



515 West Hamilton Street
Suite 502
Allentown, PA 18101
T: 610-391-1800
F: 610-391-1805

jlushis@norris-law.com

September 30, 2020

E-FILE

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

**RE: Petition of Duquesne Light Company for Approval of a Default
Service Plan for the Period June 1, 2021 through May 31, 2025
Docket No. P-2020-3019522**

Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission is the Main Brief on behalf of Calpine Retail Holdings, LLC in the above-referenced proceeding.

As evidenced by the attached Certificate of Service, all parties to the proceeding are being served with a copy of this document.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

NORRIS McLAUGHLIN, P.A.

/s/ John F. Lushis, Jr.

John F. Lushis, Jr.

c: Administrative Law Judge Mark A. Hoyer
Certificate of Service

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**Petition of Duquesne Light Company for :
Approval of Default Service Plan for :
the Period of June 1, 2021 through : Docket No. P-2020-3019522
May 31, 2025 :**

MAIN BRIEF OF CALPINE RETAIL HOLDINGS, LLC

James Laskey
(NJ Id. No 016311978, admitted *pro hac vice*)
Norris McLaughlin, P.A.
400 Crossing Blvd, 8th Floor
Bridgewater, NJ 08807
Phone: (908) 252-4221
Fax: (908) 722-0755
jlaskey@norris-law.com

John F. Lushis, Jr.
(PA I.D. No. 32400)
Norris McLaughlin, P.A.
515 W. Hamilton Street, Suite 502
Allentown, PA 1810
Phone: (484) 765-2211
Fax: (484) 765-2270
jlushis@norris-law.com

Attorneys for Calpine Retail Holdings, LLC

September 30, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
III. ARGUMENT	3
IV. CONCLUSION	5

Table of Authorities

Page

Statutes:

66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a)..... 7

Cases:

Petition of Duquesne Light Company for Approval of a Default Service Program and Procurement Plan for the Period June 1, 2013 through May 31, 2015, Docket No. P-2012-2301664 3

Petition of Duquesne Light Company for Approval of a Default Service Program and Procurement Plan for the Period June 1, 2015 through May 31, 2017, Docket No. P-2014-2418242 3

Shenango Township Board of Supervisors v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n, 686 A.2d 910, 914 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1996)..... 7

I. INTRODUCTION

This brief is filed on behalf of Calpine Retail Holdings, LLC (“Calpine Retail”) to address a single issue explicitly reserved for litigation in the Partial Settlement in this docket: namely, whether the Commission should reverse many years of consistent pro-competition rulings regarding the recovery by Petitioner Duquesne Light Company (“Duquesne”) of certain costs incurred by competitive Electric Generation Suppliers, or EGS’s. These costs are known as Network Integration Transmission Services, or “NITS.” Seven EGS companies comprising a small subset of the market and calling themselves the EGS Parties sponsored testimony to argue that NITS, which are currently assessed on each EGS based on such EGS’s own unique demand, should be shifted into a one size fits all charge for Non-Bypassable Transmission, or “NBT” costs.¹ The effect of this shift would be to shift risk to consumers in Duquesne’s service territory and force the spreading of these costs among all Duquesne customers, both those taking service under Duquesne Default Service Plan and also those who are served by EGS’s.

The effect of such a shift would be that EGS’s who are currently supplying and managing their customers’ loads would no longer be able to offer NITS-associated products and services in the marketplace and provide those benefits to customers in Duquesne’s service territory and indeed throughout Pennsylvania. This one size fits all bailout of NITS costs at the request of this subset of suppliers would remove an important incentive that exists in today’s competitive marketplace to pursue load management strategies and apply operational and management expertise that encourages efficient use of the transmission grid.

This proposal is not new. It has been considered by the Commission on numerous occasions, and consistently rejected. Yet certain market participants, the so-called EGS Parties,

¹ See EGS Parties Statement No. 1, Direct Testimony of Christopher Kallaher (hereafter “Kallaher Testimony”).

keep trying to seek protection for their own business and management decisions. Calpine Retail urges the Commission to make it clear that the EGS Parties need to stop coming to the Commission for a bailout , and instead need to figure out how to compete more efficiently.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Calpine Retail is an independent, national provider of retail electric service across twenty states. Through its subsidiaries it operates as a licensed Electric Generation Supplier (EGS) in Pennsylvania and serves industrial, commercial and residential customers. Calpine Retail is also a Load Serving Entity (LSE) and member of PJM Interconnection LLC. Calpine Retail is actively serving and soliciting customers throughout Pennsylvania, including in Duquesne's territory. Calpine Retail currently offers a wide variety of demand-related and energy-related products and services beyond simple energy procurement, including load and risk management as well as renewable energy and sustainability solutions. Its products and services are designed to meet the individualized needs and demands of Calpine Retail's customers and capture the benefits of the competitive wholesale energy environment and bring those benefits forward into Pennsylvania's competitive retail electric market.²

NITS costs are billed by PJM on every Load Serving Entity, including Calpine Retail and the EGS Parties which are a subset of market participants, pursuant to tariffs that are filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC. These rates are subject to annual adjustment according to a formula. There is a regulatory process in place at FERC for determining those rates as well as the ability to challenge those rates.³

² See Calpine Retail Statement No. 1, Rebuttal Testimony of Becky Merola (hereafter "Merola Testimony"), at 2.

