interrogatory and discovery request herein is deemed continuing in nature pursuant to the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure and Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission ("Commission"), and Respondents are obligated to reasonably amend and provide any updated information that renders the responses to one or more of these interrogatories and discovery requests, incomplete or inaccurate, and serve those amended responses upon the undersigned Complainants' counsel.
5. Complainants at its/their expense requests that the documents be produced and made available for this inspection at Complainants' office of counsel located at 1095 Rydal Rd., Jenkintown, PA 19046, or at such office of the Respondent as may be the location of any of the documents requested, during
normal business hours, and with the least possible disruption to the ordinary course of Respondent's duties and responsibilities.
6. Complainants further requests that this inspection be permitted by Respondents immediately after Respondents' response to this request has been filed, and that Complainants' attorney be permitted to remove from Respondent's custody such documents as they may desire to copy, on the understanding that Complainants' attomeys will be responsible for such documents so long as they are in their possession, that copying will be done at Complainants' expense, and that the documents will be promptly returned after copying has been completed.
7. These interrogatories and discovery requests are intended to cover all documents in Respondent's possession, or subject to their custody and control, regardless of location. If there are no such documents, please so state. If there are such documents, please list and mark appended documents responsive to each request.
8. Each interrogatory propounded herein should be answered upon Respondent's entire knowledge from all sources and all information in Respondent's possession or otherwise available to Respondent, including information from Respondent's officers, employees, agents, representatives or consultants and information which is known by each of them. An incomplete or evasive answer is deemed a failure to answer.
9. If any answer is qualified, Respondent shall state specifically the terms of each qualification and the reasons for it. If an interrogatory cannot be answered in full, state the part which can be answered and answer the same in full to the extent possible; state further and specifically the reason(s) why the remainder cannot be answered.
10. If any interrogatory may be answered fully by a document, the document may be attached in lieu of an answer if the document is marked to refer to the Interrogatory to which it responds.
11. For purpose of these requests, a statement is: (a) a written statement signed or otherwise adopted or approved by the person making it, or (b) stenographic, mechanical, electrical, or other recording,
or a transcription thereof, which is a substantially verbatim recital of an oral statement by the person making it and contemporaneously recorded.
12. Fully describe any documents, which are being withheld from production and the reasons why any such documents have been withheld.
13. Submit an affidavit from the responding party stating that there has been full compliance with this request.
14. Unless otherwise indicated, the time period for all requests is from the initiation of gas service for each Complainant at each Subject Property (as defined below), to the present.
15. If you object to any part of an interrogatory or request, answer all parts of such interrogatories or requests to which you do not object, and as to each part to which you do object, separately set forth the specific basis for the objection.
16. If you claim any form of privilege or other protection from disclosure as a ground for withholding information responsive to an interrogatory or request for production or any part thereof, contained in a non-written communication, state the following with respect to the non-written communication:
(i) the date thereof;
(ii) the identity of each of the participants in the non-written communication;
(iii) the identity of each person present during all or any part of the non-written communication;
(iv) a description of the non-written communication which is sufficient to identify the particular communication without revealing the information for which a privilege or protection from nondisclosure is claimed;
(v) the nature of your claim of non-discoverability (e.g. attorney-client privilege); and
(vi) each and every fact on which you rest your claim of privilege or other protection from disclosure, stated with sufficient specificity to permit Complainants to make a full determination as to whether your claim is valid.
best information you have on the subject and identify every person you believe to have the required information.
17. The singular form of a noun or pronoun shall be considered to include within its meaning the plural form of the noun or pronoun, and vice-versa; the masculine form of a pronoun shall be considered to include also within its meaning the feminine and neuter forms of the pronoun, and vice versa; and the use of any tense of any verb shall be considered to include also within its meaning all other tenses of the verb. In each instance, the interrogatory or request shall be construed so as to require the most inclusive answer or production.
18. Please attach written material to any answer for which written material is requested and/or available. If such written material is not available, state where it may be obtained. Label the written material with the number of the interrogatory to which it pertains.
19. On each Interrogatory response list the name and title of the person or persons who prepared the response or who is responsible for the information contained therein.
20. PURSUANT TO THE E-DISCOVERY REQUIREMENTS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 4009.1, COMPLAINANT SPECIFICALLY DEMANDS HEREIN THAT ALL DISCOVERY DOCUMENTS THAT CAN BE PRODUCED IN READABLE AND FULLY SEARCHABLE ELECTRONIC FORMAT BE PRODUCED IN THAT FORMAT. "PRINT SCREENS," PRINTOUTS, OR OTHER MANUALLY PRODUCED COPIES OF ELECTRONIC DATA ARE UNACCEPTABLE.

## Definitions

As used in these Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents, the following terms have the meaning as set forth below:

1. The terms "Complainant" or "Complainants" means Colonial Garden Realty Co. (I) ("Colonial I), Colonial Garden Reaty Co. (II) ("Colonial II") (the two Colonial cases, hereafter collectively referred to as, "Colonial"), SBG Management Services, Inc. ("SBG"), Fairmount Realty Co. ("Fairmount"), Simon Gardens ("Simon"), Elrae Garden Realty ("Elrae"), Marchwood Realty ("Marchwood"), Fernrock

Realty ("Femrock"), Oak Lane Realty Co., L.P. ("Oak Lane"), and Marshall Square Realty ("Marshall"), and any affiliate or related entity, unless the context indicates otherwise (hereafter, individually "Complainant" and all collectively, "Complainants")
2. The term "Respondent" or "You" means the Respondent, Philadelphia Gas Works, PGW, and its agents, representatives, employees, contractors, officers, directors, related parties, and/or counsel of PGW, in interest.
3. "Address" means the present or last known street name and number, city or town, state and zip code.
4. "Customer Account(s)" as used herein shall mean and include all SBG and Non-tenant accounts, customer'accounts, "SA" accounts or "SA" metered accounts and numbers, former and current meters and meter numbers for which Complainants have been held legally responsible for payment of bills rendered for natural gas service by the Respondents, at the Subject Property and/or Subject Properties as defined herein, including but not limited to the "Disputed Transactions, as defined herein, and as set forth as highlighted transactions on corresponding Exhibits "A-1" (for Colonial), "A-2" (for Elrae), "A-3" (for Fairmount), "A-4" (for Fernrock), "A-5" (for Marchwood), "A-6" (for Marshall), "A7" (for Oak Lane), and "A-8" (for Simon), (collectively, "Exhibits 'A-1' through 'A-8"), and involving such subjects such as credit determinations, deposit requirements, the accuracy of meter readings or bill amounts, interest charges imposed or whether the proper party has been properly charged for service.
5. "Disputed Transactions" refers to any and all disputes (including those as defined in accordance with 52 Pa . Code §56.2), questions, complaints, and/or inquiries regarding Customer Accounts and includes, but is not limited to those transactions identified on PGW's Statement of Account and which are now identified by number as Disputed Transactions for each Subject Property in Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8' for Complainants, SBG, Colonial, Fairmount, Simon, Elrae, Marchwood, Fernrock, Oak Lane, and Marshall.
6. "Documents": As used in these interrogatories and discovery requests, the term "document" or "documents", has the same meaning and scope as in Rule 4009 of the Pennsylvania Rules
c. The names and present addresses of the person or persons who prepared the document and of the signers and addressors of the document;
d. The name of the employer or principal whom the signers, addressers and preparers were representing;
e. The present location of the document;
f. The name and current business and home addresses of the present custodian of the original document, and any copies of it;
g. A summary of the contents of the document; and
h. If the original document is no longer in Respondent's possession or was destroyed, state the actual or approximate date of such disposition and reason for or circumstances surrounding as well as the authorization for such disposition;
i. With respect to any non-written communication or "oral communication", the term "identify" or "identity" shall mean to state the identity of the natural person(s) making and receiving the communication, their respective principals or employers at the time of the communication, and the topic or subject matter of the communication.
8. The term "including" means "including, but not limited to."
9. "List", "describe", "explain", "specify", or "state" means to set forth fully, in detail, and unambiguously each and every fact of which Respondent has knowledge, which is relevant to the answer called for by the interrogatory.
10. The term "oral communication" means any utterance heard, whether in person, by telephone or otherwise.
11. "Person" or "persons" means a natural person, firm, proprietorship, association, corporation or any other type of organization or entity.
12. As used herein, "relative to," "relating to," "relates to" or "relevant to" shall mean directly or indirectly mentioning or describing, pertaining to, being connected with, or reflecting upon a stated subject matter.
13. The term to "state the basis" for an allegation, contention, conclusion, position or answer means (a) to identify and specify the sources therefore, and (b) to identify and specify all facts on which you rely or intend to rely in support of the allegation, contention, conclusion, position or answer, and (c) to set forth and explain the nature and application to the relevant facts of all pertinent legal theories upon which you rely for your knowledge, information, and/or belief that there are good grounds to support such allegation, contention, conclusion, position or answer.
14. "Subject Property" or "Subject Properties" as used herein shall mean and be defined as the properties owned and/or operated by the Complainants in these consolidated matters for which Respondents provide or have provided natural gas service, and as named herein, and as located at the addresses set forth herein: (1) Colonial Garden Realty Co., Complainant, in Docket No. C-2012-2304183 ("Colonial I), and in Docket No. C-2012-2334253 ("Colonial II") is the owner of the property located at 5427 Wayne Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19144 (the two Colonial cases, hereafter collectively referred to as, "Colonial"), (2) Fairmount Realty Co. ("Fairmount"), Complainant, Docket No. C-2012-2304215, is the owner of the property located at 650 Fairmount Avenue, Philadelphia, PA. 19123 and 700 North Marshall Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123, (3) Simon Gardens ("Simon"), Complainant, Docket No. C-2012-2304324, is the owner of property located at 6731 and 6732 Musgrave Street, Philadelphia, PA 19119, (4) Elrae Garden Realty ("Elrae"), Complainant, Docket No. C-2012-2304167, is the owner of the property located at 36083610 Spring Garden Street and 4012-4028 Baring Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (5) Marshall Square Realty ("Marshall"), Complainant, Docket No. C-2012-2304303, is the owner of property located at 844 845 North 6th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123, (6) Marchwood Realty Co., L.P., Complainant, Docket No. C-2012-2308454, is the owner of the property located at 5515 Wissahickon Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19144, ("Marchwood" or "Subject Property"); (7) Oak Lane Realty Co., L.P., Complainant, Docket No. C-2012-2308462, is the owner of the property located at 1623-35 Cheiten Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19126, ("Oak Lane" or "Subject Property"); and (8) Fernrock Realty, Complainant, Docket No. C-20122308465 is the owner of the property located at 910 W. Godfrey Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19141
("Fernrock" or "Subject Property") (hereafter, individually referred to as, "Subject Property" or collectively referred to as "Subject Properties").
15. In construing these requests, the plural shall include the singular, the singular shall include the plural, and a masculine, feminine or neuter pronoun shall not exclude the other genders.

## REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND INTERROGATORIES, SET II

1. For each individual person, officer, employee, agent, or other entity answering or providing any information used by Respondent to answer any Interrogatory, state the following:
a. First, last, and middle legal name;
b. All DBA, fake, or alias name(s) used by this person;
c. Job title or capacity;
d. Business address and telephone number;
e. Home address and telephone number; and
f. Age;
2. Identify each document referred to or consulted by Respondent in the preparation of the Answers to these Interrogatories and Discovery Requests made within this entire document.
3. For each document identified and in Respondent's possession, or subject to their custody and control, regardless of location exists, Respondents shall produce or make available for inspection the document identified in response to the propounded interrogatory.
4. Identify all persons known to Respondent to have personal knowledge of any facts or issues involved in this lawsuit, state the following:
a. First, last, and middle legal name;
b. All DBAs, fake, or alias name(s) used by this person;
c. Job title or capacity;
d. Business address and telephone number;
e. Home address and telephone number; and
f. Age;
5. Identify and describe with particularity any and all documents, of any kind, that are in the possession, control or custody of Respondent, or of which Respondent has knowledge, whether originals, copies or facsimiles, regardless of their location, which are utilized to manage Complainants' Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8".
6. Identify and describe with particularity all training that Respondent provides or receives, in the area of debt collection activities, including but not limited to:
a. The training content, timing, and duration;
b. All documents and audio or visual materials used in such training; and
c. Each person involved in providing such training.
7. Identify and describe with particularity all training that Respondent provides or receives, in the area of customer billing activities, including but not limited to:
a. The training content, timing, and duration;
b. All documents and audio or visual materials used in such training; and
c. Each person involved in providing such training.
8. Identify and describe with particularity all training that Respondent provides or receives, in the area of customer dispute resolution activities, including but not limited to:
a. The training content, timing, and duration;
b. All documents and audio or visual materials used in such training; and
c. Each person involved in providing such training.
9. Identify and describe all documents, manuals, instructions, checklists, memorandum, restrictions or other documentation or instructions that Respondent is given, read, reviewed, or otherwise used, regarding policies and procedures related to:
a. The management of Customer Accounts.
b. Customer dispute resolution techniques, methods and practices.
c. The debt collection activities on Customer Accounts.
d. Meter reading, meter testing practices, policies and procedures.
e. Responding to inquiries from third parties on Customer Accounts.
10. Identify and describe with particularity all training that Respondent provides or receives, in the area of Customer Account management activities, including but not limited to:
a. The training content, timing, and duration;
b. All documents and audio or visual materials used in such training; and
c. Each person involved in providing such training. Identify and describe any and all documents that describe, record, or establish Respondent's methods and techniques used to collect debts.
d. Each person involved in providing such training. Identify and describe any and all documents that describe, record, or establish Respondent's methods and techniques used to manage or respond to customer billing disputes.
11. Identify and describe fully any and all computerized, mechanical, manual, or other system(s) that Respondent uses, maintains, or operates to record any and all mail, email, telephone, electronic data collection, electronic notation, in-person, or other forms of communications, or attempted communications, with persons or other third parties in connection with the collection of accounts, and Respondent's policies and procedures for operating such a system of records pertaining to Complainants' Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8".
12. Identify and describe fully any and all computerized, mechanical, manual, or other system(s) that Respondent uses, maintains, or operates to record any and all mail, email, electronic data collection, electronic notation, telephone, in-person, or other forms of communications, or attempted communications, with persons or other third parties in connection with rates charged or billed or the billing of Customer Accounts, and Respondent's policies and procedures for operating such a system of records, pertaining to Complainants' Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8".
13. Identify and describe fully any and all computerized, mechanical, manual, or other system(s) that Respondent uses, maintains, or operates to record any and all mail, telephone, in-person, or other forms of communications, or attempted communications, with persons or other third parties in connection with the dispute resolution practices, and Respondent's policies and procedures for operating such a system of records.
14. Identify whether Respondent, including, any or all of the Respondent's employees, directors, officers, managers, contractors, and/or related parties, notate, manually or electronically record, or tape record, telephone calls by any means with any persons from whom they are collecting debts or alleged debts, and what steps are taken to preserve these recordings.
15. Identify whether Respondent, including, any or all of the Respondent's employees, directors, officers, managers, contractors, and/or related parties, notate, manually or electronically record, or tape record, telephone calls by any means with any persons from whom they are performing customer dispute resolution actions, and what steps are taken to preserve these recordings or notations.
16. Identify whether Respondent, including, any or all of the Respondent's employees, directors, officers, managers, contractors, and/or related parties, recorded any telephone call, manually or electronically notated, logged, discussions with Complainants and whether or not these recordings, logs or notations have been preserved, and the current location and/or disposition of these recordings or notations pertaining to Complainant's Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8".
17. In the form of a chronology, for each of Complainants Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8", identify and describe in detail and with particularity, the process, the origin, the events, and circumstances under which the Complainants incurred the arrearages, if any alleged due by Respondent, sufficient to warrant the imposition of municipal liens, identifying all documents relevant to, related to, or reflecting such filing or imposition of such municipal lien.
18. Identify and describe each document known to Respondent, which is related to or contains information about the debts that Respondent alleges are due and owing by Complainants and for which Respondent has sought or now seeks to collect on, from Complainants for utility service provided by Respondent, pertaining to Complainant's Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8".
19. Identify, explain and describe each document known to Respondent, which is related to or contains information about billing inquiries, complaints, or disputes on or pertaining to Complainant's Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8".
20. Identify, describe and explain each instance of a mistake, error or event requiring a correction by Respondent for which Respondent was responsible-either for the error or the correction--pertaining to Complainants' Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8"; thereafter, identify and describe the conduct and action taken by Respondents to resolve, correct, repair or rectify the dispute, problem, or error.
21. Identify and describe in detail each mathematical method, algebraic mean, algorithm and method of calculation used by Respondent to calculate or to confirm the accuracy of Complainant's utility bills from initiation of the Customer Account in each Complainant's name to the present:
a. Describing for each equation, the basis for and manner in which Respondents' imposed its rates and charges;
b. The particular tariff granting authority for or referred to or used to calculate or impose such charges;
c. How and when any charges or payments in accordance with the applicable tariffs were applied to Complainant's Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8".
22. Identify and describe each communication, or attempted communication, by any means, between the Respondents and the Complainants, or any other person, which was made in connection with the collection of Complainants' Customer Accounts, by stating the following:
a. The name of the individual initiating communication;
b. The name of the person and/or description of the person to whom the communication was directed;
c. The date and time of the communication;
d. The method of the communication (e.g. letter, phone call, in-person);
e. A detailed description of the substance of the communication, (do not simply refer to collection notes);
f. Identification of all witnesses to or participants in the communication; and,
g. Any actions taken by any Respondent as a result of the communication.
23. Identify and describe each communication, or attempted communication, between the Respondents and the Complainants, or any other person related to this litigation, by any means, which was made in connection with the bills, billings, rates, billing disputes, billing practices/statements for Complainants' Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A8".
a. The name of the individual initiating communication;
b. The name of the person and/or description of the person to whom the communication was directed;
c. The date and time of the communication;
d. The method of the communication (e.g. letter, phone call, in-person);
e. A detailed description of the substance of the communication, (do not simply refer to collection notes);
f. Identification of all witnesses to or participants in the communication; and,
h. Any actions taken by any Respondent as a result of the communication.
24. Identify and describe each communication, or attempted communication, between the Respondent and the Complainants, or any other person, which was made in connection with the dispute resolution negotiations for Complainants' Customer Accounts, including, but limited to the Disputed Transactions, including those set forth at Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8", by stating the following:
a. The name of the individual initiating communication;
b. The name of the person and/or description of the person to whom the communication was directed;
c. The date and time of the communication;
d. The method of the communication (e.g. letter, phone call, in-person);
e. A detailed description of the substance of the communication, (do not simply refer to collection notes);
f. Identification of all witnesses to or participants in the communication;
g. Any actions taken by any Respondent, or agent thereof, as a result of the communication; and
h. Identify, describe and explain the resolution reached by the parties.
25. Identify and describe the manner and frequency in which Respondent maintains, repairs, inspects, tests, and insures accuracy of utility meters, pertaining to Complainant's Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, the Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8", and for each Customer Account and/or SA metered account number--identify and state the following:
a. The date of each meter and sub-meter test for each meter where at any or all of the Subject Properties, from time of application for service to the present.
b. Describe the nature of each test and results of each test performed.
c. The name of the person(s) conducting the test and documenting the results of each test.
d. Identify any written, electronic, notations or reports of tests performed or condition reports of meters tested (including the date of the test and report and the author of the report).
e. Identify any repaired or replaced meters.
f. Identify the date and manner of meters replaced or repaired at the Subject Property or Subject Properties, by named property address, account number, and SA accounts, if applicable, and explain the methodology used for determining the necessity for replacement and/or repair.
26. Identify and describe any writings, utility reports, correspondence, letters, memorandums, email communications, "MELITA" notes, or any other documentation Respondents sent, mailed, faxed to Complainants or the Commission related to the resolution of or pertaining to Complainant's Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8", and including but not limited to the same as located in the books and records of Respondents' Dispute Resolution Group, Customer Service Center and/or the Commercial Resource Center.
27. Identify and describe any writings, utility reports, correspondence, letters, memorandums, email communications, notes, electronic notations, or any other documentation Respondents sent, mailed, emailed, faxed to Complainants or the Commission related to the filing of an Informal Complaint with the Commission related to Complainants' customer disputes, disputed transactions, or pertaining to Complainant's Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-I" through "A-8", and including but not limited to the same as located in the books and records of Respondents' Dispute Resolution Group, Customer Service Center and/or the Commercial Resource Center.
28. Identify, describe and explain Respondent's system of accounts, its policies and practices pertaining to maintaining and ensuring accuracy of customer financial accounts and collection accounts, identify and state the following:
a. Explain whether and how the Respondents' system of accounts is in conformity with the

Uniform System of Accounts Prescribed for Natural Gas Companies by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
b. The name of the accounting operating system maintained by Respondents.
c. The method for determining how payments are applied and reflected or stated on Customer Accounts.
d. State the manner in which all usage and billed charges applied to Customer Accounts as payments are received and credited.
e. Describe the manner in which Respondent determines that a Customer Account should be subject to a collection action of any kind, including a collection action to file and/or impose a municipal lien.
29. Identify, describe and explain Respondent's automated collection policies and practices.
30. Identify any policy and procedures, manuals, written memoranda, communications and other writings, internal policies, meta-data or documents that describe and explain Respondent's collection and billing practices.
31. Identify, describe and explain any manual methods of accounting, bookkeeping or other accounting practice Respondent utilized to adjust Customer Accounts.
32. Name each Respondent/PGW manager, supervisor, department head or chair, employee or related party responsible for applying Complainants' payments to the Customer Accounts and for verifying said application of Complainants' payments to the applicable Customer Accounts.
33. Identify, describe and explain the manner and methodology used in by Respondent, to calculate and apply charges for "makeup" bills for or relating to all or any Customer Accounts.
34. Identify, describe and explain the manner and methodology used by Respondent to calculate and apply charges for makeup bills for or relating to Complainant's Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, and including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8".
35. Identify, describe and explain the manner, calculations, and methodology Respondents used to calculate and apply interest charges to Complainants' Customer Accounts where liens were filed with the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas and/or Philadelphia Municipal Court, for Complainants' Customer

Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, and including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto and set forth at Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8".
36. Identify, describe and explain the numeric interest rate used by Respondent to calculate and apply interest on late charges on Complainants' Customer Accounts, SA metered account numbers, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, and including but not limited to, the Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8".
37. Identify, describe and explain the numeric interest rate used by Respondent to calculate and apply interest on outstanding municipal liens for the Customer Accounts from initiation of the Customer Account for or in each Complainant's name to the present, in particular, the accounts pertaining to Complainant's Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, and including but not limited to, Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8". 38. Identify, describe and explain the origin of, as well as the billing period and gas usage period covered by each lien filed or imposed on any and all of Complainants' Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, and including but not limited to, those related to the Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8" imposed since initiation of the Customer Account in each Complainants' name.
39. Identify, describe, and produce all documents, court orders, notices, letters, correspondence, and/or other writings Respondent sent to the Commission and to Complainants indicating that any municipal liens on file with the Court of Common Pleas and/or Municipal Court have been marked as satisfied, and for each production, provide the date and manner in which notice was given to Complainants of the same, for Complainants' Customer Accounts, SA accounts, former and current meters located at the Subject Properties, including but not limited to, the Disputed Transactions attached hereto as Exhibits "A-1" through "A-8".
40. Identify all persons and their immediate supervisor known to Respondent to have personal knowledge of any facts or issues involved in the establishment, maintenance, calculations, assumptions,
algorithms, accounting practices with respect to Respondent/PGW's system of accounts as it pertains to this lawsuit, state the following:
a. First, last, and middle legal name;
b. All DBAs, fake, or alias name(s) used by this person;
c. Job title or capacity;
d. Business address and telephone number;
e. Home address and telephone number; and
f. Age.
41. As set forth in any responses or documents produced in response to these Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents and/or as used by Respondent for Respondent's specific data and record keeping, identify, explain, and describe all acronyms, abbreviations, and alphabetical and numeric codes displayed on utility bills, MELITA notes, internal correspondence, notations to Customer Accounts, Statement of Accounts, and other writings and documents of Respondent.
42. State the name, address, telephone number, title, place of employment and field of expertise of each person whom Respondent intends to call as an expert witness at a trial of this case, identifying:
a. The subject matter on which the expert is expected to testify;
b. The substance of the facts and opinions to which the expert is expected to testify;
c. A summary of the grounds for each opinion the expert is expected to testify;
d. All documents, treatises, books, studies, or other materials upon which the expert may rely for information or support of facts and opinions; and
e. The expert's current curriculum vitae or résumé.
43. Identify by name, position, home address, home telephone number, business address, business telephone number, all witnesses that Respondent intends to call or may call to testify at trial, and provide a detailed summary of the expected testimony of each such person.
44. Identify, describe specifically and provide copies of all exhibits Respondent may introduce at the hearing or trial of this matter. In responding to this Interrogatory, also supply copies of each such exhibit and mark them as responsive to this Interrogatory.

## VERIFICATION

I verify and affirm that the statements made in this foregoing document are true and correct. I understand that false statements made herein are subject to the penalties of 18 Pa .C.S.A.§ 4904 relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

Date: $\qquad$
Respondent/PGW


Exhibit "A-1"


Elrae
Acct. \# 227745786 SA 1453977841 Meter \# 20798383608 Spring Garden M:

| Olspute NO. | STATEMENT <br> Transaction Date Type | Reading | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Readir } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | \# of Days | CCF Usage | Average CCF/Days | Heating DOD's | Payment Type | Due Date | Transaction Amount | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISPUTE } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ | Current Bałance | Actual Balance |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2/3/2004 BILL | 3400 |  | 30 | 559 | 18.63 | 1153 |  | 2/27/2004 | \$769.85 | J | \$1,402.24 | \$1,402.24 |  |
| 2 | 3/4/2004 BILL | 3894 |  | 32 | 494 | 15.44 | 913 |  | 3/29/2004 | \$ $\$ 717.73$ | J | \$2,140.86 | \$2,140.86 |  |
| 3 | 1/3/2005 BILL | 5868 |  | 30 | 446 | 14.87 | 821 |  | 1/27/2005 | \$772.49 | J | \$1,267.15 | \$1,267.15 |  |
| 4 | 2/1/2005 B1LL | 6403 |  | 32 | 535 | 16.72 | 1039 |  | 2/25/2005 | \$922.80 | , | \$922.80 | \$922.80 |  |
| 5 | 1/4/2006 B/LL | 8800 |  | 33 | 465 | 14.09 | 996 |  | 1/27/2006 | - \$970.06 | J | \$1,544.30 | \$1,544.30 |  |
| 6 | 3/6/2006 BILL | 9625 |  | 29 | 434 | 14.97 | 859 |  | 3/29/2006 | - \$916.36 | J | \$3,399.25 | \$3,399.25 |  |
| 7 | 5/4/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$123.12 | F | \$9,498.74 | \$9,498.74 | 1.31\% |
| 8 | 6/4/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 5126.23 | F | \$9,831.95 | \$9,831.95 | 1.30\% |
| 9 | 7/2/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$128.76 | $F$ | \$10,129.79 | \$10,129.79 | 1.29\% |
| 10 | 8/3/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$130.56 | $F$ | \$10,379.78 | \$10,379.78 | 1.27\% |
| 11 | 9/2/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$132.68 | F | \$10,654.16 | \$10,654.15 | 1.26\% |
| 12 | 10/2/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$134.50 | $F$ | \$10,909.69 | \$10,909.69 | 1.25\% |
| 13 | 10/30/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$136.60 | F | \$11,186.72 | \$11,186.72 | 1.24\% |
| 14 | 12/2/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$139.47 | F | \$11,517,22 | \$11,517.22 | 1.23\% |
| 15 | 1/4/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$142.85 | F | \$11,885.49 | \$11,885.49 | 1.22\% |
| 16 | 2/3/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$146.03 | F | \$12,242.08 | \$12,242.08 | 1.21\% |
| 17 | 3/3/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$150.53 | $F$ | \$12,693.95 | \$12,693,95 | 1.20\% |
| 18 | 4/1/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$154.88 | $F$ | \$13,138.72 | \$13,138.72 | 1.19\% |
| 19 | 5/4/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$158.39 | $F$ | \$13,531.23 | \$13,531.23 | 1.18\% |
| 20 | 6/2/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$161.77 | $F$ | \$13,918.69 | \$13,918.69 | 1.18\% |
| 21 | 7/1/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$164.55 | F | \$14,268.31 | \$14,268.31 | 1.17\% |
| 22 | 8/3/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$166.07 | F | \$14,535.38 | \$14,535,38 | 1.16\% |
| 23 | 9/1/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$167.54 | F | \$14,800.91 | \$14,800.91 | 1.14\% |
| 24 | 10/1/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$169.23 | $F$ | \$15,083.22 | \$15,083.22 | 1.13\% |
| 25 | 11/1/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$170.70 | F | \$15,351.87 | \$15,351.87 | 1.12\% |
| 26 | 12/1/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$172.96 | $F$ | \$15,675.41 | \$15,675.41 | 1.12\% |
| 27 | 1/4/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$176.01 | F | \$16,054.74 | \$16,054.74 | 1.11\% |
| 28 | 2/2/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$179.17 | F | \$16,444.87 | \$16,444.87 | 1.10\% |
| 29 | 3/4/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$183.34 | F | \$16,906.21 | \$16,906.21 | 1.10\% |
| 30 | 4/1/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$187.21 | F | \$17,350.85 | \$17,350.85 | 1.09\% |
| 31 | 5/3/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$190.30 | $F$ | \$17,747.64 | \$17,747.64 | 1.08\% |
| 32 | 6/2/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$193.89 | F | \$18,180.40 | \$18,280.40 | 1.08\% |
| 33 | 7/1/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$196.64 | $F$ | \$18,560.42 | \$18,560.42 | 1.07\% |
| 34 | 8/2/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$198.19 | $F$ | \$18,862.01 | \$18,862.01 | 1.06\% |
| 35 | 9/1/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$199.56 | F | \$19,152.97 | \$19,152.97 | 1.05\% |
| 36 | 10/3/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$200.95 | $F$ | \$19,446.82 | \$19,446.82 | 1.04\% |
| 37 | 11/1/2011 PC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$203.32 | $F$ | \$19,808.29 | \$19,808.29 | 1.04\% |
| 38 | 12/1/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$206.71 | 8 | \$20,240.96 | \$20,240.96 | 1.03\% |
| 39 | 1/4/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$210.75 | 8 | \$20,720.87 | \$20,720.87 | 1.03\% |
| 40 | 2/2/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$214.85 | B | \$21,209.25 | \$21,209.25 | 1.02\% |
| 41 | 3/5/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$220.14 | 8 | \$21,781.62 | \$21,781.62 | 1.02\% |
| 42 | 4/4/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$225.08 | 8 | \$22,335,93 | \$22,335.93 | 1.02\% |
| 43 | 5/3/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$38.76 | F | \$2,623.26 | \$2,623.26 | 1.50\% |
| 44 | 6/5/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$42.27 | $F$ | \$2,899.07 | \$2,899.07 | 1.48\% |

** Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers. The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.

Exhibit "A-2"

## Elrae

## Acct. \# 227745786 SA 1453977841 Meter $\# 2079838 \mathbf{3 6 0 8}$ Spring Garden M:

| Dispute <br> NO. | STATEMENT <br> Transaction Date Type | Reading | Reading Code | \# of Days | CCF Usage | Average CCF/Days | Heating DOD's | Payment <br> Type | Due Date | Transaction Amount | $\begin{gathered} \text { DISPUTE } \\ \text { CODE } \end{gathered}$ | Current Balance | Actual Balance | \% Calculated LPC assassed Current Baiance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45 | 7/3/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$45.95 | F | \$3,190,68 | \$3,190.68 | 1.46\% |
| 46 | 8/2/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$47.89 | F | \$3,367.88 | \$3,367.88 | 1.44\% |
| 47 | 9/4/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$49.22 | F | \$3,505,53 | \$3,505.53 | 1.42\% |
| 48 | 10/3/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$50.56 | $F$ | \$3,645.79 | \$3,645.79 | 1.41\% |
| 49 | 11/1/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$52.35 | F | \$3,817.50 | \$3,817,50 | 1.39\% |
| 50 | 12/4/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$54.98 | F | \$4,047,53 | \$4,047.53 | 1.38\% |
| 51 | 1/4/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$58.62 | F | \$4,349.18 | \$4,349.18 | 1.37\% |
| 52 | 2/5/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2/28/2013 | \$62.17 | F | \$4,647,84 | \$4,647.84 | 1.36\% |
| 53 | 3/5/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3/28/2013 | \$66.29 | F | \$4,988.92 | \$4,988.92 | 1.35\% |
| 54 | 4/3/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$70.78 | F | \$5,358.98 | \$5,358.98 | 1.34\% |
| 55 | 5/2/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$74.32. | F | \$5,668.98 | \$5,668.98 | 1.33\% |
| 56 | 6/4/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$77.19 | $F$ | \$5,937,51 | \$5,937.51 | 1.32\% |
| 57 | 7/2/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$79.52 | $F$ | \$6,172,48 | \$6,172.48 | 1.31\% |
| 58 | 8/2/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$81.33 | F | \$6,374.54 | \$6,374.54 | 1.29\% |



* Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.

The balance at 3/29/12 should not incude additional late fees.



- Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.

The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not Include additlonal late fees.



* Settlemerr amount according to PGW workpapers.

The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees


## Elrae 294731407 No Meter \# 3608 Spring Garden M2

| Dispute NO. | Transaction <br> Date | Type | Reading | Reading Code | $\#$ of Days | CCF Usage | Average CCF/Days |  | Payment Type Due Date | Transaction Amount | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISPUTE } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ | Current Balante | Actual Balance | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Calculated } \\ & \text { LPC assessed } \\ & \text { Current Balance } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3/4/2004 B | BILL | 850 |  | 32 | 306 | 9.56 | 913 | 3/29/2004 | \$452.10 | 1 | \$1,356.42 | \$1,356.42 |  |
| 2 | 4/2/2004 | BILL | 867 |  | 29 | 175 | 6.03 | 585 | 4/28/2004 | \$273.39 | J | \$745.74 | \$745.74 |  |
| 3 | 5/4/2004 | BILL | 879 |  | 30 | 119 | 3.97 | 323 | 5/27/2004 | \$193.54 | J | \$193.54 | \$193.54 |  |
| 4 | 6/3/2004 B | BILL | 884 |  | 32 | 44 | 1.38 | 47 | 6/28/2004 | \$85.94 | J | \$282.38 | \$28238 |  |
| 5 | 7/2/2004 | Bill | 887 |  | 29 | 33 | 1.14 | 11 | 7/28/2004 | \$68.90 | J | \$68.90 | \$68.90 |  |
| 6 | 8/3/2004 8 | 8 LL | 891 |  | 30 | 38 | 1.27 | 0 | 8/26/2004 | \$76.42 | 1 | \$146.35 | \$146.35 |  |
| 7 | 9/2/2004 B | BILC | 895 |  | 32 | 39 | 1.22 | 0 | 9/28/2004 | \$77.92 | 1 | \$156.53 | \$156.53 |  |
| 8 | 10/2/2004 B | BILL | 899 |  | 30 | 48 | 1.6 | 10 | 10/26/2004 | \$92.15 | 1 | \$92.15 | \$92.15 |  |
| 9 | 11/2/2004 B | BILL | 910 |  | 29 | 103 | 3.55 | 263 | 11/29/2004 | \$172.79 | 1 | \$256.32 | \$266.32 |  |
| 10 | 12/3/2004 B | BILL | 927 |  | 32 | 170 | 5.31 | 512 | 12/30/2004 | \$282.85 | J | \$286.82 | \$286.82 |  |
| 11 | 1/3/2005 B | BILL | 954 |  | 30 | 272 | 9.07 | 822 | 1/27/2005 | \$478.63 | $J$ | \$769.75 | \$769.75 |  |
| 12 | 2/1/2005 | BILL | 990 | R | 32 | 358 | 11.19 | 1039 | 2/25/2005 | \$623.87 | $J$ | \$623.87 | \$623.87 |  |
| 13 | 5/4/2007 B | Bll | 397 |  | 30 | 161 | 5.37 | 408 | 5/30/2007 | \$309.69 | $J$ | \$309.69 | \$309.69 |  |
| 14 | 6/6/2007 L | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$4.64 | 1 | \$314.33 | \$314.33 | 1.50\% |
| 15 | 6/6/2007 8 | BIL | 401 |  | 32 | 41 | 1.28 | 68 | 6/28/2007 | \$96.56 | 1 | \$410.89 | \$410.89 |  |
| 16 | 7/5/2007 L | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$6.09 | 1 | \$416.98 | \$416.98 | 1.48\% |
| 17 | 7/5/2007 B | BILI | 404 |  | 29 | 30 | 1.03 | 4 | 7/30/2007 | \$76.24 | 1 | \$493.22 | \$493.22 |  |
| 18 | 8/3/2007 L |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$7.23 | 1 | \$500.45 | \$500.45 | 1.47\% |
| 19 | 8/3/2007 B | BILI | 408 |  | 30 | 43 | 1.43 | 0 | 8/28/2007 | \$100.92 | J | \$601.37 | \$601.37 |  |
| 20 | 9/4/2007 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$8.75 | 1 | \$610.12 | \$610.12 | 1.46\% |
| 21 | 9/4/2007 B | BIU | 4123 |  | 29 | 34 | 1.17 | 6 | 9/27/2007 | \$83.83 | 1 | \$693.95 | \$693.95 |  |
| 22 | 10/3/2007 L | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$10.00 | 1 | \$703.95 | \$703.95 | 1.44\% |
| 23 | 10/3/2007 | BILL | 415 |  | 32 | 35 | 1.09 | 13 | 10/26/2007 | \$82.02 | 1 | \$785.97 | \$785.97 |  |
| 24 | 11/1/2007 L | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$11.23 | 1 | \$797.20 | \$797.20 | 1.43\% |
| 25 | 11/1/2007 8 | 814 | 420 |  | 29 | 48 | 1.66 | 117 | 11/28/2007 | \$111.64 | 1 | \$908.84 | \$908.84 |  |
| 26 | 12/4/2007 L | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$12.91 | J | \$921.75 | 5921.75 | 1.42\% |
| 27 | 12/4/2007 B | BiLL |  |  | 33 | 183 | 5.55 | 656 | 12/31/2007 | \$343.59 | J | \$1,265.34 | \$1,265.34 |  |
| 28 | 1/6/2008 L | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$18.06 | 1 | \$1,283.40 | \$1,283.40 | 1.43\% |
| 29 | 1/6/2008 | BILL | 4681 |  | 31 | 292 | 9.42 | 850 | 1/30/2008 | \$558.93 | 1 | \$1,842.33 | \$1,842.33 |  |
| 30 | 2/4/2008 L |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$26.45 | J | \$1,868.78 | \$1,868.78 | 1.44\% |
| 31 | 2/4/2008 | BILL | 492 |  | 29 | 2411 | 8.45 | 814 | 2/28/2008 | \$485.01 | 1 | \$2,353.79 | \$2,353.79 |  |
| 32 | 3/4/2008 L | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$33.72 | 1 | \$2,387.51 | \$2,387.51 | 1.43\% |
| 33 | 3/4/2008 | BILL | 5139 |  | 31 | 213 | 6.87 | 856 | 3/28/2008 | \$415.60 | J | \$2,803.11 | \$2,803.11 |  |
| 34 | 4/3/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$39.98 | 1 | \$2,843,07 | \$2,843.07 | 1.43\% |
| 35 | 4/3/2008 | BfL | 5275 |  | 30 | 136 | 4.53 | 565 | 4/28/2008 | \$279.10 | J | \$3,222.17 | \$3,122.17 |  |
| 36 | 5/2/2008 L | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$44.14 | 1 | \$3,166.31 | \$3,166.31 | 1.41\% |
| 37 | 5/2/2008 | BlL | 533 |  | 29 | 64 | 2.21 | 256 | 5/28/2008 | \$142.73 | 1 | \$3,309.04 | \$3,309.04 |  |
| 38 | 6/3/2008 L | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$46.28 | J | \$3,355.32 | \$3,355.32 | 1.40\% |
| 39 | 6/3/2008 B | BILI | 5381 |  | 32 | 42 | 1.31 | 137 | 6/26/2008 | \$98.93 | $J$ | \$3,454.25 | \$3,454.25 |  |
| 40 | 7/3/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$47.77 | J | \$3,502.02 | \$3,502.02 | 1.38\% |
| 41 | 7/3/20088 | 814 | 5392 |  | 29 | 11 | 0.38 | 0 | 7/28/2008 | \$43.54 | ) | \$3,545.56 | \$3,545.56 |  |
| 42 | 8/1/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$48.42 | 1 | \$3,593.98 | \$3,593,98 | 1.37\% |

- Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.

The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.

