Public Service Commission ("PSC")
FY15-16 Performance Oversight Hearing Questions
Committee on Business, Consumer, and Regulatory Affairs
Vincent B. Orange, Chairperson

I. Agency Organization and Personnel

1. Provide a complete, up-to-date organizational chart for each division within PSC including, either attached or separately, an explanation of the roles and responsibilities for each division and subdivision. Also, provide a narrative explanation of any organizational changes made during FY15 and thus far in FY16.

RESPONSE: See Attachments 1 and 2.

In FY 2015, four new positions were added to the Office of Technical and Regulatory Analysis: a Senior Economist, a Senior Engineer, an Administrative Officer, and a One Call Inspector, which position was converted from a contractual position to a regular position in the Office of Compliance and Enforcement.

In FY 2016, the PSC received the budget authority and approval for the addition of one new position, an IT Specialist. This position was filled with a contract employee.

For FY 2017, the PSC has requested the budget authority and is awaiting approval for the addition of one new position, a Pipeline Safety Engineer. The Administrative Officer position is currently being utilized for this position.

See Attachment 3 for a proposed FY 2017 Organizational Chart of the Commission.

2. Provide a complete, up-to-date position listing for the agency, which includes the following information:

A. Title of Position
B. Subdivision of the agency in which the position is located
C. Name of employee or statement that the position is vacant, unfunded, or proposed
D. Date employee began in position
E. Salary and fringe benefits, including the specific grade, series, and step of position
F. Job status (continuing/term/temporary/contract)

RESPONSE: See Attachment 4.

3. Provide the number of FY15 full-time equivalents ("FTEs") for the agency, and FY16 FTEs to date, broken down by program and activity. Please also note the number of vacancies at the close of FY15 and in FY16, to date, by program and activity.

A. For each vacant position, please note how long the position has been vacant and whether or not the position has been filled.
B. How many vacancies within the agency were posted during FY15 and how many have been posted during FY16, to date?

RESPONSE: See Attachment 5 for a listing of FY 2015 and FY 2016 FTEs, by program and activity, including vacant positions. In FY 2015, the number of FTEs was 82.6. The number of FTEs was increased in FY 2016 to 83.6.

For FY 2015, eleven vacancies were posted. At the close of FY 2015, there were nine vacancies: one in the Office of the Executive Director, one in the Office of the General Counsel, six in the Office of Technical and Regulatory Analysis, and one in the Office of Consumer Services.

For FY 2016, five vacancies have been posted to date. As of February 11, 2016, there are eleven vacancies: two in the Office of the General Counsel, six in the Office of Technical and Regulatory Analysis, one in the Office of the Deputy Executive Director for Administrative Matters, and two in the Office of Consumer Services.

4. Please provide:

A. A list of all employees who receive cell phones, personal digital assistants, or similar communications devices at the agency's expense.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 6.

B. A list of all employees who receive laptops and tablets at the agency's expense.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 7.

C. A list of vehicles owned, leased, or otherwise used by the agency and to whom the vehicle is assigned.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 8.

D. A list of employee bonuses or awards granted in FY15 and FY16, to date, if any.

RESPONSE: No employees were granted bonuses or awards in FY 2015 or FY 2016 to date.

E. A list of travel expenses, arranged by employees. For each such occurrence, list the official event titles, the names and job titles of the individuals who attended the event, the cost (detailed by cost of registration, lodging, airfare, per diems, etc.) of attending the event, the funding source used to pay for each expense, and how participation benefited the agency and its clients.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 9. Participation in travel benefitted the PSC because travel helps assure that employees are aware of the latest in technological and economic developments in the regulatory arena. For example, travel to and attendance at National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners ("NARUC") events has allowed employees to participate in panels and discussions on topics germane to regulators. In addition, we conduct Brown Bag Lunches after employees have attended conferences at which they give presentations about the conferences to their colleagues.

5. Please list and describe all employee training provided in FY15 and FY16, to date. In addition, please list and describe all proposed employee training for the remainder of FY16.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 9. Proposed additional training will include participation in the NARUC Summer Program on Rate Regulation, the NARUC Annual Conference, and various meetings and webinars during the year.

6. Does the agency conduct annual performance evaluations of all its employees? If so, who conducts such evaluations? What steps are taken to ensure that all agency employees are meeting individual job requirements?

RESPONSE: Yes. The PSC conducts annual performance evaluations of its employees. PSC employees are rated for the fiscal year period (October 1 to September 30).

PSC supervisors conduct the annual performance evaluations, usually after employees are given an opportunity to provide their own draft evaluation. The employee and supervisor then discuss the draft before the supervisor finalizes the evaluation.

In order to assist employees in making the annual performance evaluation process proceed more efficiently, the Office of Human Resources (OHR) has held workshops for PSC staff and managers to discuss the performance evaluation form, the narrative justification, evaluation pitfalls, Letter of Warning instructions and preparing for and conducting evaluation meetings. In addition, OHR has prepared a guide for implementing the performance evaluation system, which describes each component of the system, as well as tools, timelines, roles and responsibilities to ensure that the process is implemented successfully. Supervisors are encouraged to have at least semi-annual discussions with their employees to chart progress toward their goals. The Executive Director also holds weekly meetings with Office Directors who report to her. One of the topics in these meetings is progress directors are making in reaching their office goals.

In addition, the PSC encourages and provides opportunities for professional development and training. The agency offers in house training through webinars and brown bag sessions led by staff or experts on emerging utility matters. The PSC also encourages staff members to take advantage of training and professional

development opportunities offered by the District of Columbia government and other outside training suppliers.

7. Please provide an explanation of the type of work approved for overtime pay. Please provide a list of employees and the amount of overtime they were paid.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 10.

II. Budget

8. Please provide a chart showing PSC's approved budget and actual spending, by program, for FY15 and FY16, to date. In addition, describe any variance between fiscal year appropriations and actual expenditures for FY15 and FY16, to date.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 11.

9. List any reprogramming which occurred in FY15 or which have occurred in FY16, to date. For each reprogramming, please list the total amount of the reprogramming, the original purposes for which the funds were dedicated, and the reprogrammed use of funds.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 12.

10. Provide an accounting of all intra-District transfers received by or transferred from the agency during FY15 or during FY16, to date.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 13.

11. Does the agency anticipate any additional spending pressures for FY16? If so, provide a detailed account of the amount and source of the spending pressures.

RESPONSE: The Commission does not anticipate any spending pressures for FY 2016.