³ Merola Testimony at 3.

III. ARGUMENT

Both Calpine Retail and the EGS Parties incur NITS costs. Calpine Retail has been able to manage these costs and still offer products and services that its customers desire. As explained by Ms. Merola, Calpine Retail does this by managing the customers loads served by Calpine Retail.⁴ Apparently, the EGS Parties have not been as successful in this regard. Subsequently, their collective response has been not to improve their expertise at load management, but instead to try to shed retail business risk and move it from the competitive retail market to all customers of the utility, regardless of existing market, contracts and products and services. When it comes to servicing customers who do not take default service, but who instead rely on EGS's such as Calpine Retail, such cost shifting would simultaneously limit existing and potential customers' product and service choices. Not only would this harm the competitive retail market, it would remove any incentive and opportunity to create customized products and services that are, or potentially might be formulated, to assist EGS customers in addressing these costs. This is nothing more than a bailout and predatory attempt to remove a competitors products and services from the market.

The EGS Parties' witness Kallaher failed to mention that the argument he is making has been considered and rejected before. However, Duquesne witness David Ogden provides a full history of the prior litigation.⁵ As Ogden notes, this issue was resolved after extensive litigation in both Duquesne's DSP VI and DSP VII proceedings.⁶

⁴ Merola Testimony at 3.

⁵ Duquesne Statement No. 4R, Rebuttal Testimony of David Ogden (hereafter "Ogden Testimony") at 21.

⁶ *Petition of Duquesne Light Company for Approval of a Default Service Program and Procurement Plan for the Period June 1, 2013 through May 31, 2015*, Docket No. P-2012-2301664, Opinion and Order dated January 25, 2013, at 221-222; *Petition of Duquesne Light Company for Approval of a Default Service Program and Procurement Plan for the Period June 1, 2015 through May 31, 2017*, Docket No. P-2014-2418242, Opinion and Order dated January 15, 2015, at 45-46 and 52-53.

Mr. Kallaher tries to overcome this precedent by arguing that circumstances have changed in terms of how NITS are set.⁷ As explained by Ms. Merola, however, the formulas now used by FERC are still subject to a ratemaking process at FERC. There is a regulatory process in place at FERC for determining those rates as well as the ability to challenge those rates. This process at FERC does not negate the ability of EGS companies to manage their loads and manage their NITS costs.⁸

In sum, Calpine Retail submits that the EGS Parties, which represent a subset of the marketplace, are looking for ways to not take responsibility for their own business decisions, level of risk management expertise and associated management decisions, valuation of risk, and products they choose to offer. In brief, they are trying to shed and shift market risk associated with their own demand-driven costs. Rather than using expertise to manage these costs and associated risks, they are asking for Duquesne's DSP customers to bail them out. As a result, one of the principal benefits of moving to retail competition would be eliminated, by removing products and services and any competitive discipline for a specific LSE demand based cost in the marketplace.⁹

Furthermore comparing retail electric market products and services to a fully regulated default service is an apples to oranges comparison. The default service is based on a uniform master supply agreement with no individually negotiated terms of service. It is essentially one size fits all. In contrast, Pennsylvania has afforded its competitive Electric Generation Suppliers a market that has worked in the past and is working today. EGS's have the freedom to choose the products and services they offer into the marketplace. Each EGS has the freedom to build,

⁷ Kallaher Testimony at 28-30.

⁸ Merola Testimony at 3.

⁹ Merola Testimony at 3-4.

establish and promote innovative products and services to meet its individual customers' needs, as well as the structure and timing of those services based on the EGS's own business and management decisions.¹⁰

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the proposal of the EGS Parties to change the way NITS costs are recovered by Duquesne from EGS Load Serving Entities should be rejected.

Respectfully submitted,

James Laskey
(admitted *pro hac vice*)
NORRIS McLAUGHLIN, P.A.
400 Crossing Blvd, 8th Floor
Bridgewater, NJ 08807
Phone: (908) 252-4221
Fax: (908) 722-0755
jlaskey@norris-law.com

/s/ John F. Lushis, Jr.
John F. Lushis, Jr. (I.D. No. 32400)
NORRIS McLAUGHLIN, P.A.
515 W. Hamilton Street, Suite 502
Allentown, PA 1810
Phone: (484) 765-2211
Fax: (484) 765-2270
jlushis@norris-law.com

