Philadelphia Gas Works

Gregory J. Stunder Senior Attorney



800 W. Montgomery Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19122 Telephone: (215) 684-6878 – Fax (215) 684-6798 Email: greg.stunder@pgworks.com

December 16, 2011

### VIA EXPRESS MAIL

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Commonwealth Keystone Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 1 North 400 North Street Harrisburg, PA 17120

> RE: Pa. PUC v. Philadelphia Gas Works Docket No. R-2008-2073938 December 19, 2008 Ordering Paragraph No. 9 – Collaborative Process

Dear Secretary Chiavetta,

Enclosed for filing is an original and three copies of Philadelphia Gas Works' Statement in Support of the Joint Petition for Settlement in the above referenced matter.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this filing.

Respectfully submitted, Gregory A Stunder

Enclosure

cc: Parties of Record

RECEIVED

DEC 1 5 2011

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION SEGRETARY'S BUREAU

#### BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION, et al. v. PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS	:		
	:	Docket No.	R-2011-2224739
	:		RECEIVED
			DEC 15 20.3
			PUBLIC UTILITY CONVERSION

## PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS' STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE JOINT PETITION FOR SETTLEMENT – COLLABORATIVE PROCESS RE: ALTERNATIVE DEFAULT SERVICE SUPPLY

Philadelphia Gas Works ("PGW" or "Company") submits this Statement in Support of the Joint Petition for Settlement filed in the above captioned proceeding. The settlement was joined by Interstate Gas Supply, Inc. ("IGS"), Dominion Retail, Inc. ("Dominion Retail"), Hess Corporation ("Hess") and Direct Energy Services, LLC ("Direct Energy").

#### I. BACKGROUND

On November 14, 2008, PGW filed a petition, direct testimony and supporting exhibits with the Commission requesting emergency rate relief, pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 1308, 1308(e), 2212(c) and 52 Pa. Code § 5.41. Most of the following active parties participated in discovery, filed testimony, participated in the evidentiary hearings and filed briefs: Office of Trial Staff ("OTS"), the Office of Consumer Advocate ("OCA"), the Office of Small Business Advocate ("OSBA"), Philadelphia Industrial and Commercial Gas Users Group ("PICGUG"), Interstate Gas Supply, Inc. and Dominion Retail, Inc. (collectively the "NGSs"), Tenant Union Representative Network ("TURN") and Action Alliance of

Senior Citizens ("Action Alliance") (together with TURN, "TURN, et al.") and Philadelphia

Housing Authority ("PHA").

On December 19, 2008, the Commission issued an Order granting emergency rate relief in the amount of \$60 million effective on or after January 1, 2009.<sup>1</sup> The December 19, 2008 Order also set forth:

That Philadelphia Gas Works shall convene, no later than sixty (60) days after the entry of this Opinion and Order, a collaborative process to explore options for transitioning some or all of its customers to an alternative default service supplier. The first sixty (60) days of the collaborative shall be devoted to the development of a proposal. At the end of the first sixty (60) day period, Philadelphia Gas Works shall submit a report to the Commission detailing the progress made and identify any areas of agreement or disagreement among the stakeholders. Participating stakeholders may submit an alternative report outlining a different course of action. The process will continue until the participants agree to submit a final action report unless the Commission orders otherwise.<sup>2</sup>

The Collaborative Process began with a kick-off meeting on February 1, 2009 and

meetings continued to be held through September 2009. The following parties participated in

the Collaborative Process: PGW, OTS, OCA, OSBA, PICGUG, TURN et. al., PHA, and

representatives of the natural gas suppliers including Interstate Gas Supply, Dominion Retail,

Hess, Direct Energy and Gas Mark.

On July 23, 2009, PGW and the Collaborative Process participants received a joint proposal from Interstate Gas Supply, Dominion Retail, Hess and Direct Energy (the "Supplier Proposal"). On September 23, 2009, the collaborative participants met in order to discuss

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> PA PUC v. PGW, R-2008-2073938 (Opinion and Order Dec. 19, 2008, Ordering Paragraph 2).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> *Id.* at Ordering Paragraph 9.

next steps. During that meeting, some of the participants expressed their concerns that the Supplier Proposal did not comport with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Code. PGW proposed that the Commission review all legal questions presented by the collaborative participants before the Collaborative Process proceeded any further. The participants agreed that all interested parties would submit their positions/legal questions to the Commission on October 21, 2009 and submit reply comments, if any, on November 4, 2009, and position papers were submitted in accordance with this schedule.<sup>3</sup>