EIrae 294731407 No Meter \# 3608 Spring Garden M2

| Dispute NO. | Transaction <br> Date $\quad$ Type | Readling | Reating Code | 4 of Days | CCF Usage | Average CCF/Days |  | Payment <br> Type Due Date | Transaction Amount | DISPUTE CODE | Current Balance | Actual Balance | \% Calculated LPC assessed Current Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 43 | 8/1/2008 BILL | 5400 | R | 30 | 8 | 0.27 | 0 | 8/26/2008 | \$36.92 | 1 | \$3,630.90 | \$3,630,90 | 1.35\% |
| 44 | 9/2/2008 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$48.97 | 1 | \$3,679,87 | \$3,679.87 |  |
| 45 | 9/2/2008 BILL | 541 | R | 29 | 11 | 0.38 | 0 | 9/25/2008 | \$43.54 | 1 | \$3,723.41 | \$3,723.41 |  |
| 46 | 10/2/2008 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$49.63 | $j$ | \$3,773.04 | \$3,773,04 | 1.33\% |
| 47 | 10/2/2008 BILC | 543 |  | 32 | 21 | 0.66 | 12 | 10/24/2008 | \$64.21 | 1 | \$3,837.25 | \$3,837.25 |  |
| 48 | 10/30/2008 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$50.59 | J | \$3,887.84 | \$3,887.84 | 1.32\% |
| 49 | 10/30/2008 B1LL | 546 |  | 29 | 34 | 1.17 | 238 | 12/25/2008 | \$91.89 | J | \$3,979.73 | \$3,979.73 |  |
| 50 | 12/3/2008 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$51,97 | J | \$4,031.70 | \$4,031.70 | 1.31\% |
| 51 | 12/3/2008 BILL | 5605 | R | 34 | 139 | 4.09 | 654 | 12/30/2008 | \$313.98 | 1 | \$4,345.68 | \$4,345.68 |  |
| 52 | 12/5/2008 81 LL | 5605 | R | 34 | 139 | 4.09 | 654 | 1/2/2009 | \$311.68 | J | \$4,291.41 | \$4,291.41 |  |
| 53 | 1/5/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$56.64 | J | \$4,348.05 | \$4,34B.05 | 1.32\% |
| 54 | 1/S/2009 B/LL | 5819 | R | 31 | 214 | 6.9 | 842 | 1/29/2009 | \$477.06 | 1 | \$4,825.11 | \$4,825.11 |  |
| 55 | 2/3/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$63.80 | 1 | \$4,888,91 | \$4,888.91 | 1.32\% |
| 56 | 2/3/2009 B/LL | 615 | R | 31 | 339 | 10.94 | 1080 | 2/27/2009 | \$670.83 | J | \$5,559.74 | \$5,559,74 |  |
| 57 | 2/21/2009 Bill | 628 | R | 17 | 123 | 7.24 | 472 | 3/17/2009 | \$267.35 | J | \$5,827.09 | \$5,827.09 |  |



Exhibit "A-3"
** Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.

| Dlspute NO. | 627 N MAR5HALI ST PHIL,PA191233411 |  |  |  | From Date 1/1/2004 |  |  |  | To Date 1 | /25/2012 | Meter 1368942 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Account Number 89533358 |  |  |  | SA Number 7366786439 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Transactlon Date | Type | Reading | Reading Code | $\#$ of Days CCF Usage |  | Average CCF/Days | Heating ODD's | Payment <br> Type | Due Date | Transaction Amount | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISPUTE } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ | Current Balance | Actual Balance | \% Calculated LPC assessed Current Balance |
| 1 | 9/1/2005 | BILL |  | R | 609 | 17761 | 29.16 | -773 |  | 9/29/2005 | \$27,553.85 | J | \$30,045.61 | \$30,045.61 |  |
| 2 | 9/1/2005 | bill |  | R | 609 | 1352 | 2.22 | 77 |  | 9/29/2005 | \$2,453.36 | 」 | \$32,498.97 | \$32,498.97 |  |
| 3 | 5/5/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$324.91 | F | \$25,535.60 | \$25,535.60 | 1.29\% |
| 4 | 6/4/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$330.26 | F | \$26,222.42 | \$26,222.42 | 1.28\% |
| 5 | 7/3/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$334.94 | F | \$26,869.73 | \$26,869.73 | 1.26\% |
| 6 | 8/4/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$337.95 | F | \$27,408.21 | \$27,408.21 | 1.25\% |
| 74 | 9/2/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$340.96 | F | \$27,949.70 | \$27,949.70 | 1.23\% |
| 8 | 10/2/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$345.02 | F | \$28,565.22 | \$28,565.22 | 1.22\% |
| 9 | 10/31/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$348.27 | F | \$29,130.59 | \$29,130.59 | 1.21\% |
| 10 | 12/3/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$352.17 | F | \$29,742.30 | \$29,742.30 | 1.20\% |
| 11 | 1/4/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$357.73 | F | \$30,471.08 | \$30,471.08 | 1.19\% |
| 12 | 2/3/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$363.43 | F | \$31,214.33 | \$31,214.33 | 1.18\% |
| 13 | 3/4/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$370.21 | F | \$32,036.79 | \$32,036.79 | 1.17\% |
| 14 | 4/1/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$376.69 | F | \$32,845.24 | \$32,845.24 | 1.16\% |
| 15 | 5/4/2010 | LPP |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$382.84 | F | \$33,638.12 | \$33,638.12 | 1.15\% |
| 16 | 6/3/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$388.76 | F | \$34,421.69 | \$34,421.69 | 1.14\% |
| 17 | 7/1/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$394.57 |  | \$35,203.18 | \$35,203.18 | 1.13\% |
| 18 | 8/3/2010 | L.PC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$398.66 | F | \$35,875.02 | \$35,875.02 | 1.12\% |
| 19 | 9/1/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 5402.67 | $F$ | \$36,544,84 | \$36,544.84 | 1.11\% |
| 20 | 10/2/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$406.02 | F | \$37,174.21 | \$37,174.21 | 1.10\% |
| 21 | 11/1/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$409.31 | F | \$37,803.04 | \$37,803.04 | 1.09\% |
| 22 | 12/1/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$413.92 | F | \$38,523.80 | \$38,523.80 | 1.09\% |
| 23 | 1/4/2011 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$419.46 | F | \$39,312.95 | \$39,312.95 | 1.08\% |
| 24 | 2/2/2011 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$425.41 | F | \$40,135.17 | \$40,135.17 | 1.07\% |
| 25 | 3/4/2011 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$431.47 | F | \$40,970.74 | \$40,970.74 | 1.06\% |
| 26 | 4/1/2011 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 | - |  |  | \$436.71 | F | \$41,756.18 | \$41,756.18 | 1.06\% |
| 27 | 5/3/2011 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$441.80 | F | \$42,537.73 | \$42,537.73 | 1.05\% |
| 28 | 6/2/2011 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 | , |  |  | \$447.15 | F | \$43,341.32 | \$43,341.32 | 1.04\% |
| 29 | 7/1/2011 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$451.94 | F | \$44,112.55 | \$44,112.55 | 1.04\% |
| 30 | 8/2/2011 | 1 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$455.40 | F | \$44,798.78 | \$44,798.78 | 1.03\% |
| 31 | 9/1/2011 | 1 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$458.82 | F | \$45,485.43 | \$45,485.43 | 1.02\% |
| 32 | 10/4/2011 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 | - |  |  | \$462.08 | F | \$46,164.85 | \$46,164.85 | 1.01\% |
| 33 | 11/1/2011 | 1 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$465.87 | F | \$46,883.76 | \$46,883.76 | 1.00\% |
| 34 | 12/1/2011 | 1 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$470.00 | F | \$47,628.54 | \$47,628.54 | 1.00\% |
| 35 | 1/4/2012 | 2 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 | , |  |  | \$474.81 | F | \$48,424.25 | \$48,424.25 | 0.99\% |
| 36 | 2/2/2012 | 2 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 | - |  |  | \$479.69 | B | \$49,229.58 | \$49,229.58 | 0.98\% |
| 37 | 3/6/2012 | 2 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$484.87 |  | \$50,059.56 | \$50,059.56 | 0.98\% |
| 38 | 4/4/2012 | 2 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$489.65 | 8 | \$50,867.74 | \$50,867.74 | 0.97\% |
| 39 | 5/3/2012 | 2 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 | - |  |  | \$35.53 | F | \$2,404.41 | \$2,404.41 | 1.50\% |
| 40 | 6/5/2012 | LPPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$ 59.58 | F | \$2,714.00 | \$2,714.00 | 1.48\% |
| 41 | 7/3/2012 | 2 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$44.30 | F | \$3,073.17 | \$3,073.17 | 1.46\% |
| 42 | 8/3/2012 | 2 PC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$47.68 | F | \$3,345.97 | \$3,345.97 | 1.45\% |

** Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.


-* Settement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.

|  | 628 N MARSH | Hall 5 | IL, PA 191 | 33446 |  | Date $1 / 1 / 2004$ Account Number 75710860 |  | To Date SA Num 615578 | 5/2012 | Meter 2071528 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dispute NO. | STATEMENT <br> Transaction <br> Date | Type | Reading | Reading Code | \# of Days | CCF Usage | Average CCF/Days | Heating DOD's | Payment Type | Due Date | Transaction Amount | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISPUTE } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ | Current Balance | Actual Balance | \% Calculated LpC assessed Current Balance |
| 43 | 11/2/2012 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$40.62 | F | \$2,953.21 | \$2,953.21 | 1.39\% |
| 44 | 12/4/2012 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$42.71 | F | \$3,135.69 | \$3,135.69 | 1.38\% |
| 45 | 1/5/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$45.37 | $F$ | \$3,358.16 | \$3,358.16 | 1.37\% |
| 46 | 2/5/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$48.51 | F | \$3,616.12 | \$3,616.12 | 1.36\% |
| 47 | 3/6/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$51.67 | F | \$3,878.49 | \$3,878.49 | 1.35\% |
| 48 | 4/4/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$55.50 | F | \$4,189.09 | \$4,189,09 | 1.34\% |
| 49 | 5/3/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$58.88 | F | \$4,473.36 | \$4,473.36 | 1.33\% |
| 50 | 6/4/2013 | IPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$62.20 | F | \$4,757.24 | \$4,757.24 | 1.32\% |
| 51 | 7/2/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$65.29 | F | \$5,028.32 | \$5,028.32 | 1.32\% |
| 52 | 8/2/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$68.24 | F | \$5,292.95 | 55,292.95 | 1.31\% |
| 53 | 7/1/2007 | PAY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - 580.539 .68 | E |  |  |  |


|  | Faltmount <br> 615 N TTH ST PHILPA 191233455 STATEMENT |  |  | From Date 1/1/2004 Account Number 25088422 |  |  | To Date 10/25/2012 SA Number 4797733461 |  |  | Meter 1357183 |  |  |  | Actual Balance |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dispute NO. | Transaction Date Type | Reading | Reading Code | \# of Days | CCF Usage | Average <br> CCF/Days | Heating DOD's |  | Payment <br> Туре | Due Date | Transaction Amount | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISPUTE } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ | Current Salance |  | \% Calculated LPCassessed Current Balance |
| 1 | 3/6/2007 816, | 91785 |  | 31 | 1080 | - 34.84 |  | 1083 |  | 3/29/2007 | \$1,993.10 | 1 | \$10,963.20 | \$10,963.20 |  |
| 2 | 4/4/2007 BILL | 92413 |  | 29 | 628 | 21.66 |  | 559 |  | 4/30/2007 | \$1,203.15 | 1 | \$12,327.23 | \$12,327.23 |  |
| 3 | 5/4/2007 BILL | 92957 |  | 30 | 544 | 18.13 |  | 408 |  | 5/30/2007 | \$1,004.41 | , | \$9,456.54 | \$9,456,54 |  |
| 4 | 6/5/2007 BiLL | 93222 |  | 32 | 265 | 8.28 |  | 68 |  | 6/28/2007 | \$526.89 | 1 | \$10,123.40 | \$10,123.40 |  |
| 5 | 7/5/2007 B1LL | 93415 |  | 29 | 193 | 6.66 |  | 4 |  | 7/30/2007 | \$385.80 | 1 | \$10,657.07 | \$10,657.07 |  |
| 6 | 8/3/2007 81LL | 93605 |  | 30 | 190 | 6.33 |  | 0 |  | 8/28/2007 | 5380.10 | 1 | \$10,968.61 | \$10,968,61 |  |
| 7 | 9/4/2007 8ILL | 93790 |  | 29 | 185 | 6.38 |  | 6 |  | 9/27/2007 | \$370.62 | J | \$11,498.59 | \$11,498.59 |  |
| 8 | 10/3/2007 BILL | 94015 |  | 32 | 225 | 7.03 |  | 13 |  | 20/26/2007 | \$422.48 | 1 | \$12,085.99 | \$12,085.99 |  |
| 9 | 11/1/2007 81 LL | 94267 |  | 29 | 252 | 8.69 |  | 117 |  | 11/28/2007 | \$504.62 | J | \$12,761.87 | \$12,761.87 |  |
| 10 | 12/4/2007 BILL | 95001 |  | 34 | 734 | 21.59 |  | 687 |  | 12/31/2007 | \$1,331.84 | J | \$14,272.54 | \$14,272.54 |  |
| 11 | 2/2/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$348.24 | B | \$37,514.89 | \$37,514.89 | 0.94\% |
| 12 | 3/5/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$352.10 | 8 | \$38,124.08 | \$38,124.08 | 0.93\% |
| 13 | 4/4/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$355.78 | B | \$38,725.52 | \$38,725.52 | 0.93\% |
| 14 | 5/3/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$26.54 | F | \$1,796.48 | \$1,796.48 | 1.50\% |
| 15 | 6/5/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$29.23 | $F$ | 52,004.56 | \$2,004.56 | 1.48\% |
| 16 | 7/3/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$32.01 | F | \$2,221.84 | \$2,221.84 | 1.46\% |
| 17 | 8/2/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$33.83 | F | \$2,377.31 | \$2,377,31 | 1.44\% |
| 18 | 9/4/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$35.41 | F | 52,517.76 | 52,517.76 | 1.43\% |
| 19 | 10/3/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$37.21 | F | 52,675.33 | \$2,675.33 | 1.41\% |
| 20 | 11/1/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$38.82 | $F$ | \$2,821.52 | \$2,821.52 | 1.40\% |
| 21 | 12/4/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$40.94 | F | \$3,003.83 | \$3,003.83 | 1.38\% |
| 22 | 1/4/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$43.58 | F | \$3,222.96 | \$3,222.96 | 1.37\% |
| 23 | 2/5/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$46.42 | $F$ | \$3,459,05 | \$3,459.05 | 1.36\% |
| 24 | 3/5/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$49.32 | $F$ | \$3,701.45 | \$3,701.45 | 1.35\% |
| 25 | 4/3/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.4 | F | \$3,959.38 | \$3,959.38 | 1.34\% |
| 26 | 5/2/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54.84 | F | \$4,177.21 | \$4,177.21 | 1.33\% |
| 27 | 6/4/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 57.09 | $F$ | \$4,384.09 | \$4,384.09 | 1.32\% |
| 28 | 7/2/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.22 | $F$ | \$4,585.20 | \$4,585.20 | 1.31\% |
| 29 | 8/2/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.05 | F | \$4,768.45 | \$4,768.45 | 1.30\% |
| 30 | 7/18/2007 PAY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7/18/2007 | ( 922.767 .78 ) | E |  |  |  |