Attorneys for Calpine Retail Holdings, LLC

September 30, 2020

¹⁰ Merola Testimony at 4.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT

1. “NITS” costs are the costs of Network Integration Transmission Services.¹¹
2. Calpine Retail and the so-called EGS Parties provide competitive service in Pennsylvania as Electric Generation Suppliers, or EGS’s.¹²
3. Calpine Retail and the EGS Parties are Load Serving Entities under PJM rules.¹³
4. Under current practice, Duquesne recovers NITS costs for default service customers, and not for customers who are served by EGS’s.¹⁴
5. The charges assessed on EGS’s for NITS are subject to a rate-setting process at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).¹⁵
6. The current practice was approved by the Commission in prior Duquesne cases after extensive litigation.¹⁶
7. The current practice creates competitive opportunities for EGS’s that are able to help their customers manage their loads.¹⁷
8. The proposal by the EGS Parties to shift NITS costs into a non-bypassable transmission charge would remove this competitive opportunity.¹⁸
9. The proposal by the EGS Parties is opposed by Duquesne and Calpine Retail.¹⁹
10. No other party has supported the proposal by the EGS Parties

¹¹ Calpine Retail Statement No. 1, at 3.

¹² Calpine Retail Statement No. 1, at 2; EGS Parties’ Statement No. 1, at 2.

¹³ Calpine Retail Statement No. 1, at 2-3.

¹⁴ Calpine Retail Statement No. 1, at 2-3; Duquesne Statement No. 4R, at 18-19.

¹⁵ Calpine Retail Statement No. 1, at 3.

¹⁶ Calpine Retail Statement No. 1, at 2-3; Duquesne Statement No. 4R, at 21.

¹⁷ Calpine Retail Statement No. 1, at 3-4.

¹⁸ Id.

¹⁹ Calpine Retail Statement No. 1, at 2-4; Duquesne Statement No. 1-R, at 16-17.

APPENDIX B

PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Under Section 332(a) of the Public Utility Code, the EGS Parties bear the burden of proof as to their proposal.²⁰
2. Changing existing Commission policy requires a strong showing.²¹
3. The EGS Parties have not met their burden to change the Commission's existing policy regarding NITS costs.

²⁰ 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

²¹ *Shenango Township Board of Supervisors v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 686 A.2d 910, 914 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1996).

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**Petition of Duquesne Light Company for :
Approval of Default Service Plan for :
the Period of June 1, 2021 through : Docket No. P-2020-3019522
May 31, 2025 :**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the Main Brief on behalf of Calpine Retail Holdings, LLC upon the individuals listed below, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant).

Service by electronic mail as follows:

Honorable Mark A. Hoyer
Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge
Pennsylvania Public Utility
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120
Mhoyer@pa.gov

Michael Zimmerman
Tishekia E. Williams
Emily Farah
Duquesne Light Company
411 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
mzimmerman@duqlight.com
twilliams@duqlight.com
efarah@duqlight.com

David T. Evrard
Kristine E. Robinson
Aron J. Beatty
Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
Forum Place, 5th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
devrard@paoca.org
krobinson@paoca.org
abeatty@paoca.org

Michael W. Gang
Anthony D. Kanagy
Post & Schell, P.C.
17 North Second Street, 12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
mgang@postschell.com
akanagy@postschell.com

Richard A. Kanaskie
Scott D. Granger
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor West
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105
rkanaskie@pa.gov
sgranger@pa.gov

Sharon E. Web
Office of Small Business Advocate
555 Walnut Street, 1st Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
swebb@pa.gov

Elizabeth R. Marx
John Sweet
Ria Pereira
Pennsylvania Utility Law Project
118 Locust Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
pulp@palegalaid.net
Counsel for CAUSE-PA

Gregory Peterson, Esq.
Phillips Lytle, LLP
201 West Third Street Suite 205
Jamestown, NY 14701
gpeterston@phillipslytle.com
Counsel for Statewise Pennsylvania et al.

James M. Van Nostrand, Esq.
Keyes & Fox LLP
275 Orchard Dr
Pittsburg, PA 15228
jvannostrand@keyesfox.com
Counsel for Chargepoint Inc

Henry McKay, Esq.
Solar United Neighbors of Pennsylvania
327 Whipple Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15218
henry@solarunitedneighbors.org
Counsel for Solar United Neighbors

Todd S. Stewart, Esq.
Hawke, McKeon & Sniscak, LLP
100 North Tenth Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
tsstewart@hmslegal.com
Counsel for Interstate Gas Supply et al.

Charles E. Thomas, Jr.
Thomas, Niesen & Thomas LLC
212 Locust Street Suite 302
Harrisburg, PA 17101
cthomasjr@tntlawfirm.com
Counsel for MAREC Action

Mark Szybist, Esq.
Natural Resources Defense Council
1152 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
mszybist@nrdc.org
Counsel for Natural Resources Defense Council

Dated: September 30, 2020

/s/ John F. Lushis, Jr.
John F. Lushis, Esquire
Attorney I.D. No. 32400
Norris McLaughlin, P.A.
515 W Hamilton Ste 501
Allentown, PA 18101
Attorneys for Calpine Retail Holdings, LLC