On April 13, 2011, the Commission issued a Secretarial Letter referring the Supplier Proposal to the Office of Administrative Law Judge ("OALJ") for an on the record proceeding in which the suppliers will bear the burden of proof if there was still interest by the suppliers.<sup>4</sup> The Secretarial Letter also encouraged PGW and the Supplier Proposal parties to work cooperatively and pursue reasonable opportunities for settlement. After the issuance of the aforementioned Secretarial Letter, PGW, Interstate Gas Supply, Dominion Retail, Hess and Direct Energy engaged in extensive discussions to try to achieve a settlement. As a result of those negotiations, the Joint Petitioners were able to reach the Settlement set forth herein.

#### II. THE SETTLEMENT IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

PGW submits that the Settlement is in the public interest because:

1) Substantial Litigation And Associated Costs Will Be Avoided. The Settlement amicably and expeditiously resolves a number of important and potentially contentious issues. The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> PGW, OCA and OSBA filed individual submissions. Interstate Gas Supply, Dominion Retail, Hess and Direct Energy filed a joint submission.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> PA PUC v. PGW, R-2008-2073938 (Sec'l Letter April 13, 2011).

administrative burden and costs to litigate these matters to conclusion would be significant.

- 2) The Settlement Is Consistent With Commission Policies Promoting Negotiated Settlements. The Joint Petitioners arrived at the Settlement terms after preparing and submitting positions/legal questions and engaging in in-depth discussions. The Settlement terms and conditions constitute a carefully crafted package representing reasonable negotiated compromises on the issues addressed herein. Thus, the Settlement is consistent with the Commission's rules and practices encouraging negotiated settlements (see 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.231, 69.391, 69.401), and is supported by a substantial record.
- The Settlement Is A Reasonable Resolution. The Settlement represents a reasonable resolution of the Collaborative Process issues regarding consumer education, customer switching data, permissible rate offerings, consolidated billing and capacity assignment/allocation.

#### III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth in the above and in the Joint Petition, PGW submits that the Settlement is in the public interest and should be approved without modification.

PGW respectfully requests:

1. That the OALJ and the Commission approve the Settlement as set forth herein, including all terms and conditions thereof;

2. That the Collaborative Process established in Commission proceeding at Docket No. R-2008-2073938 be marked closed following a Commission decision; and

- 4 -

3. That the Commission enter an Order, following a Commission decision

evidencing its approval of the Settlement and terminating the proceeding.

Bespectfully submitted:

Gregory J. Stunder, Esc. PhNadelphia Gas Works 800 W. Montgomery Ave. Philadelphia, PA 19122 215-684-6878

Counsel for Philadelphia Gas Works

# RECEIVED

# DEC 1 5 2011

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION BECRETARY'S BUREAU

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the foregoing document upon the participants listed below in accordance with the requirements of § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant).

#### VIA REGULAR MAIL

Richard Kanaskie, Esquire Office of Trial Staff Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission P.O. Box 3265 Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Aron Beatty, Esquire Office of Consumer Advocate 555 Walnut Street 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Forum Place Harrisburg, PA 17101-1921

Sharon E. Webb, Esquire Office of Small Business Advocate Suite 1102, Commerce Building 300 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Harrisburg, PA 17101

Charis Mincavage, Esquire McNees Wallace Nurick 100 Pine Street Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166

John F. Povilaitis, Esq. Ryan, Russell, Ogden & Seltzer P.C. 800 North Third Street, Suite 101 Harrisburg, PA 17102-2025

Date: December 16, 2011

Todd S. Stewart, Esquire Hawke McKeon Sniscak & Kennard 100 North Tenth Street Harrisburg, PA 17105-1778

Philip Bertocci, Esquire Thu B. Tran, Esquire Community Legal Services 1424 Chestnut Street Philadelphia, PA 19102

Daniel Clearfield, Esquire Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellot, LLC 213 Market Street - 9th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101

Philip L. Hinerman, Esquire Fox Rothschild LLP 2000 Market Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor Philadelphia, PA 19103-3291

Stunder, Esq. gorv

RECEIVED

DEC 1 5 2011

PA PUBLIC UTILITY GOMMIS: SEGRETARY'S BUREAU

