**BEFORE THE**

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission : R-2015-2469275

Office of Consumer Advocate, : C-2015-2475448

Office of Small Business Advocate : C-2015-2478277

PP&L Industrial Customer Alliance : C-2015-2480265

C. Wintermeyer : C-2015-2485827

Cathleen A. Woomert : C-2015-2484588

Michael B. Young : C-2015-2485860

Joseph E. McAndrew : C-2015-2489524

:

v. : :

PPL Electric Utilities Corporation :

PPL Electric Utilities Corporation :

Petition for a Waiver of the Distribution : P-2015-2474714

System Improvement Charge Cap of 5% :

of Billed Revenues :

**ORDER GRANTING THE PETITION TO INTERVENE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND, GRANTING THE MOTION FOR ADMISSION PRO HAC VICE OF MICHAEL PANFIL AND JOHN FINNEGAN, AND GRANTING THE MOTION IN LIMINE OF PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION TO STRIKE THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DICK MUNSON AND TO EXCLUDE THE ISSUES RAISED THEREIN**

**Sixth Prehearing Order**

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On March 31, 2015, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL Electric or Company) filed Supplement No. 179 to Tariff Electric – Pa. PUC No. 201, containing proposed changes in rates, rules, and regulations calculated to produce approximately $167.5 million in additional annual revenues based upon data for a fully projected future test year ending December 31, 2016. This proposed rate change represents an average increase in the Company's distribution rates of approximately 18.5%, which equates to an average increase in total rates (distribution, transmission, and generation charges) of approximately 3.9%. Supplement No. 179 was proposed to take effect on June 1, 2015. The filing was suspended by Commission Order entered April 23, 2015.

Formal complaints against this proposed tariff have been filed by: the Office of Consumer Advocate (OCA), the Office of Small Business Advocate (OSBA), PP&L Industrial Customer Alliance (PPLICA), D. Wintermeyer, Cathleen A. Woomert, Thomas B. Young, and Joseph McAndrew.

Prior to the prehearing conference, petitions to intervene were filed by the Commission on Economic Opportunity (CEO), the Coalition for Affordable Utility Services and Energy Efficiency in Pennsylvania (CAUSE-PA), the Clean Air Council, Sustainable Energy Fund (SEF), the Alliance for Solar Choice (TASC), and Eric Joseph Epstein. The Commission's Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (I&E) filed a Notice of Appearance.

Motion for admission pro hac vice was filed by Joseph Minnott, attorney for the Alliance for Solar Choice, seeking admission for David R. Wooley and Jacob J. Schlesinger.

On April 22, 2015, a Notice was issued which scheduled the prehearing conference for Thursday, May 7, 2015. A prehearing conference order (First Prehearing Order) was also issued on April 22, 2015, which directed the litigating parties to file and serve their prehearing memos on or before Friday, May 1, 2015 on or before noon. Prehearing memos were filed by the following: PPL Electric, OCA, OSBA, I&E, PPLICA, CEO, SEF, Clean Air Council, TASC, CAUSE-PA, and Mr. Epstein.

The prehearing conference was held as scheduled on May 7, 2015. The following attended: David B. MacGregor, Esq., Paul E. Russell, Esq., and Christopher T. Wright, Esq., for PPL Electric; Darryl Lawrence, Esq., Hobart Webster, Esq., and Lauren Birge, Esq., for OCA; Richard Kanaskie, Esq., Gina L. Lauffer, Esq., and Kenneth R. Stark, Esq., for I&E; Steven C. Gray, Esq., for OSBA; Joseph Vullo, Esq., for CEO; Adeolu Bakare, Esq., for PPLICA; Kenneth L. Mickens, Esq., for SEF, Logan Welde, Esq., and Joseph O. Minott, Esq., for the Clean Air Counsel; Mr. Minott also appeared on behalf of the Alliance for Solar Choice, along with David R. Wooley, Esq.; Elizabeth Marx appeared on behalf of CAUSE-PA, and Mr. Epstein appeared pro se.