12. Please identify any special purpose revenue accounts maintained by, used by, or available for use by your agency during FY15 or FY16, to date. For each account, please list the following:

A. The revenue source name and code
B. The source of funding
C. A description of the program that generates the funds
D. The amount of funds generated by each source or program in FY15 and FY 16, to date
E. Expenditures of funds, including the purpose of each expenditure, for FY15 and FY16, to date

RESPONSE: See Attachment 14.

13. Please provide a complete accounting of all federal grants received for FY15 and FY16, to date.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 15.

III. Property and Other Fixed Costs

14. Provide a list of all properties occupied by PSC in FY15 and thus far in FY16. For each property, what were your total rental costs in FY15 and what have been your total rental costs thus far in FY16?

RESPONSE: In June 2015, the Commission relocated from 1333 H Street, NW to 1325 G Street, NW. The total rental cost for FY 2015 was $1,854,659. The projected cost for FY 2016 is $1,587,001. The Commission does not occupy any other properties.

15. Provide a list of PSC's fixed costs budget and actual spending for FY15 and thus far in FY16.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 16.

16. What steps were taken in FY15 and FY16, to date to reduce the following:

A. Energy use
B. Communication costs
C. Space utilization

RESPONSE:

A. Energy Use

In FY15, The PSC upgraded its servers, enabling staff to be more productive and reducing energy costs. The PSC relocation enabled the installation of occupancy sensors, high efficiency lighting, high efficiency appliances, and audio/visual technology.

In FY 16, the PSC leased two Hybrid vehicles reducing gas usage and its carbon footprint. The agency also installed window tinting to reduce energy costs.

B. Communications Costs

In FY 15, the PSC purchased additional laptops to complete the implementation of the PSC’s emergency procedures allowing employees to complete assignments and activities remotely.

In FY 16, the PSC has upgraded its communication devices so critical staff can communicate during non-business hours and handle emergency issues and other PSC concerns. These devices are necessary for employees to conduct field inspections and receive notifications of outages and other utility problems on a 24/7 basis to facilitate the location of the problem sites so staff can be dispatched. This connectivity enhances the ability of staff to communicate and respond from any location connected to the internet.

C. Space Utilization

In FY 15, The PSC moved its Office location, utilizing a floor plan that reduces the amount of space required by PSC staff.

In FY 16, the PSC continues to make improvements to the space by providing, e.g., automatic doors, better lighting in the Hearing Room, and improvements to the Audio/Visual system.

III. Agency Programs and Policies

17. Please list each program and policy initiative ("program") of your agency during FY15 and FY16, to date. For each program, please provide:

A. A detailed description of the program
B. The name of the employee who is responsible for the program
C. The total number of FTEs assigned to the program
D. The name and title of each employee assigned to the program, including the percent of the employee's time dedicated to the program
E. The amount of funding budgeted to the program:
F. A description of the initiative
G. The funding required to implement to the initiative
H. Any documented results of the initiative

RESPONSE: See <u>Attachment 17.</u>

18. Did the agency meet the objectives set forth in its performance plan for FY15? Please provide a narrative description of what actions the agency undertook to meet the key performance indicators or any reasons why such indicators were not met.

RESPONSE: See <u>Attachment 18</u> for a copy of our 2015 Performance Accountability Report ("PAR"). The Commission exceeded two of its three Key Performance Indicators: the percentage of consumer complaints resolved at the informal level and the percentage of decisions in adjudications made within 90 days of the close of the record. With regard to the third KPI, our pipeline safety program, United States Department of Transportation information concerning our rating will not be available until September 2016, after the annual audit (conducted in the spring) is completed.

19. How well is PSC currently meeting the objectives set forth in its performance plan for FY16? Please provide a narrative description of what actions the agency is undertaking to meet the key performance indicators or any reasons why such indicators are not being met.

RESPONSE: The PSC is making excellent progress in meeting the objectives of its 2016 Performance Plan. With regard to the first objective, *Ensuring Safe, Reliable and Quality Electric, Natural Gas and Local Telecommunications Services*, in FY 2015, we approved the Pepco/District Department of Transportation ("DDOT") Triennial Underground Infrastructure Improvement Projects Plan ("Triennial Plan") to place certain electric distribution feeders in the District of Columbia underground for increased reliability (called "DC PLUG"). In Formal Cases 1116 and 1121, we also approved an Underground Project Charge and a Financing Charge. The Commission's decisions were appealed to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. In FY 2016, the Court ruled in the Commission's favor. However, that decision is itself the subject of a request for rehearing. Once the decision on rehearing is made, and assuming that decision is favorable to the Commission, we expect that construction of underground facilities will begin in earnest. If so, the Commission will review the design drawings and construction plans of Pepco and the District Department of Transportation and will provide engineering oversight of the project and will monitor the implementation of a Consumer Education Plan. In additional support of our first objective, the Commission will oversee Washington Gas Light's PROJECTPipes, a plan for the accelerated replacement of aging natural gas lines. During 2016, the Commission will continue to monitor the pipeline construction program, review individual pipeline prioritization and design drawings, survey construction sites, and ensure coordination with the DC PLUG construction program. In addition, we will continue to oversee the Consumer Education Plan to assure that affected consumers are made aware of construction in their neighborhoods.

In addition, we issued a timely decision in Formal Case No. 1119, the Non-unanimous Settlement Agreement relating to the Application for a change in control of Pepco to be effected by a merger with the Exelon Corporation.

In support of our second objective, *Fostering Fair and Open Competition Among Utility Service Providers*, we have initiated a new Formal Case No. 1130, Modernizing the Energy Delivery System for Increased Sustainability (MEDSIS). So far in FY 2016, we have conducted two very well-attended workshops focusing on a review of the current energy delivery systems in the District and new technologies that might be employed to modernize them, including energy storage, distributed energy resources, and microgrids. We expect to have a third workshop in the Spring of 2016, which will focus on barriers to the development of these new technologies. Depending on the results of our investigations, we may recommend the adoption of legislation to support sustainability initiatives in the District.

Our third objective, *Educating Utility Consumers and Informing the Public*, will be met in FY 2016 by a top-to-bottom review of the Commission's website and changes to make the website more user friendly. This initiative is well under way and we

expect to launch the new website in Spring of 2016. In addition, March will see the publication of a book commemorating the PSC's Centennial, which occurred in 2013. The book, *The First Hundred Years: Protecting the Public Interest*, is an historical review of how the Public Service Commission has served the citizens of the District, and how its decisions affected both ratepayers and utilities. We are also exploring opportunities to use Social Media to communicate our message to the public. We expect to approve a Social Media Policy and a Procedures Plan this spring.

