

Richards Energy Comments on EDC Obligation to Serve L-00040169

Richards Energy Group, Inc. is an energy consulting engineering firm. We have been licensed by the PUC as a broker/marketer in PA since 1999. Our power purchasing consortium, REAP, continues to expand, and currently has over 900 industrial and commercial electric accounts. REAP has been active and successful finding shopping deals within PA from 1999 through today (yes, we actually have a 3MW client shopping in PPL right now, which is quite an accomplishment, considering the market). We would like to offer our comments from the perspective of a firm that has had to make deregulation work for its customers even when few others have been able to shop.

Our comments on Docket L-00070183 apply to this docket as well, and in fact, I'm having a hard time separating comments from one docket to the other.

One new area of discussion concerns the default service provider requirements, specifically the rules to be allowed to leave default service...considering the problems we've had in the Met Ed/Penelec territories due to the automatically renewing 1 year contract and the restrictions we've had in PPL (stay on default for 1 year after return to default) and PECO (no apparent restriction from leaving PECO default service, but unless you leave in May, you receive huge penalties the rest of the year until next May). We'd like to see specific direction from the PUC that DSPs not be allowed to restrict in any way (economic or other) the free movement of a customer from default supply to EGS supply, except that it be on his meter read date for the month he desires to leave.

Paragraph 54.189 (d) seems to get at this issue, but I hate to see an "if" referring to another regulation with a subject this important. If this issue is not clearly defined by the PUC, I'm concerned that the individual DSP tariffs may attempt to install roadblocks or other convolutions that would preclude customers free access to the deregulated market, which is the whole point of deregulation.

Another is a comment on the statement on P. 17: "The use of a PTC will enable customers to make more informed choices regarding whether or not to seek service with an EGS." This is certainly true with a PTC that has some level of certainty over a period of time...allowing PTC to change monthly or even more often makes the customer's choice more "guessed" or "hoped for" than "informed".

Frank J. Richards, P.E.