The petitions to intervene filed by CAUSE-PA, CEO, SEF, and Mr. Epstein were unopposed and were granted in the ordering paragraphs of the Scheduling Order.

Two petitions to intervene were opposed by the Company for lack of standing. The petition to intervene filed by the Clean Air Council faced the objections of the Company for failure to aver by name their members who are PPL Electric customers, and the petition to intervene filed by TASC faced the objections of the Company for failure to identify which members provide service within PPL Electric's service territory. Both TASC and the Clean Air Council were given five business days from the date of issuance of this Order to file and serve amended petitions with the requested information. The Company was given five business days from the date of the filing of the amended petitions to respond.

On May 12, 2015, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) filed a Notice of Intervention. As notices of intervention can only be filed by statutory advocates, and all others must file either a petition or a complaint, the NRDC filing was treated as a petition.

On May 13, 2015, the Clean Air Council filed its Amended Petition to Intervene, and on May 14, 2015, TASC filed its Amended Petition to Intervene. No response was filed. Counsel for PPL Electric indicated by email that no opposition would be filed to any of the three outstanding petitions to intervene. Therefore, the three petitions were granted by Order issued May 28, 2015.

On June 1, 2015, the Keystone Energy Efficiency Alliance (KEEA) Energy Education Fund filed a Petition to Intervene, and no party filed opposition to the Petition. The Petition was granted by Order dated June 22, 2015 (Fifth Prehearing Order).

On June 19, 2015, the Motion for Admission Pro hac Vice, Notice of Appearance, Petition to Intervene of Environmental Defense fund and the Prehearing Memorandum on Behalf of Environmental Defense Fund (EDF or Petitioner) was filed and served. As there was no indication that the Petitioner had obtained the agreement of other parties to its Petition to Intervene, the full time for response was required to run prior to my addressing the Petition. 52 Pa.Code § 5.61(a). On June 23, 2015, EDF served the Direct Testimony of Dick Munson.

On July 10, 2015, PPL Electric filed its Answer in Objections to the Petition to Intervene of Environmental Defense Fund and Motion in Limine to Exclude Environmental Defense Fund's Testimony and to Limit the Scope of the Evidentiary Hearing.

On July 10, 2015, EDF filed its Response.

There being no provision in the rules for further filings on this issue, the EDF's Petition to Intervene with its Motion for Admissions Pro Hac Vice, and PPL Electric's Motion in Limine are ripe for disposition.

DISCUSSION

**Petition to Intervene**

The EDF avers that it "engages in policy development, public education, litigation and other actions to achieve its goals, including the promotion of clean energy resources and technologies," Petition ¶2. It identifies four individuals with addresses in PPL Electric's service territory and avers that the four individuals are customers of PPL Electric. Petition ¶1. Petitioner claims that it has a right and interest in assuring that safe, reliable, clean and affordable public utility service, and participation in these Proceedings is an appropriate way to protect these rights and interest. Petition ¶6.

PPL Electric argues that the Petition should be denied or, in the alternative, participation should be limited to exclude EDF's proposals and its direct testimony stricken as beyond the proper scope of the proceeding.

Commission regulations provide:

**§ 5.72. Eligibility to intervene.**

(a) *Persons*. A petition to intervene may be filed by a person claiming a right to intervene or an interest of such nature that intervention is necessary or appropriate to the administration of the statute under which the proceeding is brought. The right or interest may be one of the following:

(1) A right conferred by statute of the United States or of the Commonwealth.

(2) An interest which may be directly affected and which is not adequately represented by existing participants, and as to which the petitioner may be bound by the action of the Commission in the proceeding.

(3) Another interest of such nature that participation of the petitioner may be in the public interest.