Our fourth objective, *Motivating Customer and Results-Oriented Employees*, will be met in FY 2016 by updating the Commission's Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP). In addition, we plan to hold Commission-wide briefings on Cyber and Physical Security. Additional training will include Internet Security issues and proper handling of confidential information.

We expect to meet our FY 2016 Key Performance Initiatives and are on target to do so.

20. Please describe any initiatives of your agency implemented in FY15 or thus far in FY16, to improve the internal operation of the agency or the interaction of the agency with outside parties. Please describe the results, or expected results, of each initiative. If the results fall into the "expected" category, please provide a timeline explaining when the results can be expected.

RESPONSE: As described above, the Commission will launch its new website this Spring The website will increase efficiency and will provide an easy-to-use platform for the public's interaction with the agency. We will also begin to use Social Media to interact with the public. In addition, the Commission moved to new office space in FY 2015. Our new location, 1325 G Street, is closer to Metro Center and has been outfitted with consumer-friendly spaces for the filing of documents and the handling of consumer complaints.

21. Please provide a copy of all publications, brochures, and pamphlets prepared by or for the agency during FY15 and FY16, to date.

RESPONSE: See <u>Attachment 19.</u>

22. Please provide a copy of all policy statements issued during FY15 and FY16, to date.

RESPONSE: The Commission has issued no new Policy Statements in FY 2015 and FY 2016 to date. However, our Telework Policy became effective at the beginning of FY 2015. That Policy was included in our response to the Committee's questions in FY 2015.

23. Please list and describe any ongoing or completed investigations, studies, audits, or reports on your agency or any employee of your agency during FY15 or FY16, to date.

RESPONSE: There are no investigations, studies, audits or reports ongoing or completed in FY 2015 or FY 2016, with the exception of the annual United States Department of Transportation audit of our natural gas pipeline safety program, which takes place every spring.

24. Please identify any recommendations regarding PSC made by the Office of the Inspector General or the D.C. Auditor during FY15 or thus far in FY16. Please note what actions have been taken to address these recommendations.

RESPONSE: None.

25. Please explain how any possible or anticipated changes in the energy market will or could affect the function of your agency.

RESPONSE: The 1999 legislation restructuring the electricity market in the District entailed a change from PSC oversight of Pepco as a vertically integrated utility to reliance on competitive markets to assure a just and reasonable outcome for District. As a result, the Commission focuses on energy supply issues on the wholesale market as well as on the retail level.

(A) <u>Wholesale Energy Market Issues</u>:

1) <u>PJM-related matters</u>

On the wholesale level, the Commission works with PJM Interconnection LLC, the Regional Transmission Organization serving the District of Columbia and 13 states. PJM runs the competitive markets upon which the District relies for its electricity supply. The PSC's attention has shifted away from directly setting generation rates to monitoring PJM and the PJM markets. The PSC has joined with other Commissions who have the same need in an organization of PJM jurisdiction Commissions: the Organization of PJM States, Inc. (OPSI). The PSC is very active in OPSI and monitors the PJM markets and, through OPSI, has regular monthly contact with PJM officials and with the Independent Market Monitor (IMM) of PJM. There are currently several PJM-related issues that concern OPSI and/or the Commission:

a) Cost Allocation Settlement -- The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") initiated a settlement process to handle a cost allocation matter remanded from U.S. Court of Appeals, 7th Circuit. The issue is related to reallocation of PJM High Voltage Transmission Project Costs for the period June 1, 2007 through Dec. 31, 2015. Commission staff participated in settlement negotiations and final settlement may be reached in March/April timeframe.

b) Changes in the market for capacity that have arisen because of the polar vortex and severe cold weather in January 2014 are of concern to PJM state commissions, including the PSC. These cold weather incidents exposed a flaw in the PJM capacity market when

up to 22% of capacity did not perform as expected. PJM has proposed several changes to their capacity construct to deal with these flaws and FERC has approved the new Capacity Performance ("CP") product in 2015. PJM also conducted capacity auctions in the 2015 summer. In general, introducing the CP product has increased capacity prices in PJM.

c) The role of Demand Response ("DR") in the PJM markets is also an issue of interest. A Court of Appeals case overturned FERC Order 745, which allowed use of DR in the PJM energy markets. On January 25, 2016, the US Supreme Court, in a 6-2 decision, ruled in favor of the FERC's demand response decision. In other words, the Supreme Court ruled that FERC's statutory authority includes Wholesale Demand Response, and FERC was not arbitrary or capricious in allowing Demand Response Energy to be paid at full Locational Marginal Price. PJM is studying the impact of this Supreme Court decision on demand response participation in wholesale and retail markets.

d) The rate-of-return on equity (ROE) in PHI's formula transmission rates was set at a time when interest rates and ROEs were much higher than at present. A Settlement Agreement in this matter was filed with FERC and we expect some refund dollars as a result of the Settlement. The reduced transmission costs may be flowed through to ratepayers either in 2016 or 2017.

e) The Commission has periodically queried PJM about the adequacy of supply to handle the forecast summer peak demand for the Pepco zone. The latest query was in May 2015. PJM replied that there were sufficient resources to adequately supply the Pepco zone during the 2015 summer peak. PJM also indicated that in each of the next three Delivery Years, between resources committed with the PEPCO Load Deliverability Area ("LDA") (including Maryland and DC) and available transmission capacity to bring resources into the PEPCO LDA, there is more than sufficient capacity to maintain reliability during system peaks in the PEPCO LDA.

f) Following Pepco's Report to the Commission on the April 7, 2015 DC-MD outage, Chairman Kane reported to the DC Council and recommended a Root Cause investigation of the outage event that resulted from a failure of a surge arrester and a ground fault on a 230 kV transmission line, and caused a loss of 1,954 MW of power generation. PJM worked with the North American Reliability Corporation ("NERC"), ReliabilityFirst, Pepco, Southern Maryland Electricity Cooperative ("SMECO") and impacted generation owners to perform the Root Cause investigation of the April 7, 2015 DC-MD outage. Both PJM and NERC created separate confidential reports summarizing their findings. The detailed reports contain Critical Energy Infrastructure information and are therefore not

being publicly released. Commission engineers will be closely monitoring the follow-up actions.