| Dispute No. | Falrmount <br> 606 MARSHALL ST PHIL,PA |  | From Date $1 / 1 / 2004$ Account Number |  | To Date 10125/2012 <br> SA Number 91056958 |  | Meter | 1357199 |  | DISPUTE <br> . CODE | Current Balance | Actual Balance |  | $\cdot$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Trensaction Oate Type | Reading Code $\begin{gathered}\text { Readling } \\ \text { Coder }\end{gathered}$ | \# of CCF Usage |  | Average Heating Payment |  | Date Dus Date |  | Transection Amount |  |  |  |  | $\qquad$ |
|  | 9/1/2005 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$15.00 |  |  | \$1,015.61 | \$1,015.61 | 1.50\% |
|  | 9/1/2005 alll | 73869 R | 30 | 241 | 8.030 |  |  | 9/27/2005 | \$410.23 |  |  | \$1,425.84 | \$1.425.84 |  |
|  | 9/12/2005 PAY |  |  |  | 0 | Check |  |  | ( $51,000.61$ ) |  |  | \$425.23 | \$425.23 |  |
|  | 10/3/2005 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$6.37 |  |  | \$431.60 | \$431.60 | 1.50\% |
|  | 10/3/2005 814 L | 741238 | 30 | 254 | 8.47 | 7 |  | 10/26/2005 | \$453.21 |  |  | \$884.81 | \$884.81 |  |
|  | 11/1/2005 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$13.17 |  |  | \$897.98 | \$897.98 | 1.49\% |
|  | 11/1/2005 8ILL | 74498 R | 31 | 375 | 12.1 | 221 |  | 11/28/2005 | \$775.10 |  |  | \$1,673.08 | \$1,673.08 |  |
|  | 12/2/2005 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$24.80 |  |  | \$1,697.88 | \$1,697.88 | 1.48\% |
|  | 12/2/2005 8:LL | 75074 R | 31 | 576 | 18.58 | 487 |  | 12/29/2005 | \$1,228.75 |  |  | \$2,926,63 | \$2,926.63 |  |
|  | 12/29/2005 PAY |  |  |  | 0 | Check |  |  | (5884.81) |  |  | \$2,041.82 | \$2,041.82 |  |
|  | 1/4/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$30.62 |  |  | \$2,072.44 | \$2,072.44 | 1.50\% |
|  | 1/4/2006 BIL | 76067 ¢ | 33 | 993 | 30.09 | 996 |  | 1/27/2006 | \$2,052.90 |  |  | \$4,125.34 | \$4,125.34 |  |
|  | 2/3/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$61.42 |  |  | \$4,186.76 | \$4,186.76 | 2.49\% |
|  | 2/3/2006 814. | 76879 R | 30 | 812 | 27.07 | 713 |  | 3/1/2006 | \$1,786.91 |  |  | \$5,973.67 | \$5,973.67 |  |
|  | 3/6/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$88.22 |  |  | \$6,061.89 | \$6,061.89 | 1.48\% |
|  | 3/6/2005 BILL | 777448 | 29 | 865 | 29.83 | 859 |  | 3/29/2005 | \$1,807.25 |  |  | \$7,869.14 | \$7,869.14 |  |
|  | 4/5/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$115.33 |  |  | \$7,986.47 | \$7,984.47 | 1.47\% |
|  | 4/5/2006 BILL | 78425 R | 31 | 681 | 21.97 | 557 |  | 5/1/2006 | \$1,450.81 |  |  | \$9,435.28 | \$9,435.28 |  |
|  | 4/26/2006 PAY |  |  |  | 0 | Check |  |  | (52.041.32) |  |  | \$7,393.96 | \$7,393.96 |  |
|  | 5/4/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$110.90 |  |  | \$7,504.86 | \$7,504.86 | 1.50\% |
|  | 5/4/2006 BIL | 78857 R | 30 | 432 | 14.4 | 245 |  | 5/30/2006 | \$935,40 |  |  | \$8,440.26 | \$8,440.26 |  |
|  | 5/23/2006 PAY |  |  |  | 0 | Check |  |  | (\$2,083.52) |  |  | \$6,356.74 | \$6,356.74 |  |
|  | 6/5/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 5/28/2009 | \$95.35 |  |  | \$6,452.09 | \$6,452,09 | 1.50\% |
|  | 6/5/2006 BILL | 79170 R | 30 | 313 | 10.43 | 67 |  | 6/28/2006 | \$668.74 |  |  | \$7,120.83 | \$7,120.83 |  |
|  | 7/6/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$105.38 |  |  | \$7,226.21 | \$7,226.21 | 1.48* |
|  | 7/6/2006 BIL | 79393 R | 31 | 223 | 7.19 | 2 |  | 7/31/2006 | \$458.05 |  |  | \$7,684.26 | \$7,684.26 |  |
|  | 8/3/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 7/28/2009 | \$112.25 |  |  | \$7,796.51 | \$7,796.51 | 1.46\% |
|  | 8/3/2006 BILL | 79634 R | 30 | 241 | 8.030 |  |  | 8/28/2006 | \$493.46 |  |  | \$8,289.97 | \$8,289.97 |  |
|  | 9/1/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$119.65 |  |  | \$8,409.62 | 58,409.62 | 1.44\% |
|  | 9/1/2006 BILL | 79865 R | 29 | 231 | 7.970 |  |  | 9/27/2006 | \$473.79 |  |  | \$8,883.41 | \$8,883.41 |  |
|  | 9/11/2006 PAY |  |  |  | 0 | check |  |  | ( $51,000.00$ ) |  |  | \$7,883.41 | \$7,883.41 |  |
|  | 10/4/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$118.25 |  |  | 58,001.66 | \$8,001.66 | 1.50\% |
|  | 10/4/2006 BILL | 80156 R | 32 | 291 | 9.09 | 36 |  | 10/26/2006 | \$590.53 |  |  | \$8,592.19 | \$8,592.19 |  |
|  | 10/24/2006 PAY |  |  |  | 0 | Check |  |  | ( 52.000 .00 ) |  |  | \$6,592.19 | \$6,592.19 |  |
|  | 11/2/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$98.88 |  |  | \$6,691.07 | \$6,691.07 | 1.50x |
|  | 11/2/2006 BILL | 80589 R | 29 | 433 | 14.93 | 279 |  | 11/27/2006 | \$862.64 |  |  | \$7,553.71 | \$7,553.71 | . |
|  | 12/4/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$111.82 |  |  | 57,665.53 | \$7,665.53 | 1.48\% |
|  | 12/4/2008 BILL | 81194 R | 31 | 605 | 19.52 | 409 |  | 12/29/2006 | \$1,268.24 |  |  | \$8,933.77 | \$8,933.77 |  |
|  | 12/19/2006 PAY |  |  |  | 0 | Check |  |  | (51,000.00) |  |  | \$7,933.77 | \$7,933.77 |  |
|  | 1/5/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$119.00 |  |  | \$8,052.77 | \$8,052.77 | 1.50\% |
|  | 1/5/2007 BILL | 82064 R | 34 | 870 | 25.59 | 756 |  | 1/31/2007 | \$1,736.24 |  |  | \$9,789.01 | \$9,789.01 |  |
|  | 1/19/2007 PAY |  |  |  | 0 | Check |  |  | (\$500.00) |  |  | \$9,289.01 | \$9,289.01 |  |
|  | 2/5/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$139.33 |  |  | \$9,428.34 | \$9,428.34 | 1.50\% |
|  | 2/5/2007 日ILL | 82976 R | 29 | 912 | 31.45 | 812 |  | 3/2/2007 | \$1,795.02 |  |  | \$11,223.36 | \$11,223.36 |  |
|  | 3/6/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$166.26 |  |  | \$11,389.62 | \$11,389.62 | 1.48\% |
|  | 3/6/2007 BILL. | 84150 R | 31 | 1174 | 37.87 | 1083 |  | 3/29/2007 | \$2,168.95 |  |  | \$13,558.57 | \$13,558.57 |  |
|  | 4/4/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 5/26/2010 | \$198.79 |  |  | \$13,757.36 | \$13,757.36 | 1.47\% |
|  | 4/4/2007 BLLL | 848848 | 29 | 734 | 25.31 | 559 |  | 4/30/2007 | \$1,402.20 |  |  | \$15,159.56 | \$15,159.56 |  |
|  | 5/2/2007 PAY |  |  |  | 0 | Check |  |  | ( $51,000.00$ ) |  |  | \$11.159.56 | \$11,159.56 |  |
|  | 5/4/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$167.39 |  |  | \$11,326.95 | \$12,326.95 | 1.50\% |
|  | 5/4/2007 BILL | 854878 | 30 | 603 | 20.1 | 408 |  | 5/30/2007 | \$1,115.66 |  |  | \$12,442.61 | \$12,442.61 |  |



- Settement amount accordlng to PGW workpapers.
the balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.


** Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.



| in Accon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sfreet Address |  | Ynat | SANumber | Mater ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Dates of Service | \$188.63 | 6 | Paid by SBG $3 / 29 / 12$ | $0 / 1$ |
| 46 | 606 N. Marshall Street | Apt AI | 6823459423 | 2071111 | 5/16/08-6/05/08 |  |  |  | 0 |
| 47 | 606 N. Marshall 5treet | Apt A4 | 8138684532 | 2070709 | 5/16/08-6/06/08 | \$628.98 | 6 | Pald by $5663 / 29 / 12$ | 0 |
| 48 | 606 N. Marshall Street | Apt A7 | 2448359295 | 2071110 | 5/16/08-6/12/08 | \$131.01 | G | Pald by SEG 3/29/12 | 0 |
| 49 | 606 N. Marshall Street | Apt AB | 9489770977 | 2070715 | 5/16/08-6/27/08 | \$762.02 | G | Pald by S8G 3/29/12 | 0 |
| 50 | 606 N. Marshall 5 treet | Apt A12 | 9868433935 | 2070714 | 5/16/08-8/14/08 | \$178.62 | G | Pald by $5863 / 29 / 12$ | 0 |
| 51 | 540 N. Marshall Street | Apt Di | 3374858657 | 1835412 | 5/16/08-6/06/08 | \$176.15 | G | Pald by 586 3/29/12 | 0 |
| 52 | 640 N. Marshall Street | Apt D4 | 8181607152 | 1594913 | 5/16/08-6/06/08 | \$126.39 | G | Paid by SEG 3/29/12 | 0 |
| 53 | 640 N. Marshall Street | Apt 06 | 50263227 | 1372832 | 5/16/08-8/14/08 | \$51.36 | G | Paid by 5BG 3/29/12 | 0 |
| 54 | 640 N. Marshall Street | Apti 07 | 7155762498 | 1552602 | 5/16/08-8/16/08 | \$199.80 | 6 | Padd by $58 \mathrm{G} 3 / 29 / 12$ | 0 |
| 55 | 640 N. Marshall 5 treet | Apt 08 | 9542607509 | 1872160 | 5/16/08-7/08/08 | \$72.74 | G | Pald by $58 \mathrm{G} 3 / 29 / 12$ | 0 |
| 56 | 540 N. Marshal Street | Apt D9 | 5031347536 | 1599078 | 5/16/08-6/12/08 | \$102.49 | G | Paid by $5863 / 29 / 12$ | 0 |
| 57 | 640 N. Marshall Street | Apt 012 | 3994578400 | 2084073 | 5/16/08-6/06/08 | \$82.60 | G | Pald by 58G 3/29/12 | 0 |
| 58 | 634 N. Marshall 5 treet | Apt H1 | 8443052867 | 2071091 | 5/16/08-8/01/08 | \$151.73 | G | Paid by SEG 3/29/12 | 0 |
| 59 | 634 N. Marshall Street | AD: Hz | 1853414587 | 2070963 | 5/16/08 - current | \$137.63 | $G$ | Paid by S8G 3/29/12 | Partial 1 |
| 60 | 634 N. Marshall Street | Apt H2 | 1853414587 | 2070963 | 5/16/08-current | \$2.80 | 6 | Open Balance | Partial 1 |
| 61 | 634 N. Marshall Street | Apt H 4 | 1481609259 | 2070954 | 5/16/08-current | \$955.91 | G | Paid by 58G 3/29/12 | Partal 1 |
| 62 | 534 N. Marshall 5 treet | Apt H 4 | 1481609259 | 2070954 | 5/16/08 -current | \$18.51 | G | Open Balance | Partal I |
| 63 | 634 N. Marshail Street | Apt H 9 | 8613922178 | 2070952 | 5/16/08-6/17/08 | \$2.29 | G | Pald by S8G 3/29/12 | 0 |
| 64 | 634 N. Marshall 5 beet | Apt H10 | 2479786985 | 2070956 | 5/16/08-6/05/08 | \$46.83 | $G$ | Pald by $5863 / 29 / 12$ | 0 |
| 65 | 634 N. Marshall Street | Apt H12 | 5518685947 | 2071092 | 5/16/08-current | \$1,051.58 | G | Pald by S8G 3/29/12 | Partial 1 |
| 66 | 634 N. Marshall Street | Apt H12 | 5518685947 | 2071092 | 5/16/08-current | \$21.80 | G | Open Balance | Partial 1 |
| 67 | 641 N. Marshall Street | Apt 12 | 654455462 | 1838549 | 5/16/08-current | 5761.72 | 6 | Paid by SBG 3/29/12 | Partial 1 |
| 68 | 641 N. Marshall 5 treet | Apt 12 | 654455462 | 1838549 | 5/16/08-current | \$17.38 | G | Open Balance | Partial 1 |
| 69 | 541 N. Marshail Street | Apt 14 | 6644708295 | 1730429 | 5/18/08-current | \$869.85 | G | Pald by S8G 3/29/12 | Partal 1 |
| 70 | 641 N. Marshall Street | Apt 14 | 6644708295 | 1730429 | 5/16/08-current | \$115.76 | 6 | Open Balance | Partal 1 |
| 1 | 641 N Marshall street | Apt 16 | 195442793 | 1496711 | 5/16/08-12/3/09 | \$264.74 |  | Pald by $5863 / 29 / 12$ | Partal 1 |
| 72 | 641 N Marshall 5treet | Apt 110 | 6391831220 | 1890661 | 1/27/09 - current | \$3,761.71 | G | Pald by SBG 3/29/12 | Partal 1 |
| 73 | 641 N Marshall Street | Apt 110 | 6391831220 | 1890661 | 1/27/09 - current | \$335.03 | 6 | Open Balance | Partal I |
| 74 | 641 N Marshall 5treet | Apt 111 | 7680484338 | 1856088 | 2/3/09-11/1/2012 | \$1,206.69 | 6 | Paid by 586 3/29/12 | Partial 1 |
| 75 | 641 N Marshall 5 5reet | Apt 111 | 7680484338 | 1856088 | 2/3/09-11/1/2012 | \$263.05 | 6 | Open Balance | Partial 1 |
| 76 | 627 N .6 th 5treet | Apt 12 | 3395628567 | 2072635 | 5/16/08-7/8/08 | \$3.88 | 6 | Pald by SBG 3/29/12 | 0 |
| 77 | 627 N. 6th Street | ADt 120 | 5575355219 | 2072693 | 5/16/08-6/05/08 | \$22.58 | G | Pald by 58G 3/29/12 | 0 |
|  | 627 N. 6th Street | Apt 111 | 7964884980 | 2074244 | 5/16/08-8/11/08 | \$58.50 | 6 | Pald by 58G 3/29/12 | 0 |