(b) *Commonwealth*. The Commonwealth or an officer or agency thereof may intervene as of right in a proceeding subject to subsection (a)(1)—(3).

(c) *Supersession*. Subsections (a) and (b) supersede 1 Pa. Code § 35.28 (relating to eligibility to intervene).

52 Pa.Code § 5.72.

"The interest of a petitioner seeking intervention must be direct and immediate." [*Re Pennsylvania Power & Light Company*, 50 Pa. PUC 38, 40 (1976).](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=5078c8bdce65b9df7770391072034e45&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b2009%20Pa.%20PUC%20LEXIS%20246%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=8&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b50%20Pa.%20PUC%2038%2cat%2040%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=2&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVzk-zSkAA&_md5=d5e6db824c37e5efc42b37779eb040ef)  
  
 To possess standing, a party must have an interest in the controversy that is distinguishable from the interest shared by other citizens. [Sierra Club v. Hartman, 529 Pa. 454, 605 A.2d 309 (1992)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=213dc75a8da2b4db48dafdbd1b6eb57a&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b903%20A.2d%20117%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=58&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b529%20Pa.%20454%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzt-zSkAW&_md5=1ffdf6ec22b455e234f27a1f3718aa97). A party possesses standing if he has a "substantial, direct, and immediate interest" in the subject matter of the litigation. [Wm. Penn Parking Garage, Inc. v. City of Pittsburgh, 464 Pa. 168, 346 A.2d 269 (1975)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=213dc75a8da2b4db48dafdbd1b6eb57a&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b903%20A.2d%20117%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=59&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b464%20Pa.%20168%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzt-zSkAW&_md5=94cef63fb336019adb37b14d9d2ca237). PPL Electric avers that EDF has failed to identify an interest which surpasses the common interest of all citizens, and that is has failed to state an interest which is not already represented adequately by other parties, as the NRDC, CAC, TASC and KEEA all state similar interests. Therefore, the interests of EDF are not unique and not a sound basis for the grant of intervention. PPL Electric Answer at pp. 5-6.

EDF responds that it has established that it has members in the PPL Electric service territory and that they have an interest in clean energy issues. Further, intervention had already been granted in other Commission electric distribution company base rate cases, as well as PECO's, now pending. Response of EDF at 1-2. In addition, EDF claims, different environmental groups emphasize different issues.

An association, as a representative of its members, may have standing to bring a cause of action even in the absence of injury to itself; the association must allege that at least one of its members is suffering immediate or threatened injury as a result of the challenged action." [*Malt Beverages Distribs. Ass'n v. Pa. Liquor  [\*123]  Control Bd.*, 881 A.2d 37, 41 (Pa.Cmwlth. 2005)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=213dc75a8da2b4db48dafdbd1b6eb57a&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b903%20A.2d%20117%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=63&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b881%20A.2d%2037%2c%2041%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzt-zSkAW&_md5=3758f8a7b8b86bb4ce770be178a7a1a2), petition for allowance of appeal denied, [586 Pa. 775, 895 A.2d 1264 (2006)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=213dc75a8da2b4db48dafdbd1b6eb57a&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b903%20A.2d%20117%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=64&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b586%20Pa.%20775%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzt-zSkAW&_md5=450c0acbfd1dc4313f091873e067bb29);   
*The Unified Sportsmen of Pennsylvania v. The Pennsylvania Game Commission et al*., 903 A.2d 117 Pa.Cmwlth. 2006), 2006 Pa. Commw. LEXIS 397; *see also Pennsylvania Academy of Chiropractic Physicians v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of State, Bureau of Professional & Occupational Affairs*, 564 A.2d 551 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1989) 1989 Pa. Commw. LEXIS 648.