2) Transmission Planning through EISPIC

The PSC participates in infrastructure planning with other stakeholders by actively participating in the Eastern Interconnection State Planning Council (EISPC), a planning project that encompasses state and federal government representatives and industry representatives in the region. EISPC is concerned with adequate transmission on an interconnection basis so that renewable resources, such as Great Plains wind generation, can serve load in urban areas. EISPC meets regularly to discuss transmission planning related issues. Recently, EISPC is working with industry stakeholders on transmission scenarios involving aggressive Distributed Generation – PV, Energy Efficiency, Demand Response and smart grid. Also, increased hydropower imports from Canada plus aggressive wind development in the mid-west will be studied. PSC Staff also attended EISPC webinars on wholesale market related issues.

(B) Retail Energy Market Issues:

(1) Smart Grid Implementation

Smart Grid involves the increased use of digital information and control technology to improve the reliability, security, and efficiency of the electric distribution network. State commissions are engaged in making sure these goals and benefits are realized.

In the District of Columbia, Pepco has completed its installation of smart meters and is making progress in eliminating the small number of remaining legacy meters in hard-to-reach locations. The smart meter radio network that allows the collection of detailed energy usage data has been activated for nearly all customers in the District. Smart meters give customers access to more information about their energy usage than they have ever had before through Pepco's MyAccount website. In Formal Case No. 1098, the Commission is examining technical issues as well as consumer protection issues related to access to smart meter data by competitive energy suppliers who seek to make new products and services available to customers as they become more familiar with their energy usage data.

The PSC has ordered Pepco to provide a Load Research Plan detailing how it will make use of the new smart meter data to manage and plan its network when it files its next base rate case. The Company must demonstrate how it will use the new information for Cost of Service, Pricing and Rate Design, Demand and Energy Forecasting, Energy Efficiency and Load Management, and Distribution and Substation Planning.

Customer engagement and education is crucial for the success of the smart grid. The Commission is grateful to representatives of OPC and other community

stakeholders who provided feedback on the Company's smart meter education programs through the Advanced Metering Infrastructure Task Force. The Task Force submitted its final report in November 2015.

(2) Future Demand Response in Retail Markets

The PSC approved a Residential Air Conditioner Direct Load Control (DLC) Program in November 2011 in Formal Case No. 1086. Pepco implemented this DLC program during the summers of 2012 through 2015. Pepco reported the installation of more than 29,000 devices to more than 25,000 residential customers in the District. The Commission approved the Company's proposal for Phase II of its program. The Commission also directed Pepco to continue to monitor wholesale market changes in order to file any necessary reform proposals.

(3) Infrastructure Planning, Public Safety and Reliability

Electric Distribution System

The Commission reviews and monitors the progress of the approved DCPLUG effort. The design for civil facilities for Feeder Nos. 308 (American University Park - Ward 3) and 14261 (Naylor Gardens - Ward 7) is complete. We expect that DDOT will issue a bid for the construction of Feeder No. 308 in the near future. The Commission is also exploring new methods to identify and improve feeders that are poor performers throughout all Wards in the District. The Commission is also exploring methods to better utilize the already deployed distributed generation throughout the city – see (6) below. This information could aid Pepco and PJM with system planning and reliability improvement.

Gas Distribution System

As of December 28, 2015, WGL had replaced 1,398 services and retired 32,327 feet of main – cast iron and unprotected steel. During Year 1 of PROJECTPipes, WGL completed greater than 70% of projected work, some projects needed to be reshuffled to accommodate the first DCPLUG feeder (Feeder 308) being constructed in the American University Park area (Ward 3). On a continuous basis, the Commission monitors the PROJECTPipes effort to ensure adherence to schedule and to identify construction coordination opportunities with DCPLUG that could result in District savings.

Public Safety/Cybersecurity

Currently, the Commission is exploring the role we are to play in assuring the security of the utilities we regulate. Specifically, we have created a Staff Task Force on Cybersecurity to assess developments and to understand impacts and potential impacts on the PSC's operations as well as on the utilities regulated by the PSC.

(4) SOS Procurement

The default source of electricity for customers who have not chosen to purchase electricity from a CES is called Standard Offer Service (SOS). The Commission has designated Pepco as the default service supplier. Pepco purchases electricity for SOS customers through power supply contracts in an annual auction that establishes generation rates that are reflective of market conditions while at the same time providing protection against extreme volatility. Currently, the SOS contracts between Pepco and wholesale providers cover three years of procurement for residential and small commercial customers. The contracts for large commercial customers cover one year of procurement. Three months after the annual bidding, the Commission makes the identities of the winning bidders publicly available on its website.

(5) Ongoing PSC Audits/Examinations

The Commission currently has three ongoing audits under three different formal cases as follows:

(i) Formal Case 1027: Management Audit and Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagement of WGL's Vintage Mechanical Coupling, Replacement, and Encapsulation Program. This audit is ongoing and we anticipate the audit to be completed in the spring of 2016.

(ii) Formal Case No. 1129: Management Audit and Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagement of WGL's Gas Procurement Practices and Policies and the Purchase Gas Charge ("PGC"). In March 2015, the Commission opened an investigation into the default gas service provided by WGL through the PGC. The Commission further determined that it was time for a more in-depth review of the PGC to ensure that the rates being charged for the natural gas supply service to default customers are just and reasonable. The audit is ongoing.

(iii) Formal Case No. 1115: Management Audit and Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagement of WGL's PROJECTPipes. In Washington Gas Light's last base rate case, the Company sought, among other things, Commission approval to implement the first five (5) years of a 50-year Pipeline Replacement Program ("APRP") and to recover the costs through a surcharge mechanism called the Plant Recovery Adjustment ("PRA") billed to customers on a monthly basis.
The focus of the audit is to assure that the project costs being recovered through the mechanism are prudent and accurate, that the projects that were completed are timely and consistent with the Annual Project List submitted by WGL. The audit is ongoing.

(6) Modernizing the Energy Delivery System for Increased Sustainability – Distributed Energy Resources

The Commission has embarked on a collaborative investigation that deals with Modernizing the Energy Delivery System for Increased Sustainability (MEDSIS – FC1130) in the District. Approximately 125 participants are providing input about how to better deploy Distributed Energy Resources – DERs (energy storage,

renewable generation, cogeneration, energy efficiency and demand response programs) throughout the District. The deployment of these DERs could defer utility capital expenditures, reduce carbon emissions, and increase overall system efficiencies. The Commission is also exploring ways with the electric utility and PJM to have more visibility of the already deployed DERs, this information will aid with system planning and reliability assurance.