|  | Fairmount 620 N MARSHALL STATEMENT | PHILPA 191233445 | From Date $1 / 1 / 2004$ Account 677180766 | Number | SA Number 7054389359 |  |  | Meter 01780400 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dispute NO. | Transaction Oate Type | Reading <br> Reading Code \# of | Days CCF Usage CCF | Average Heating F/Days DOD's |  | Payment Type | Due Date | Transaction Amount | DISPUTE CODE | Current Balance | Actual Balance | \% Calculated <br> LPC assessed <br> Current Balance |
| 1 | 4/1/2005 BILL | 17567 R | 59 1581 | 26.8 | 1583 |  | 4/26/2005 | \$2,531.68 | J | \$5,853.66 | \$5,853,66 |  |
| 2 | 5/4/2009 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$318.16 | F | \$25,319.16 | \$25,319.16 | 1.27\% |
| 3 | 6/4/2009 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$321.58 | $F$ | \$25,868.60 | \$25,868.60 | 1.26\% |
| 4 | 7/3/2009 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$324.59 | F | \$26,394.28 | \$26,394.28 | 1.25\% |
| 5 | 8/3/2009 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$327.08 | F | \$26,885.91 | \$26,886.91 | 1.23\% |
| 6 | 9/2/2009 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$329.27 | $F$ | \$27,362.64 | \$27,362.64 | 1.22\% |
| 7 | 10/2/2009 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$331.59 | F | \$27,848.64 | \$27,848.64 | 1.21\% |
| 8 | 10/30/2009 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$334.46 | F | \$28,374.13 | \$28,374.13 | 1.19\% |
| 9 | 12/3/2009 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 5337.64 | $F$ | \$28,924.34 | \$28,924.34 | 1.18\% |
| 10 | 1/4/2010 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$341.38 | F | \$29,514.68 | \$29,514.68 | 1.17\% |
| 11 | 2/3/2010 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$345.03 | $F$ | \$30,103.19 | \$30,103.19 | 1.16\% |
| 12 | 3/3/2010 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$349.31 | F | \$30,737.93 | \$30,737.93 | 1.15\% |
| 13 | 4/1/2010 UPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 5353.16 | F | \$31,347.86 | \$31,347.86 | 1.14\% |
| 14 | 5/4/2010 UPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 5357.13 | F | \$31,969.46 | \$31,969.46 | 1.13\% |
| 15 | 6/3/2010 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$361.53 | F | \$32,624.51 | \$32,624.51 | 1.12\% |
| 16 | 7/1/2010 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$365.65 | F | \$33,264,61 | \$33,264.61 | 1.11\% |
| 17 | 8/3/2010 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$368.46 | F | \$33,820.16 | \$33,820.16 | 1.10\% |
| 18 | 9/1/2010 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 5371.08 | F | \$34,366.24 | \$34,366.24 | 1.09\% |
| 19 | 10/1/2010 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$373.14 | F | \$34,876.63 | \$34,876.63 | 1.08\% |
| 20 | 11/1/2010 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$375.16 | F | \$35,386.67 | \$35,386.67 | 1.07\% |
| 21 | 12/1/2010 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$377.62 | F | \$35,928.31 | \$35,928.31 | 1.06\% |
| 22 | 1/4/2011 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$380.44 | F | \$36,496.16 | \$36,496.16 | 1.05\% |
| 23 | 2/2/2011 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$383.92 | F | \$37,112.42 | \$37,112.42 | 1.05\% |
| 24 | 3/4/2011 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$388.09 | F | \$37,778.73 | \$37,778.73 | 1.04\% |
| 25 | 4/1/2011 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$392.12 | F | \$38,439.00 | \$38,439.00 | 1.03\% |
| 26 | 5/3/2011 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$395.86 | $F$ | \$39,084.17 | \$39,084.17 | 1.02\% |
| 27 | 6/2/2011 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$400.10 | F | \$39,766.96 | \$39,766.96 | 1.02\% |
| 28 | 07/01/2011 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$403.74 | F | \$40,413.33 | \$40,413.33 | 1.01\% |
| 29 | 8/2/2011 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$406.39 | $F$ | \$40,996.57 | \$40,996.57 | 1.00\% |
| 30 | 9/1/2011 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$408.75 | F | \$41,562.69 | \$41,562.69 | 0.99\% |
| 31 | 10/3/2011 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$411.06 | F | \$42,128.13 | \$42,128.13 | 0.99\% |
| 32 | 11/1/2011 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$413.55 | F | \$42,707,13 | \$42,707.13 | 0.98\% |
| 33 | 12/1/2011 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$416.23 | F | \$43,302.50 | \$43,302.50 | 0.97\% |
| 34 | 1/4/2012 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$419.43 | F | \$43,935.31 | \$43,935.31 | 0.96\% |
| 35 | 2/2/2012 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 423.04 | 8 | \$44,598.95 | \$44,598.95 | 0.96\% |
| 36 | 3/5/2012 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$428.37 | B | \$45,382.31 | \$45,382.31 | 0.95\% |
| 37 | 4/4/2012 (PC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 432.89 | B | \$46,116.91 | \$46,116.91 | 0.95\% |
| 38 | 5/3/2012 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$33.60 | $F$ | \$2,274.22 | \$2,274.22 | 1.50\% |
| 39 | 6/5/2012 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 36.93 | F | \$2,532.97 | \$2,532.97 | 1.48\% |
| 40 | 7/3/2012 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$40.70 | F | \$2,825.13 | \$2,825.13 | 1.45\% |
| 41 | 8/2/2012 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 43.14 | $F$ | \$3,030.78 | \$3,030.78 | 1.44\% |
| 42 | 9/4/2012 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$45.08 | F | \$3,205.17 | \$3,205.17 | 1.43\% |
| 43 | 10/3/2012 LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 47.44 | F | \$3,410.02 | \$3,410.02 | 1.41\% |
| 44 | 11/1/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$49.61 | $F$ | \$3,604.31 | \$3,604.31 | 1.40\% |

-0 Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.

|  | Fairmount 620 N MARSHALL ST STATEMENT | PHIL,PA 191233445 | From Date $1 / 1 / 2004$ <br> Account 677180766 <br> Number | To Date 10/25/2012 <br> SA Number 7054389359 | Meter 01780400 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlspute NO. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transaction } \\ & \text { Date } \quad \text { Type } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\qquad$ <br> Reading <br> Readling Code \# of | $\qquad$ Days CCF Usage CCF/Days DOD's | Payment <br> Type Due Date | Transaction Amount | DISPUTE CODE | Current <br> Balance | Actual Balance | \% Calculated <br> LPC assessed <br> Current Balance |
| 45 | 12/4/2012 LPC |  |  |  | \$52.89 | F | \$3,875.55 | \$3,875.55 | 1.38\% |
| 46 | 1/5/2013 LPC |  |  |  | \$57.18 | F | \$4,219.15 | \$4,219.15 | 1.37\% |
| 47 | 2/5/2013 LPC |  |  |  | \$61.87 | F | \$4,593.75 | \$4,593.75 | 1.37\% |
| 48 | 3/6/2013 LPC |  |  |  | \$66.37 | F | \$4,960.14 | \$4,960.14 | 1.36\% |
| 49 | 4/4/2013 UPC |  |  |  | 570.88 | $F$ | \$5,331.67 | \$5,331.67 | 1.35\% |
| 50 | 5/3/2013 LPC |  |  |  | \$75.15 | F | \$5,691,34 | \$5,691.34 | 1.34\% |
| 51 | 6/4/2013 LPC |  |  |  | \$79.23 | F | \$6,042,33 | 56,042.33 | 1.33\% |
| 52 | 7/2/2013 LPC |  |  |  | \$82.87 | F | \$6,367.93 | \$6,367.93 | 1.32\% |
| 53 | 8/2/2013 LPC |  |  |  | \$85.97 | F | \$6,660.30 | \$6,660,30 | 1.31\% |



- Settiement amount according to PGW workpapers.

The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not Include additional late fees.





** Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additlonal late fees.

|  | Falrmount |  |  | 123271 | From Date | $1 / 2004$ |  | To Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 640 N MARS | HALL S | PHIL, PA1 | 9123271 | Account N | ber 355139832 | 832 | SA Numb |  | Meter 152 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | STATEMENT |  |  | Reading |  |  | Average |  |  |  | Transaction | DISPUTE | Current | Actual | LPC assessed |
| No. | Date | Type | Reading | Code | \# of Days | CCF Usage | CCF/Days | s DDD's | Type | Due Date | Amount | CODE | Balance | Balance | Current Balance |
| 45 | 7/3/2012 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 542.32 | F | \$2,936.72 | \$2,936.72 | 1.46\% |
| 46 | 8/2/2012 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 545.64 | $F$ | \$3,201.10 | \$3,201.10 | 1.45\% |
| 47 | 9/4/2012 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$48.29 | F | \$3,425.98 | \$3,425.98 | 1.43\% |
| 48 | 10/3/2012 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$51.43 | F | \$3,687.21 | \$3,687.21 | 1.41\% |
| 49 | 11/1/2012 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$54.60 | F | \$3,953.12 | 53,953.12 | 1.40\% |
| 50 | 12/4/2012 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$58.63 | F | \$4,280.39 | \$4,280.39 | 1.39\% |
| 51 | 1/4/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$63.47 | F | 54,666.11 | \$4,666.11 | 1.38\% |
| 52 | 2/5/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$68.72 | $F$ | \$5,085.01 | \$5,085.01 | 1.37\% |
| 53 | 3/5/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$74.20 | $F$ | \$ $5,524.88$ | \$5,524.88 | 1.36\% |
| 54 | 4/3/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$80.18 | F | \$6,003.69 | \$6,003.69 | 1.35\% |
| 55 | 5/3/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 585.92 | F | \$6,471.80 | \$6,471.80 | 1.35\% |
| 56 | 6/4/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$91.33 | F | \$6,924.32 | \$6,924.32 | 1.34\% |
| 57 | 7/2/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$95.95 | F | \$7,327.92 | \$7,327.92 | 1.33\% |
| 58 | 8/2/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$100.24 | F | \$7,714.47 | \$7,714.47 | 1.32\% |


*) Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not /achude addillonal late fees.

|  |  |  |  |  | From Date mber 3338 | SAN | /25/2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Service Address | 634N6THS |  | Account | umber 3338 | SA | 2935701 | Meter 198 |  |  |  |  | \% Calculated |  |
| Dispute No. | Transaction <br> Date <br> Type | Reading | Reading <br> Code | \# of Days | Us | Average CCF/Days | Heating Payment DOD's Type | Due Date | Transaction Amount | DISPUTE | Current Balance | Actual Balance | LPC assesse Current Balance |  |
| 47 | 3/5/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 541.72 | F | \$3,093.51 | \$3,093.51 | 1.37\% |  |
| 48 | 4/3/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S44.80 | F | \$3,343.84 | 53,343.84 | 1.36\% |  |
| 49 | 5/3/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$47.62 | F | \$3,579.19 | \$3,579.19 | 1.35\% |  |
| 50 | 6/4/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$50.22 | F | \$3,803.13 | \$3,803.13 | 1.34\% |  |
| 51 | 7/2/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$52.50 | F | \$4,007.80 | \$4,007.80 | 1.33\% |  |
| 52 | 8/2/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$54.42 | F | \$4,190.12 | \$4,190,12 | 1.32\% | : |



|  | Speeffic Service Agr Falmenunt SBG MANAGEMEN Servke Address 63ANGHSTPHLL.PA | rement State NT SERVICES <br> A191232805 | count SA- 4304754753 | From Date 1/1/2004 Account Number 333870431 | To Date SA Num | 5/2012 <br> 304754753 | Meter Rat |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dispute NO. | STATEMENT <br> Transaction <br> Date | Typa Reading | Reading <br> Code \# of Days CCF Usage | Average CCF/Days | Heatling DOD's | Pryment <br> Type | Due Date | Trensaction Amount | DISPUTE COOE | Current Balance | Actual Balance | $\begin{aligned} & \text { XCalculated } \\ & \text { ifCAstessed } \\ & \text { Current Balance } \end{aligned}$ |
| 51 | 7/1/2010 | PPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | 5126.40 | $F$ | \$12,211.23 | \$12,211.23 | 1.05\% |
| 52 | 8/3/2010) | LPC |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 5126.40 | $F$ | S12,337.63 | \$12,337.63 | 1.04\% |
| 53 | 9/1/2010 | WC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | S12,464.03 | \$12,464.03 | 1.02\% |
| 54 | 10/2/2010 | LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | 5126.40 | F | S12,590.43 | \$12,590.43 | 1.01\% |
| 55 | 12/1/2010 | LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | 5126.40 | F | \$12,716.83 | \$12,716.83 | 1.00\% |
| 56 | 12/1/2020 | LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$125.40 | F | S12,843,23 | \$12,843.23 | 0.99\% |
| 57 | 1/4/2011 | LT |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | $F$ | S12,969.63 | \$12,969.63 | 0.98\% |
| 58 | 2/2/2011 | LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$125.40 | $F$ | \$13,096.03 | \$13,096.03 | 0.97\% |
| 59 | 3/4/2011 | WC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | \$13,222,43 | \$13,222.43 | 0.97\% |
| 60 | 4/1/2012 | LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | \$13.348.83 | \$13,348.83 | 0.96\% |
| 61 | 5/3/2011 | $1{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | \$13,475.23 | \$13,475.23 | 0.95\% |
| 62 | 6/2/2012 | LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | \$13,601.63 | \$13,501.69 | 0.94x |
| 63 | 7/1/2011 | LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | \$13,728.03 | \$13,728.03 | 093* |
| 54 | 9/2/2011 | $1 P C$ |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | \$13,854.43 | S13,854.43 | 0.92\% |
| 65 | 9/1/2011 | PPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | S126.40 | F | \$ $13,988.83$ | 513,980.83 | 0.91\% |
| 66 | 10/3/2011 | LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | S14,107.23 | \$14,107.23 | 0.90\% |
| 67 | 21/1/2011 | LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | 514,233.63 | \$14,233.63 | 0.90\% |
| 58 | 12/1/2021 | PPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | \$14,360.03 | \$14,360.03 | 089\% |
| 69 | 1/4/2012 | $\mathrm{P}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | $F$ | \$14,486.43 | \$14,486.43 | 0.88\% |
| 70 | 2/2/2012 | LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | \$14,612.83 | \$14,612.83 | 0.87\% |
| 71 | 3/5/2012 | LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | \$14.739.23 | \$14,739.23 | 0.85\% |
| 72 | 4/4/2012 | PPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$126.40 | F | \$14,865.63 | \$ 14.865 .63 | 0.86\% |
| 73 | 5/3/2012 | PC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$5.58 | F | \$384.88 | \$384.88 | 1.50\% |
| 74 | 6/5/2012 | LPC |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$5.68 | F | \$390.56 | \$390.56 | 1.48\% |