Even in the absence of injury to itself, [however], an ass**o**ciation may have standing solely as the representative of its members. The possibility of such representational standing, however, does not eliminate or attenuate the constitutional requirement of a case or controversy. The association must allege that its members, or any one of them, are suffering immediate or threatened injury as a result of the challenged action of the sort that would make out a justiciable case had the members themselves brought suit. So long as this can be established, and so long as the nature of the claim and of the relief sought does not make the individual participation of each injured party indispensable to proper resolution of the cause, the association may be an appropriate representative of its members, entitled to invoke the court's jurisdiction.

[*Warth v. Seldin*, 422 U.S. 490, 511, 95 S.Ct. 2197, 2211, 45 L.Ed.2d 343, 362 (1975)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=6cbe0fdd4195d96840e56187ef084eb0&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b290%20Pa.%20Super.%20365%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=11&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b422%20U.S.%20490%2c%20511%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=10&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzt-zSkAW&_md5=f1ff6c50fd42e6894d316b1e876da8a3) (citations omitted). See also [*Boston Stock Exchange v. State Tax Commission*, 429 U.S. 318, 97 S.Ct. 599, 50 L.Ed.2d 514 (1977)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=6cbe0fdd4195d96840e56187ef084eb0&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b290%20Pa.%20Super.%20365%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=12&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b429%20U.S.%20318%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=10&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzt-zSkAW&_md5=aaeb19f2c13d61e1b9039fb657baad11);  *[Tripps Park Civic Association v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=6cbe0fdd4195d96840e56187ef084eb0&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b290%20Pa.%20Super.%20365%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=13&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b42%20Pa.%20Commw.%20317%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=10&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzt-zSkAW&_md5=10639743c7bd9fed05aee58ec9cdb1ea)*[, 415 A.2d 967 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1980)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=6cbe0fdd4195d96840e56187ef084eb0&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b290%20Pa.%20Super.%20365%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=13&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b42%20Pa.%20Commw.%20317%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=10&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzt-zSkAW&_md5=10639743c7bd9fed05aee58ec9cdb1ea); [*Concerned Taxpayers v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, 382 A.2d 490 (Pa.Cmwlth.1978)](https://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=6cbe0fdd4195d96840e56187ef084eb0&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b290%20Pa.%20Super.%20365%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=14&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b33%20Pa.%20Commw.%20518%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=10&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzt-zSkAW&_md5=aaf1e0c66089fe9b744bdb63e65049ae).

The EDF, having identified members who are ratepayers of the utility, have established standing to intervene in a base rate case, and intervention will be granted.

**Motion in Limine to Exclude EDF Testimony and to Limit the Scope of the Evidentiary Hearing**

PPL Electric states that the EDF advances three proposals: (1) that PPL Electric be required to undertake a cost-benefit analysis of providing usage data to customers and third parties and be required to submit a proposal to provide detailed energy usage data to customers and third parties; (2) that PPL Electric be required to use 21 environmental and performance metrics to ensure that its distribution facilities are performing as expected and customers are receiving the full benefits of grid modernization investments; and (3) that PPL Electric be required to report on the performance of its Integrated Volt/VAR Control projects and its future plans for full deployment. These, PPL Electric argues, are not properly within the scope of this base rate case but should be addressed in a statewide proceeding that affords all relevant parties the opportunity to participate.

These are three proposals which, PPL Electric argues, are not related to anything in PPL Electric's proposed or existing tariff rules, rates, or services. Rather, the determination of what usage data should be provided to customers and third parties is a statewide issue as the requirements must be uniform among EDCs. To this end, the Commission has adopted regulations and guidelines regarding access to customer data and the protection of customer information. *Re Standards for Electronic Data Transfer and Exchange,* Docket No.

M-00960890F0015 (June 18, 1998); *Smart Meter Procurement and Installation,* Docket No.