IV. Contracting and Procurement

26. Please list each contract, procurement, lease, and grant awarded or entered into by PSC during FY15 and FY16, to date. For each contract, please provide the following information, where applicable:

A. The name of the contracting party or vendor
B. The nature of the contract, including the end product or service
C. The dollar amount of the contract, including budgeted amount and actual spending
D. The term of the contract
E. Whether the contract was competitively bid or not
F. The name of the agency's contract monitor and the results of any monitoring activity
G. The funding source
H. Indicate whether or not the vendor is a certified business enterprise

RESPONSE: See Attachment 20.

27. Does your agency have a written policy to increase contracting with, and procurement from certified business enterprises? If so, please provide a copy of the policy. Please describe the methods used by the agency to increase contracting with, and procurement from certified business enterprises.

RESPONSE: The PSC has focused on reaching out to CBEs and has been in full compliance with the CBE law. In fact, since the implementation of regulations, the PSC has met or exceeded its CBE goals. See Attachment 21 for a copy of the policy to increase contracting with, and procurement from, Certified Business Enterprises.

28. Please provide a list of all MOUs in place during FY15 and FY16, to date.

RESPONSE: In FY 2015, the Commission entered into one MOU with the Office of the Chief Technology Officer ("OCTO") to provide for reimbursement from OCTO to the Commission for personal services of one employee who was detailed to OCTO for 180 calendar days. In addition, as explained to the Council in FY 2015, the Commission had an MOU with the Department of General Services in connection with the relocation of our offices.

29. Please detail in other programs or policies PSC has to encourage utilities to increase contracting with, and procurement from certified business enterprises. Has there been any coordination with the Department of Small and Local Business Development?

RESPONSE: The PSC has been a leader in encouraging the regulated utilities to do business with local and disadvantaged business enterprises. For over 22 years, the Commission has had in place a Diversity Supplier Memorandum of Understanding with Verizon Washington, DC Inc., Washington Gas Light, and Pepco. The MOU was updated in 2013 to ensure that women, minority, and disabled veterans, as well as not-for-profit entities, have fair opportunities to participate in and compete for contracts and subcontracts with the public utilities and to better align its provisions with District of Columbia law regarding local, small, and disadvantaged enterprises. Specifically, the 2013 MOU:

1. **implements a diverse supplier program to encourage diverse suppliers to become potential suppliers of products and services;**
2. **develops a diverse supplier prime contractor outreach program to inform and recruit diverse suppliers to apply for procurement contracts;**
3. **establishes and maintains a subcontracting program for the purpose of encouraging prime contractors to utilize diverse supplier subcontractors;**
4. **maintains a process to receive and review diverse supplier procurement-related complaints; and**
5. **sets substantial and verifiable short-term, mid-term, and long-term goals for the utilization of diverse suppliers in an annual plan.**

While the MOU will result in the provision of benchmarks, it remains voluntary. District of Columbia-wide, all three utilities exceeded their goals.

The Commission utilizes the DSLBE regulations as benchmarks in determining goals for the utility companies. Since the implementation of the MOUs with the utility companies, each company has exceeded their benchmarks.

V. Legislative and Regulatory Requirements

30. Please identify any legislative requirements that the agency lacks sufficient resources to properly implement.

RESPONSE: None

31. Please list all regulations for which the agency is responsible for oversight or implementation. Please list by chapter and subject heading, including the date of the most recent revision.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 22.

32. Please explain the impact of any legislation passed at the federal level during the FY15 and FY16, to date, that significantly affected your agency's operations. Please note if regulations are the shared responsibility of multiple agencies.

RESPONSE: None

33. Please identify any statutory or regulatory impediments to your agency's operations.
RESPONSE: The current system of assessing companies for PSC investigations and non-rate cases only allows assessments against the three legacy public utility companies (Pepco, WGL, and Verizon DC). (Note that this assessment is separate from the operating budget assessment). As competition matures in the District, more issues are beginning to arise that relate solely or in part to the competitive companies over which the Commission has no assessment authority. Costs for these cases cannot be assessed to the competitive companies. Thus, the Commission's ability to pursue new policy issues related to these companies and our ability to aggressively pursue violations of District law or regulations could be hampered by a lack of resources. We raise this issue for the Council's consideration.

Another issue that has come to the Commission's attention is that the Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards Act does not give the Commission explicit authority to impose penalties for violations of the Act. To provide clarity, this explicit authority should be added to the Act. See <u>Attachment 23.</u>

34. Please identify any legislation and regulations the agency plans to introduce in FY16.

RESPONSE: In addition to the legislation proposed in Attachment 23, the PSC requests an amendment to D.C. Code § 10-1141.06 to ensure that public utility companies recover their public rights-of-way ("ROW") lease payments through a ROW surcharge from: 1) all customers receiving services that use the public ROW, regardless of whether the services are regulated or unregulated; and 2) all non-utility entities that lease the public utility's facilities in the public ROW, including but not limited to, stand-alone conduit, pipe, aerial wires or surface structures housing transmission facilities. The PSC has become aware that public utility companies are imposing the ROW surcharge only on those customers subscribed to regulated services based on the language of the current statute. Given the fact that the ROW statute was passed prior to deregulation in the electric, gas, and telecommunications markets, the PSC does not believe that the intent of the legislation was to impose the ROW surcharge on some customers (those subscribed to regulated services) and not on other customers (those subscribed to non-regulated services and non-utility entities leasing space from a public utility company). The current statutory language is causing public utility companies to impose an inequitable financial burden on certain customers while exempting others for the same service. The PSC requests that the statute be amended to ensure that public utility companies recover the ROW lease payments from all customers and non-utility entities that use the ROW rather than impose the financial burden only on the smaller subset of regulated ratepayers. The PSC has attached a sample amendment to address this inequality at <u>Attachment 24</u>.

VI. Consumer Issues

35. To the extent that is permissible, please provide an explanation, as detailed as possible, of the role the PSC is playing in the following:

A. Pepco and the District's Department of Transportation's ("DDOT") $1 billion plan to underground key portions of its electric distribution service system

RESPONSE: Legislation governing a public-private partnership between Pepco and the District Department of Transportation ("DDOT") to improve electric service reliability, the "Electric Company Infrastructure Improvement Financing Act of 2013," was introduced in the Council of the District of Columbia on July 9, 2013. The legislation was approved by the Council on February 4, 2014 and became effective May 3, 2014.

The Act provides for DDOT and Pepco to file a joint application for the Commission's approval of a Triennial Plan for undergrounding certain electrical facilities, which they did on June 17, 2014. In the Joint Application, Pepco and DDOT requested (a) authority to implement an initial three year project (2015-2017) to expand the undergrounding of certain electric distribution feeders so as to increase the reliability of the electric distribution system in the District of Columbia and (b) approval of the Underground Project Charge ("UPC") to be charged by Pepco with respect to costs incurred for the Undergrounding Project, known as "DC PLUG."