-* Settiement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at 3/29/12 should not include addluonal late fees.

| Dispute NO. | Falrmount |  |  |  |  | From Date 1/1/2004 To Date 10/25/2012 <br> Account Number 215659749 SA Number 8938394971 |  |  |  | Meter 1806207 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 700 N MARS <br> STATEMENT <br> Transaction Date | Type | Reading | Reading Code | \# of Days | CCF Usage | Average CCF/Days | Heating 000's | Payment Type | Due Date | Transaction Amount | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISPUTE } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ | Current Balance | Actual Balance | \% Calculated LPC assessed Current Balance |
| 46 | 5/8/2007 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | F | \$10.33 | \$10.33 | 1.47\% |
| 47 | 6/7/2007 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | F | \$10.48 | \$10.48 | 1.45\% |
| 48 | 7/9/2007 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | F | \$10.63 | \$10.63 | 1.43\% |
| 49 | 8/7/2007 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | $F$ | \$10.78 | \$10.78 | 1.41\% |
| 50 | 9/6/2007 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | F | \$10.93 | \$10.93 | 1.39\% |
| 51 | 10/5/2007 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | $F$ | \$11.08 | \$11.08 | 1.3\%\% |
| 52 | 11/5/2007 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | F | \$11.23 | \$11.23 | 1.35\% |
| 53 | 12/6/2007 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | F | \$11.38 | \$11.38 | 1.34\% |
| 54 | 1/8/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | F | \$11.53 | \$11.53 | 1.32\% |
| 55 | 2/6/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | $F$ | \$11.68 | \$11.68 | 1.30\% |
| 56 | 3/6/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | $F$ | \$11.83 | \$12.83 | 1.28\% |
| 57 | 4/7/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | F | \$11.98 | \$11.98 | 1.27\% |
| 58 | 5/7/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.15 | F | \$12.13 | \$12.13 | 1.25\% |
| 59 | 5/29/2008 | PAY |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | Check |  | (52.96) | G | \$9.17 | \$9.17 |  |
| 60 | 6/5/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$9.30 | \$9.30 | 1.42\% |
| 61 | 7/7/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$9.43 | \$9.43 | 1.40\% |
| 62 | 8/5/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$9.56 | \$9.56 | 1.38\% |
| 63 | 9/4/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | $F$ | \$9.69 | \$9.69 | 1.35\% |
| 64 | 10/4/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | $F$ | \$9.82 | \$9.82 | 1.34\% |
| 65 | 11/3/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | $F$ | \$9.95 | \$9.95 | 1.32\% |
| 66 | 12/5/2008 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$10.08 | \$10.08 | 1.31\% |
| 67 | 1/8/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$10.21 | \$10.21 | 1.29\% |
| 68 | 2/5/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | $F$ | \$10.34 | \$10.34 | 1.27\% |
| 69 | 3/8/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$10.47 | \$10.47 | 1.26\% |
| 70 | 4/7/2009 | L.PC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$10.60 | \$10.60 | 1.24\% |
| 71 | 5/6/2009 | (9C |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$10.73 | \$10.73 | 1.23\% |
| 72 | 6/6/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$10.86 | \$10.86 | 1.21\% |
| 73 | 7/8/2009 | 1 PC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$10.99 | \$10.99 | 1.20\% |
| 74 | 8/6/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$11.12 | \$11.12 | 1.18\% |
| 75 | 9/4/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | $F$ | \$11.25 | \$11.25 | 1.17\% |
| 76 | 10/5/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | $F$ | \$11.38 | \$11.38 | 1.16\% |
| 77 | 11/4/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$11.51 | \$11.51 | 1.14\% |
| 78 | 12/5/2009 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$11.64 | \$11.64 | 1.13\% |
| 79 | 1/6/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.13 | F | \$11.7 | \$11.77 | 1.12\% |
| 80 | 1/11/2010 | PAY |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | Check |  | (\$11.64) | 6 | \$0.13 | \$0.13 |  |
| 81 | 2/4/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.00 |  | \$0.13 | \$0.13 |  |
| 82 | 3/5/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.00 |  | \$0.13 | \$0.13 |  |
| 83 | 4/7/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.00 |  | \$0.13 | \$0.13 |  |
| 84 | 5/6/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.00 |  | \$0.13 | 50.13 |  |
| 85 | 6/5/2010 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.00 |  | \$0.13 | \$0.13 |  |
| 86 | 7/6/2010 | L.PC |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | \$0.00 |  | \$0.13 | \$0.13 |  |
| 87 | 7/22/2010 | PAY |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | Check |  | (50.13) | $G$ | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |  |

** Settiement amount according to PGW workpapers

**Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.

*" Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.


* Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.

The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.


[^1]The batance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.

| falrmount |  |  | From Date 1/1/2004 |  |  | To Data10/25/2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 702 N MARSHALL ST PHIL, PA 191232710 |  | Account Number |  |  | SA Number |  |  | Meter |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 215659749 |  | 1882249424 |  |  | 1905337 |  | DISPUTE CODE |  |  |  |
|  | STATEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Transaction Amount |  |  |  |  |
| Dispute NO. | Transaction Date Type | Reading <br> Reading Code | \# of Days | CCF Usage | Average CCF/Oays | Heating DOD's |  | Payment Type | Due Date |  |  | Current Balance | Actual Balance | \% Calculated LPC assessed Current Balance |
| 77 | 4/26/2006 PAY |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | Check |  | (\$308.47) | G | \$628.26 | \$628.26 |  |
| 78 | 5/8/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$9.42 | G | \$637.68 | \$637.68 | 1.50\% |
| 79 | 5/8/2006 BILL | 5412 R | 30 | 45 | 1.5 |  | 245 |  | 6/1/2006 | \$119.11 | $G$ | \$756.79 | \$756.79 |  |
| 80 | 5/23/2006 PAY |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | Check |  | (\$219.59) | G | \$537.20 | \$537.20 |  |
| 81 | 6/7/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$8.05 | $G$ | \$545.25 | \$545.25 | 1.50\% |
| 82 | 6/7/2006 Bill | 5417 R | 30 | 5 | 0.17 |  | 67 |  | 6/30/2006 | \$30.24 | G | \$575.49 | \$575.49 |  |
| 83 | 7/7/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$8.51 | $G$ | \$584.00 | \$584.00 | 1.48\% |
| 84 | 7/7/2006 BILL | 5417 R | 31 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 8/1/2006 | \$19.26 | G | \$603.26 | \$603.26 |  |
| 85 | 8/7/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$8.80 | G | \$612.06 | \$612.06 | 1.46\% |
| 86 | 8/7/2006 BILL | 5417 R | 30 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 8/30/2006 | \$19.26 | G | \$631.32 | \$631.32 |  |
| 87 | 9/6/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$9.08 | G | \$640.40 | \$640.40 | 1.44\% |
| 88 | 9/6/2006 BILL | 5417 R | 29 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 9/29/2006 | \$19.26 | G | \$659.66 | \$659.66 |  |
| 89 | 9/11/2006 PAY |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | Check |  | (\$232.34) | G | \$427.32 | \$427.32 |  |
| 90 | 10/5/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$6.40 | G | \$433.72 | \$433.72 | 2.50\% |
| 91 | 10/5/2006 8ILL | 5417 R | 32 | 0 | 0 |  | 36 |  | 10/30/2006 | \$19.26 | $G$ | \$452.98 | \$452.98 |  |
| 92 | 11/4/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$6.69 | G | \$459.67 | \$459.67 | 1.48\% |
| 93 | 11/4/2006 BII | 5445 R | 29 | 28 | 0.97 |  | 279 |  | 11/28/2006 | \$73.24 | 6 | \$532.91 | \$532.91 |  |
| 94 | 12/6/2006 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$7.79 | $G$ | \$540.70 | \$540.70 | 1.46\% |
| 95 | 12/6/2006 BILL | 5648 R | 31 | 203 | 6.55 |  | 409 |  | 01/03/200? | \$451.66 | G | \$992.36 | \$992.36 |  |
| 96 | 1/9/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$14.57 | G | \$1,006.93 | \$1,005.93 | 2.47\% |
| 97 | 1/9/2007 BILL | 5856 R | 34 | 208 | 6.12 |  | 756 |  | 2/2/2007 | \$437.12 | G | \$1,444.05 | \$1,444.05 |  |
| 98 | 1/19/2007 PAY |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | Check |  | (\$215.64) | $G$ | \$1,228.41 | \$1,228.41 |  |
| 99 | 2/7/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$18.42 | G | \$1,246.83 | \$1,246.83 | 1.50\% |
| 100 | 2/7/2007 8fLL | 5984 R | 29 | 128 | 4.41 |  | 812 |  | 3/5/2007 | \$270.80 | G | \$1,517.63 | \$1,517.63 |  |
| 101 | 3/8/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$2248 | G | \$1,540.11 | \$1,540.11 | 1.48\% |
| 102 | 3/8/2007 BIL | 6320 R | 31 | 336 | 10.84 |  | 1083 |  | 4/2/2007 | \$629.60 | G | \$2,169.71 | \$2,169.71 |  |
| 103 | 4/9/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$31.93 | G | \$2,201.64 | \$2,201.64 | 1.47\% |
| 104 | 4/9/2007 BILL | 6468 R | 29 | 148 | 5.1 |  | 559 |  | 5/2/2007 | \$298.98 | $G$ | \$2,500.62 | \$2,500.62 |  |
| 105 | 5/2/2007 PAY |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | Check |  | (\$1,517.63) | 1 | \$982.99 | \$982.99 |  |
| 106 | 5/8/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$14.74 | G | \$997.73 | \$997.73 | 1.50\% |
| 107 | 5/8/2007 EtL | 6573 R | 30 | 105 | 3.5 |  | 408 |  | 6/1/2007 | \$206.72 | G | \$1,204.45 | \$1,204.45 |  |
| 108 | 6/7/2007 L.PC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$17.84 | G | \$1,222.29 | \$1,222.29 | 1.48\% |
| 109 | 6/7/2007 81LL | 6573 R | 32 | 0 | 0 |  | 68 |  | 7/2/2007 | \$19.26 | G | \$1,241.55 | \$1,241.55 |  |
| 110 | 7/9/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$18.13 | G | \$1,259.68 | \$1,259.68 | 1.46\% |
| 111 | 7/9/2007 BILL | 6575 R | 29 | 2 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 8/1/2007 | \$23.06 | G | \$1,282.74 | \$1,282.74 |  |
| 112 | 8/7/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$18.48 | G | \$1,301.22 | \$1,301.22 | 1.44\% |
| 113 | 8/7/2007 8ILL | 6575 R | 30 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 8/30/2007 | \$19.26 | G | \$1,320.48 | \$1,320.48 |  |
| 114 | 9/6/2007 LPC |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | \$18.76 | G | \$1,339.24 | \$1,339,24 | 1.42\% |

** Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional fate fees.


* Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers

The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.

** Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.


[^2]The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees.

** Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.
The balance at $3 / 29 / 12$ should not include additional late fees



Exhibit "A-4"


|  | fean rock $934-938 \mathrm{~W}$ | JDF | ave Apt |  | PA 19141000 C | From Date Account N |  | To Date SA Numb |  | Meter Rat | 2035385 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Statement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% Calculated |
| Olspute NO. | Transaction Date | Type | Reading | Reading Code | 4 of Days | CCF Usage | Average CCF/Days | Heating DDD's | Payment Type | Due Date | Transaction Amount | DISPUTE CODE | Current <br> Balance | Actual Balance | LPC assessed Current Balance |
| 51 | 5/4/201 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 346.37 | F | \$27,240.57 | \$27,240.57 | 1.29\% |
| 52 | 6/6/201 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 354.52 | $F$ | \$28,137.97 | \$28,137.97 | 1.28\% |
| 53 | 7/3/201 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 363.12 | F | \$29,074.92 | \$29,074,92 | 1.26\% |
| 54 | 8/6/201 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 369.23 | F | \$29,851.48 | \$29,851.48 | 1.25\% |







Exhibit "A-5"




|  |  |  |  |  |  | From Date 1/1/200 Account Number 5128000237 |  | To Date 10/26/2012 SA Number 6430067215 |  | 'Merer Rave 1970015 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISPUTE } \\ & \text { COOE } \end{aligned}$ | Current Balance | Actual Babance |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Statiment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Paym |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oispute No. | Dato | Trpe | Rexins | code | Hof oxys | Crfuma |  |  | Trpee | Oue Date |  | 53.15 |  | F | 52,36236 |  | \$2,362.36 | 1.42\% |
| , | $7{ }^{2} 172013$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 535.71 | F | \$2568.40 |  | \$2,568.40 | 1,11\% | 60 7/3/2013LPC 61 8/6/2019LP