By Order No. 17697, issued on November 12, 2014, the Commission determined that the initial Triennial Plan met all applicable requirements of the Act. Accordingly, the Commission approved the initial Triennial Plan filed by the Joint Applicants and authorized the imposition, charging, and collection of the non-bypassable volumetric UPC. The Commission also directed the Joint Applicants to create an Underground Project Community Education ("UPCE") Task Force to deal with implementation issues. The Commission recommended that the Task Force be chaired by the City Administrator.

The Act also authorizes the District to issue Bonds to fund the DDOT Improvement Activities that DDOT will undertake in connection with the Undergrounding Project. Prior to any such issuance, however, the Act requires the Commission to review a financing order application and issue a financing order authorizing the issuance of the Bonds.

On August 1, 2014, Pepco, on behalf of itself and DDOT, submitted an application for issuance of a financing order (the "Financing Order Application"), seeking approval for the District's issuance of Bonds in a total aggregate par amount of up to $375 million, the maximum amount permitted pursuant to the Act. The Financing Order Application contemplates that the Bonds would be issued through a securitization structure that will finance the costs of the DDOT Improvement Activity.

By Order No. 17714, issued on November 24, 2014, the Commission granted Pepco and DDOT's Financing Application. Both the Triennial Order and the Financing Order were the subjects of Petitions for Reconsideration. The

Commission issued decisions on those reconsiderations on January 22 and February 2, 2015. The Commission clarified issues in the Triennial Order and denied petitions to amend its decisions approving the UPC and the DDOT Improvement Charge. In March 2015, the Apartment and Office Building Association ("AOBA") appealed the Commission's decisions to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. Oral argument was held on November 3, 2015 and the decision affirming the Commission was issued on January 20, 2016 by a three-judge panel. However, on January 29, 2016, AOBA requested a rehearing of the case by the entire District of Columbia Court of Appeals. A decision on that request is pending as of this date.

B. The proposed $6.83 billion merger of Pepco Holding. Inc. ("PHI"), and the Chicago-based Exelon Corporation

RESPONSE: On June 18, 2014, in Formal Case No. 1119, Exelon Corporation, Pepco Holdings, Inc. ("PHI"), and Pepco (collectively, the "Joint Applicants"), filed for approval by the Commission, pursuant to D.C. Code §§ 34-504 and 34-1001, for a change of control of Pepco, the District's electric distribution company. On March 30 through April 8, 2015, an evidentiary hearing was held. After that evidentiary hearing and several community hearings, and after over 3,000 residents, non-profits and small businesses presented testimony and comments, the Commission announced its decision on August 27, 2015. The Commission determined that, taken as a whole, the transaction as proposed by Exelon and Pepco was not in the public interest. On September 28, 2015, the Joint Applicants asked the Commission to reconsider its decision. Then, on October 6, the Joint Applicants asked the Commission to reopen the record to allow for consideration of a Non-unanimous Settlement Agreement ("NSA") between the Joint Applicants, the District of Columbia Government, including the Office of the People's Counsel, the National Consumer Law Center, AOBA, and others ("Parties"). On October 28, the Commission granted the request to reopen the record, tolled consideration of the Joint Applicants' request for reconsideration and set an aggressive procedural schedule, including additional evidentiary and community hearings on the question of whether the NSA is in the public interest.

On February 26, 2016, a majority of the Commission rejected the NSA pursuant to the Commission's rules on Settlement Agreements, Section 130.16 of Title 15 of the DC Municipal Regulations. A majority of the Commission also directed the Parties to review alternative terms to the Settlement Agreement and gave the Parties 14 days to accept the alternative terms or request other relief.

C. Washington Gas and Light Company's plan to modernize its pipeline system

RESPONSE: In Washington Gas Light Company's last base rate case (Formal Case No. 1093), the Company sought Commission approval to implement the first five years of a 50-year Accelerated Pipeline Replacement Plan and to recover the costs through a surcharge mechanism called the Plant Recovery Adjustment ("PRA") billed to customers on a monthly basis. In its decision on WGL's rate application, the Commission acknowledged the need for a program to address the aging pipeline infrastructure in the District, but found, based on the record made in that

proceeding, that there were problems with WGL's proposed plan which required the Commission to reject the program (and the PRA) as submitted. On August 15, 2013, WGL filed a Revised Plan and requested Commission approval to implement the first five years of a 40-year Revised Plan and proposed PRA. The Office of the People's Counsel ("OPC") and the Apartment and Office Building Association of Metropolitan Washington ("AOBA") filed comments on WGL's Revised Plan.

On August 21, 2014, the Commission granted approval of WGL's Revised Plan. Under the plan as approved, over the next five years, WGL is authorized to spend up to $110 million to replace 20 miles of cast iron pipes, 18 miles of unprotected steel mains and 8000 service lines throughout the District. The Commission also determined that an evidentiary hearing was necessary to consider WGL's requested funding mechanism for the APRP. Prior to the evidentiary hearing, however, WGL, OPC and AOBA filed a Joint Motion for Approval of Unanimous Agreement of Stipulation and Full Settlement.

On January 29, 2015, the Commission approved the financing mechanism that was determined by a Settlement Agreement among the parties, directed WGL to enhance its Customer Education Plan and gave its final approval to the plan, now called PROJECTPipes. The Settlement Agreement provisions that were accepted by the Commission include a Surcharge for the first five years of the program that will result in a charge of $7.28 (or about 60¢ a month) in the first year for an average residential customer using 775 therms per year; an annual reconciliation procedure to address over-or-under collections; annual completed project reporting to allow for the monitoring of estimated and actual spending for each project completed during the prior plan year; and WGL's agreement to file two base rate cases with the Commission during the next five years, one by August 1, 2016, and the other by April 30, 2020. ON February 26, 2016, WGL filed the first of these rate cases in Formal Case No. 1137.

The Commission monitors the PROJECTPipes effort to assure adherence to schedules and budgets and to identify construction coordination opportunities with DC PLUG. As if December 28, 2015, WGL had replaced 398 service lines and retired 32,327 feet of main (cast iron and unprotected steel) at an actual total project cost of $19,459,087. During year 1, WGL completed greater than 70% of projected work.

D. Verizon Washington DC's copper to fiber optic technology service infrastructure transition

RESPONSE: In response to numerous consumer letters filed with the Commission concerning Verizon DC's efforts to have consumers switch their phone service from copper-based service to fiber-based service, the Commission opened FC No. 1102. The purpose of the case was to investigate Verizon DC's continued use of its copper infrastructure for the provision of telecommunications services in the District of Columbia and to determine whether, and under what circumstances, the Company plans to transition customers from the telecommunications services provided over copper facilities to telecommunications services provided over fiber facilities. The

Commission is not seeking to regulate services that the Council has determined to be unregulated or to impede the technology transition. Rather, the Commission is seeking to determine the impact of this transition on District of Columbia ratepayers and Commission-regulated services; to ensure that the quality and availability of regulated service is not adversely affected in the transition; to determine the type of consumer information about the pros and cons of a regulated versus an unregulated telecommunications service that needs to be available to the public; and to ensure that the core values of the copper-based technology era (i.e., public safety, universal service, competition and consumer protection) endure after the transition.

The Commission held two community hearings in November 2014. Evidentiary hearings were held on January 22 and 23, 2015. The Commission rendered a decision on September 1, 2015, taking steps to protect telephone customers during the transition from telephone service provided over copper facilities to telephone service provided over fiber optic facilities. In particular, the Commission directed Verizon DC to ensure that telephone customers know when they choose telephone service provided over fiber facilities that they will not have telephone service during a power outage unless they have battery back-up. The Commission also directed Verizon DC to continue to permit customers who wish to keep telephone service provided over copper facilities to do so. The Commission also ruled that Verizon DC's FiOS Digital Voice Service was a VoIP service, so the Commission could not regulate that service.

Both Verizon DC and OPC asked for reconsideration of portions of the Commission's decision. On December 4, 2015, the Commission granted in part the Verizon DC request. Specifically, the Commission directed Verizon DC to remove references to residential and small business customers in portions of the tariff that make customers responsible for providing their own power. The Commission granted in part and denied in part the OPC request for reconsideration. Specifically, the Commission denied arguments regarding the reliability of the fiber network in reaching E911 and affirmed the decision that FiOS Digital Voice was VoIP service.

E. Ensuring District utility consumers benefit from the District's sustainable-energy programs

RESPONSE: The Commission and Commission Staff have worked to ensure that District utility consumers benefit from the District's sustainable-energy programs. In FY15, the Commission Staff approved 475 applications for certification of renewable facilities in the District so the owners can participate in the market for Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) in support of the District's Renewable Portfolio Standards. Commission Staff track the locations of the certified facilities District-wide and by Ward and reports that information to the Council in the Annual RPS Report that is filed by May 1 each year. The 2016 RPS Report, including information for the 2015 compliance year, will be timely filed.

Commission staff monitors interconnection activity between Pepco and customers through its review of Pepco's Annual Interconnection Report filed by March 31 of each year. In addition, on July 21, 2015, the Commission held a legislative-style hearing on barriers to interconnection. The Commission expects to issue an order on this matter in the First Quarter of CY 2016.

In FY14, the Commission promulgated proposed rules in two different dockets to implement the community net metering ("CNM") program that was enacted by the Community Renewable Energy Act ("CREA"): F.C. 945 to address the features of the program and F.C. 1017 to address necessary changes in the operation of the Standard Offer Service to accommodate the purchase of energy from the Community Renewable Energy Facilities ("CREFs") created under CNM. The Commission also sought comments in a third docket, F.C. 1078, concerning the ability of Pepco's new billing system to implement the billing changes related to CREA. On January 30, 2015, the Commission published amended proposed rules in the D.C. Register. After considering filed comments, the Commission published final rules on May 8, 2015. In June 2015, Pepco filed its CREF tariff, Procedural Manual and other documents in compliance with the final rules. In Order No 18050, the Commission approved the CREF documents with modifications. On January 11, 2016, Pepco filed an Application for Reconsideration of Order No. 18050. On February 26, 2016, the Commission granted Pepco's Application for Reconsideration.

The Commission monitors the work of the Sustainable Energy Utility (SEU) through the Commission Chair's participation as a member of the SEU's Advisory Board and continues to be an active participant in its activities. During the past year, the SEU has focused on energy efficiency for home and business, including educational programs, home energy audits and the Solar Photovoltaic Initiative. In addition, the Commission Chair, as a member of the Advisory Board, has been involved in the development of the new RFP to determine the SEU contractor for the next five years.

36. The PSC's Office of Consumer Services ("OCS") tracks consumer service quality complaints, and produces internal quarterly reports. Please provide these reports for the last year.

RESPONSE: See <u>Attachment 25.</u>

37. How many complaints did the PSC receive about PEPCO in FY14, FY15, and FY16, to date?

RESPONSE: The Commission received the following number of complaints about Pepco:

FY 2014: 378
FY 2015: 489
FY 2016: 129 (as of 2/10/16)

38. What are the major complaints received by the PSC with regard to PEPCO?

RESPONSE: Most Pepco complaints concern high bills and requests for payment arrangements. However, in January of 2015, Pepco implemented a new billing system (known as Solution One), which caused the number of complaints to increase.

39. What trends does the PSC see regarding complaints against PEPCO?

RESPONSE: We have noticed a downward trend in the number of complaints regarding the new billing system as consumers have become accustomed to the features of the system and as Pepco has remedied early system glitches. Additionally, the number of complaints that we anticipated receiving about DC PLUG did not materialize as major construction has been delayed by litigation.

40. What is the success rate of OCS's complaint mediation program with PEPCO?

RESPONSE: The Commission measures success in resolving consumer complaints by considering those cases that go to the Formal Complaint Stage as having been unsuccessful in mediation. We currently average about a 98% success rate.

FY 2014 Complaints Received:	**378**
FY 2014 Complaints Mediated:	**366**
Success Rate	**96.83%**
FY 2015 Complaints Received:	**489**
FY 2015 Complaints Mediated:	**481**
Success Rate:	**98.36%**
FY 2016 Complaints Received:	**129 (as of 2/10/16)**
FY 2016 Complaints Mediated:	**128 (as of 2/10/16)**
Success Rate:	**99.22%**

41. How many complaints did the PSC receive about Washington Gas in FY14, FY15, and FY16, to date?

RESPONSE: The Commission received the following number of complaints about WGL:

FY 2014: 201
FY 2015: 240
FY 2016: 54 (as of 2/10/16)

42. What are the major complaints received by the PSC with regard to Washington Gas?

RESPONSE: Most complaints against WGL concern high bills and payment arrangements.

43. What trends does the PSC see regarding to complaints against Washington Gas?

RESPONSE: The Commission has observed no discernible trends in complaints regarding WGL. We had expected to observe an increase in complaints associated with PROJECTPipes construction, but very few complaints have been received.