** Settiement amount according to PGW workpapers.



[^3]| Disputg NO. | oaklane <br> 1623 W CHELTEN AVE AgIS PHILPA $19126351 S$ |  |  |  | From Oate 1/1/2004 |  |  |  | To Date 10/26/2012 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Account NCcr usage | Average CCF/Days | Heating DOD's | Payment Type | SA Number 8606551072 |  | Meter Rate 2012799 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Calculated } \\ & \text { LPC assessed } \\ & \text { Current Balance } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Transaction <br> Date Type | Reading | Reading Code | \# of Days |  |  |  |  | Transaction Due Date Arrount |  | DISPUTE CODE | Current <br> Easlance | Actua) Balance |  |
| 1 | 4/17/2008 BliL | 98013 |  | 30 | 01915 | 63.83 |  |  | 5/12/2008 | \$3,641.46 | 3 | \$6,954.35 | \$6,954,35 |  |
| 2 | 5/16/2008 日iLi | 99482 | R | 29 | $9-1469$ | 50.66 |  |  | 6/11/2008 | \$2,901.79 | J | \$9,959.72 | \$9,959.72 |  |
| 3 | 6/17/2008 BILI | 770 |  | 32 | 21288 | 40.25 |  | 6 | 7/11/2008 | \$2,574.28 | J | \$10,536.09 | \$10,536,09 |  |
| 4 | 4/18/2008 814 | 16267 |  | 30 | 0. 2021 | 67.37 |  |  | 5/12/2009 | \$3,497.19 | , | \$14,176.64 | 514,176.64 |  |
| 5 | 5/18/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$143.65 | F | \$9,720.53 | \$9,720.53 | 1.50\% |
| 6 | 5/18/2009 811 | 1729 |  | 29 | 91027 | 35.41 |  |  | 6/11/2009 | \$1,854.33 | J | \$11,574.86 | \$11,574.86 |  |
| 7 | 6/18/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$171.46 | $F$ | \$11,746.32 | \$11,746.32 | 1.48\% |
| 8 | 7/17/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$191.82 | F | \$13,294.94 | \$13,294.94 | 1.46\% |
| 9 | 8/17/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$109.92 | $F$ | \$7,438.24 | \$7,438.24 | 1.50\% |
| 10 | 9/17/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$46.95 | F | \$3,177.22 | \$3,177.22 | 1.50\% |
| 11 | 10/16/2009 PPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$48.33 | F | \$3,270.61 | \$3,270.61 | 1.50\% |
| 12 | 11/16/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$49.95 | F | \$3,379.96 | \$3,379.96 | 1.50\% |
| 13 | 12/16/2009 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$27.89 | F | \$1,887.59 | \$1,887.59 | 1.50\% |
| 14 | 1/19/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$28.31 | F | \$1,915.90 | \$1,915.90 | 1.50\% |
| 15 | 2/17/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$85.07 | F | \$5,785.23 | \$5,785.23 | 1.49\% |
| 16 | 3/17/2010 814 | 31402 |  | 28 | 8 2133 | 76.18 |  |  | 4/12/2010 | \$3,461.13 | $F$ | \$13,521.09 | \$13,521.09 |  |
| 17 | 5/17/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$186.78 | F | \$12,639.19 | \$12,639.19 | 1.50\% |
| 18 | 6/16/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$209.38 | 5 | \$14,355.01 | \$14,355.01 | 1.48\% |
| 19 | 7/16/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$192.72 | $F$ | \$13,041.19 | \$13,041.19 | 1.50\% |
| 20 | 8/16/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$204.36 | F | \$14,021.68 | \$14,021.68 | 1.48\% |
| 21 | 9/16/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$209.46 | F | \$14,173.77 | \$14,173.77 | 1.50\% |
| 22 | 10/15/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$222.09 | F | \$15,237,97 | \$15,237.97 | 1.48\% |
| 23 | 11/16/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$150.69 | F | \$10,196.72 | \$10,196.72 | 1.50\% |
| 24 | 12/15/2010 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 5183.25 | F | \$12,550.89 | \$12,550.89 | 1.48\% |
| 25 | 1/19/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$197.35 | F | \$13,354,49 | \$13,354.49 | 1.50\% |
| 26 | 1/19/2011 BILI | 42566 |  | 3.5 | 52906 | 83.03 | 11 |  | 2/11/2011 | \$4,040.62 | J | \$17,395.11 | \$17,395.11 |  |
| 27 | 2/16/2011 lPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$150.69 | F | \$10,196.72 | \$10,196.72 | 1.50\% |
| 28 | 3/18/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$150.69 | F | \$10,196.72 | \$10,196.72 | 1.50\% |
| 29 | 4/15/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$199.40 | $F$ | \$13,643.87 | \$13,543.87 | 1.48\% |
| 30 | 5/17/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$293.83 | f | \$13,216.41 | \$13,116.41 | 1.50\% |
| 31 | 5/17/2011 BILL | 49737 |  | 32 | 21034 | 32.31 |  |  | 6/10/2011 | \$1,707.57 | 1 | \$14,823.98 | \$14,823.98 |  |
| 32 | 6/17/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$179.21 | F | \$12,126.64 | \$12,126.64 | 1.50\% |
| 33 | 7/18/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$120.00 | $F$ | \$8,120.00 | \$8,120.00 | 1.50\% |
| 34 | 8/16/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$232.43 | F | \$9,081.43 | \$9,081,43 | 1.48\% |
| 35 | 9/17/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$135.50 | F | \$9,168.96 | \$9,168.96 | 1.50\% |
| 36 | 10/17/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$125.81 | $F$ | \$8,513.74 | \$8,513.74 | 1.50\% |
| 37 | 11/16/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$30.79 | $F$ | \$2,083.56 | \$2,083.56 | 1.50\% |
| 38 | 12/15/2011 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$16.39 | $F$ | \$ $51,109.44$ | 51,109.44 | 1.50\% |
| 39 | 1/18/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$49.57 | F | \$3,370.70 | \$3,370.70 | 1.49\% |
| 40 | 2/16/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$97.39 | F | \$6,656.51 | \$6,656.51 | 1.48\% |
| 41 | 3/20/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$93.51 | F | \$6,327.77 | \$6,327.77 | 1.50\% |
| 42 | 4/18/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$130.99 | $F$ | \$8,957.45 | \$8,957.45 | 1.48\% |
| 43 | 5/17/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$156.98 | F | \$10,847.20 | \$10,847.20 | 1.47\% |
| 44 | 6/19/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$170.97 | F | \$11,950.85 | \$11,950.85 | 1.45\% |
| 45 | 7/18/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$181.24 | F | \$12,817.00 | \$12,817.00 | 1.43\% |
| 46 | 8/16/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$189.78 | F | \$13,575.57 | \$13,575.57 | 1.42\% |
| 47 | 9/18/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$197.25 | F | \$14,271.33 | \$14,271.33 | 1.40\% |
| 48 | 10/18/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$206.36 | $F$ | \$15,084.72 | \$15,084.72 | 1.39\% |
| 49 | 11/16/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$218.42 | $F$ | \$16,107.40 | \$16,107.40 | 1.37\% |
| 50 | 12/18/2012 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$247.49 | F | \$18,292.86 | \$18,292.86 | 1.37\% |

Exhibit "A-7"





|  | SIMON GARDEN REALTY co <br> 6731 MUSGRAVE ST Apt A PHIL,PA 191192168 |  |  |  | From Date 1/1/2004 <br> Account Number 539547187 |  |  | To Date 10/26/2012 <br> SA Number 4395848077 |  | Meter 2035836 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dispute NO. | state <br> Trans <br> Date | Type | Reading | Readling <br> Code |  |  |  | Heating DOD's | Payment Type | Due Date | Transaction Amount | DISPUTE CODE | Current Balance | Actual Balance | \% Calculated LPC assessed Current Balance |
| 49 | 10/2 | LPC |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | \$23.92 | F | \$1,804.71 | \$1,804,71 | 1.34\% |
| 50 | 11/6 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$35.75 | F | \$2,629.25 | \$2,629.25 | 1.38\% |
| 51 | 12/6 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$51.23 | F | \$3,712.25 | \$3,712.25 | 1.40\% |
| 52 |  | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$107.25 | F | \$7,554.20 | \$7,554.20 | 1.44\% |
| 53 |  | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$174.70 | $F$ | \$12,235.84 | \$12,225.84 | 1.45\% |
| 54 |  | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$26282 | F | \$18,363.46 | \$18,363,46 | 1.45\% |
| 55 |  | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$334.69 | F | \$23,489.38 | \$23,489.38 | 1.45\% |
| 56 |  | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$407.63 | F | \$28,759,76 | \$28,759.76 | 1.44\% |
| 57 |  | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 443.51 | F | \$31,595.11 | \$31,595.11 | 1.42\% |
| 58 |  | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 467.53 | F | \$33,664,16 | \$33,664.16 | 1.41\% |
| 59 |  | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 480.75 | F | \$35,026.03 | \$35,026.03 | 1.39\% |



|  | Siman garden realty co |  |  |  |  | From Date 1/1/2004 |  |  |  | To Date 10/25/2019 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 6732 CHEW AVE Apt M2 PHILPA 191191910 |  |  |  | Account Number 539547187 |  |  |  | SA Number 1162325601 |  | Meter 1944659 |  |  | \% Calculated |
| Dlspute NO. | Transaction Date | Type | Reading | Reading Code | 3 of Days | CCF Usage | Average CCF/Days | Heating DDD's | Payment <br> Түре | Due Date | Trarsaction Amaunt | DISPUTE COOE | Current Batance | Actual Balance | LPC assessed Current Balance |
| 51 | 1/5/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$56.40 | F | \$3,858,01 | \$3,858.01 | 1.48\% |
| 52 | 2/5/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$87.56 | F | \$6,022.62 | \$6,022.62 | 1.48\% |
| 53 | 3/5/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$125.03 | F | \$8,645.70 | \$8,645.70 | 1.47\% |
| 54 | 4/4/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$156.37 | F | \$10,891.28 | \$10,891.28 | 1.46\% |
| 55 | 5/4/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$188.84 | F | \$13,245.16 | \$13,245.16 | 1.45\% |
| 56 | 6/6/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$211.80 | F | \$14,987.71 | \$14,987.71 | 1.43\% |
| 57 | 7/3/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 227.09 | $F$ | \$16,233.92 | \$16,233.92 | 1.42\% |
| 58 | 8/6/2013 | LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 233.93 | F | \$16,923.85 | \$16,923.85 | 1.40\% |



|  | SIMON GARDEN REALTY CO <br> 6731 MUSGRAVE ST Apt B PHil,PA 191192168 |  |  |  | From Date 1/1/2004 <br> Account Number 539547187 |  | To Date 10, | To Date 10/26/2012 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlspute NO. | STATEMENT <br> Transaction <br> Date <br> Type | Reading | Reading <br> Code | \# of Days | Average CCF Usage CCF/Days | Heating DOD's | Payment Type | Due Date | Transaction Amounl | DISPUTE CODE | Current Balance | Actual Balance | * Calculated LPC assecsed Current Balance |
| 51 | 2/5/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$25.32 | F | \$1,878.68 | \$1,878.68 | 1.37x |
| 52 | 3/6/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$47.21 | F | \$3,385.00 | \$3,385.00 | 1.41\% |
| 53 | 4/4/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$69.11 | F | \$4,914.66 | \$4,914.66 | 1.43\% |
| 54 | 5/4/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$89.24 | F | \$6,345.33 | \$6,345.33 | 1.43\% |
| 55 | 6/6/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$95.91 | F | \$6,886.52 | \$6,886.52 | 1.41\% |
| 56 | 7/3/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$97.53 | F | \$7,091.69 | \$7,091.69 | 1.39\% |
| 57 | 8/6/2013 LPC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$98.24 | f | \$7,237.16 | \$7,237.16 | 1.38\% |





## COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

In the Matter of:
Docket No. C-2012-2304167--SBG Management Services, Inc. (Elrae) v. Philadelphia Gas Works
Docket No. C-2012-2304183--SBG Management Scrvices, Inc. v. Philade!phia Gas Works
Docket No. C-2012-2304215--SBG Management Services, Inc. v. Philadelphia Gas Works
Docket No. C-2012-2304303--SBG Management Services, Inc. (v. Philadelphia Gas Works
Docket No. C-2012-2304324--SBG Management Services, Inc. v. Philadelphia Gas Works
Docket No. C-2012-2308454--SBG Management Services. Inc. v. Philadelphia Gas Works
Docket No. C-2012-2308462-SBG Management Services, Inc. v. Philadelphia Gas Works
Docket No. C-2012-2308465--SBG Management Services, Inc. y. Philadelphia Gas Works
Docket No. C-2012-2334253--SBG Management Services, Inc./Colonial Garden Realty Co., L. P. . . . Philadelphia Gas Works

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on Octoher 29, 2013, I have served the foregoing Motion to Dismiss PGW's Objections and to Compel Response to Set II Interrogatories upon the Secretary for the Penasylvania Public Utifity and a copy of the same upon the persons listed below in the manner indicated in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa . Code Section 1.54:

VIA Email and/or First Class Mail only:

For the PA Public Utility Commission:
Administrative Law Judge Eranda Vero
PA Public Utility Commission
Suite 4063--80I Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Email: evero@pa.gov
RECEIVED

For Respondent:
Laureto Farinas, Esquire, Philadelphia Gas Works 800 W. Montgomery Avenue, $4^{\text {th }}$ Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19122
Email: Laureto.Farinas@pgworks.com.

Date: October 29,2013


ATTORNEY FOR COMPLAINANTS


## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE THIS DAY SERVED A TRUE COPY OF THEFOREGOING DOCUMENT, PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS' OBJECTION TO THE
COMPLAINANTS' INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF
DOCUMENTS, Set II, save No. 41 UPON THE PARTICIPANTS LISTED BELOW, IN
ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF 52 PA CODE $\$ \$ 1.54$ and 5.342(c)
(RELATING TO SERVICE BY A PARTICIPANT).
Service List
For Complainants:
Francine Thornton Boone, Esq. SBG Management Services, Inc. 702 N. Marshall Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
Mr. Philip Pulley
Ms. Kathy Treadwell
\& by e-mail: fboone@sbgmanagement.com
SBG Management Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 459
Abington, PA 19001
October 21, 2013




[^0]:    cc: Rosemary Chiavetti, Secretary, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (w/o attachments) Phil Pulley (for Complainants)
    Kathy Treadwell (for Complainants)

[^1]:    * Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers

[^2]:    - Settlement amount according to PGW workpapers.

[^3]:    The belance at $3 / 23 / 12$ stroutd tot indude addild