44. What is the success rate of OCS's complaint mediation program with Washington Gas?

RESPONSE: The Commission measures success in resolving consumer complaints by considering those cases that go to the Formal Complaint Stage as having been unsuccessful in mediation. We currently average about a 98% success rate.

FY 2014 Complaints Received:	**207**
FY 2014 Complaints Mediated:	**203**
Success Rate	**98.07%**
FY 2015 Complaints Received:	**240**
FY 2015 Complaints Mediated:	**235**
Success Rate:	**97.92%**
FY 2016 Complaints Received:	**54 (as of 2/10/16)**
FY 2016 Complaints Mediated:	**54 (as of 2/10/16)**
Success Rate:	**100%**

45. How many complaints did the PSC receive about Verizon in FY14, FY15, and FY16, to date?

RESPONSE: The Commission received the following number of complaints about Verizon:

FY 2014: 146
FY 2015: 170
FY 2016: 52 (as of 2/10/16)

46. What are the major complaints received by the PSC with regard to Verizon?

RESPONSE: The typical Verizon complaint concerns quality of service - either periodic service interruptions or trouble reports.

47. What trends does the PSC see regarding complaints against Verizon?

RESPONSE: Consumers are increasingly concerned about retaining copper-based facilities, which they feel are less susceptible to failure during power outages.

48. What is the success rate of OCS's complaint mediation program with Verizon?

RESPONSE: The Commission measures success in resolving consumer complaints by considering those cases that go to the Formal Complaint Stage as having been unsuccessful in mediation. We currently average about a 98% success rate.

FY 2014 Complaints Received:	**146**
FY 2014 Complaints Mediated:	**143**
Success Rate	**99.56%**

FY 2015 Complaints Received:	**170**
FY 2015 Complaints Mediated:	**165**
Success Rate:	**97.05%**

FY 2016 Complaints Received:	**53 (as of 2/10/16)**
FY 2016 Complaints Mediated:	**53 (as of 2/10/16)**
Success Rate:	**100%**

49. Please provide a list of open formal cases and provide a status report on each.

RESPONSE: See <u>Attachment 26.</u>

VII. Other

50. Please describe the PSC's three biggest accomplishments in FY15.

RESPONSE: As described in our Performance Accountability Report at Attachment 18, we view our top three accomplishments as: (1) acting upon the application for authorization and approval of a change of control of Pepco, to be effected by the merger of Pepco Holdings Inc. into a wholly owned subsidiary of Exelon Corporation; (2) approving the first Triennial Plan, the Underground Project Charge and the Finance Charge to implement DC PLUG (and successfully defending those decisions in the D.C. Court of Appeals); and (3) successfully establishing a consumer-oriented telecommunications transition from copper facilities to fiber optic facilities. In addition, it should be noted that we relocated and consolidated Commission offices on schedule, under budget and with no appreciable loss of productivity.

51. Please identify all electronic databases maintained by PSC, including the following:

A. A detailed description of the information tracked within each system

B. The age of the system and any discussion of substantial upgrades that have been made or are planned to the system

C. Whether the public can be granted access to all or part of each system

RESPONSE: See <u>Attachment 27.</u>

52. What has the agency done in the past year to make the activities of the agency more transparent to the public? In addition, please identify ways in which the activities of the agency and information retained by the agency could be made more transparent.

RESPONSE: The Commission continues to stream biweekly Commission Open Meetings and Evidentiary Hearings. In 2015, as part of our relocation and consolidation of offices, we upgraded our Audio Visual equipment to provide better sound and picture quality, and to add more features, such as picture within picture, which is very useful during evidentiary hearings. The PSC also continues its long-standing practice of convening community hearings where members of the public can voice their views on issues before the Commission. In 2015 and thus far in 2016, we have held community hearings on FC 1119, both the application for merger and the subsequent Non-unanimous Settlement Agreement. We have scheduled two workshops in FC 1130, Modernizing the Energy Delivery System for Increased Sustainability, which have been open to the public.

In addition, the Commission website continues to be a principle source of information about the Commission and its work. We recognize, however, that the website could be more user-friendly. We have therefore conducted a complete redesign to make the experience easier and more streamlined. Further, to insure that our information is minute-by-minute current, we will undertake to make website updates in house. This way, updates can be made virtually simultaneously with Commission decisions. As part of the website redesign, our Mobile App "PSC on the Go" will also be updated.

Further, we will shortly announce the launch of our entry into Social Media. We expect a Social Media Policy to be approved in the First Quarter of CY 2016. Once the policy has been approved by the Commissioners, we will have a presence on such Social Media platforms as Twitter, Facebook, Linked In and others. In order to prepare for this, the Commission has made an investment in improved photographic and video graphic equipment and has supported the training of staff members.

Finally, we have published a history of the founding of the Commission and of its regulation of District of Columbia utilities, called *The First Hundred Years: Protecting the Public Interest.* We will commemorate the publication of the book, which will be available to the public, at a Conference on March 18, 2016.

53. How does the agency solicit feedback from customers?

RESPONSE: The PSC's Office of Consumer Services (OCS) solicits feedback from consumers in a number of ways. The public can contact the PSC and OCS through the "Contact Us" page on the PSC's website which allows consumers to submit comments and questions on any aspect of the PSC's operations and decisions and through the "Request Form" on our mobile app ""PSC on the Go." If a consumer is specifically requesting assistance with a service provider, OCS is notified and will contact the consumer to answer any questions or offer help. Consumers can also call OCS directly; and write or email the office, Office Director or any person in the office.

The Commission also solicits feedback through Community Hearings. These hearings provide an opportunity for the public to testify on the record in Formal

cases. The Commission gives approximately 30-day notice of its hearings by publishing a Notice of Community Hearings in the most widely read publications in the District of Columbia.

OCS Consumer Specialists continually engage consumers through community outreach events (over 75 were conducted in FY 2015). Requests for participation in outreach events can also be made using our mobile app. Consumer Specialists also receive feedback regarding utility services through the complaint and inquiry processes, refereed meter tests, site visits, and walk-in visits to our offices from consumers.

54. Has the agency changed its practices as a result of such feedback?

RESPONSE: As a result of the feedback the Commission has received in the past, we have improved our Community Hearings by holding more evening sessions throughout the District, in all wards and questions. The Commission also continues to use the consumer complaint process as a catalyst for the initiation of investigations, hearings and other proceedings.

55. Please provide any addition information, feedback, or requests to the Committee that PSC deems necessary.

RESPONSE: None