M-2009-2092655 (Order entered June 24, 2009); *Smart Meter Procurement and Installation Plan,* Docket No. M-2009-2092655 (July 8, 2011); *Interim Guidelines for Eligible Customer Lists,* Docket No. M-2010-2183412 (November 15, 2011); *Submission of the Electronic Data Exchange Working Group's Web Portal Working Group's Solution Framework for Historical Interval Usage and Billing Quality Interval Usage,* Docket No. M-2009-2092655 (April 23, 2015); 52 Pa.Code §§ 54.8-54.122. PPL Electric states that this is essentially a request to amend the Commission's existing regulations, orders and guidelines, which should not be permitted outside a statewide process. PPL Electric Answer at 7-8.

Similarly, PPL Electric charges, the proposed environmental and performance metrics and Integrated Volt/VAR Control project reporting requirements would, in effect, be an amendment to the Commission's Electric Reliability Standards. PPL Electric Answer at 8-9. Any determination of additional performance metrics would be across the state, not just in one EDC's service territory.

EDF responds that it is raising issues which are quite different from those raised by the other parties, which supports its intervention, and asks that it be permitted full participation. The data access, environmental and performance metrics, and Volt/VAR are all service issues, which are properly raised in a base rate case. EDF states that, while they may be the subject of other proceedings, those simply establish minimum standards. Nothing prohibits PPL from offering service to its customers in excess of the minimum standards. Response at 4.

A review of Mr. Munson's Direct Testimony reveals that he presents three numbered issues. His first issue is "Access to Energy Usage Data," in which he advocates for the increased access of actual usage to the customer in shorter intervals, in order to motivate customers to amend their usage more effectively. He advocates the use of in-home displays, web portals, and prepaid metering programs, as well as an Open Access Data Framework as the basis for sharing that information with authorized third parties. Munson Direct, pp. 2-6.

A similar issue was raised as part of the Company's recent Smart Meter Plan, and my Initial Decision in that case included the following language:

. . . the Company will be bound by a Commission initiative presently underway. The electronic data exchange working group (EDEWG) convened a web portal working group (WPWG) to develop standardized solutions for the acquisition of both the historical interval usage (HIU) and billing quality interval use (IU) data via a secure web portal, under Commission Order entered December 6, 2012, in this docket. On February 17, 2015, a final version of the document titled "Pennsylvania Web Portal Working Group Solutions Framework" was filed, which purportedly outlines the portal solution that would permit third parties such as EGSs and Conservation Service Providers (CSPs) to acquire data within 48 hours of daily meter reads. Commission review of this document will occur at a public meeting. The outcome of this proceeding will likely determine the direction of this issue.

Ideally, the Commission's scrutiny will result in regulations, which are the appropriate way to implement a statute. The parties' failure to mention the ongoing Commission initiative is understood because a search of the Commission's regulations would not result in finding them. Rather, the process is one that the Commission uses when the directions in a new statute require Commission guidance before regulations can be promulgated, and where the Commission institutes a regulatory process afterwards to ensure the due process rights of all involved.

In the meantime, the Company will be expected to comply with whatever outcome that the EDEWG recommends and the Commission approves at Docket No. M-2009-2092655, and there appears to be a recommendation pending at this time. The Commission's Final Order in that matter may be available to provide guidance for the disposition of this issue by the time the Commission issues its Final Order in the present case, but it is not available at this time. Accordingly, the parties who seek to be involved in the development of that process should look to that docket, and that the Company develop its Plan in accordance with Commission guidelines.

*Petition of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation for Approval of its Smart Meter Technology Procurement and Installation Plan,* Docket No. M-2014-2430781 (Initial Decision issued

April 30, 2015, case pending before the Commission on exceptions).

There is an ongoing proceeding before this Commission which addresses the functions of PPL Electric's proposed metering system. That proceeding was public and included other parties who fully litigated the case. The present base rate case is to set rates, and all intervenors are permitted and even encouraged to pursue all issues regarding the rates of this Company. However, I will not permit the re-litigation of issues which are presently pending before this Commission in another proceeding.

Similarly, each EDC in this Commonwealth is subject to performance metrics which were set according to regulations. Any challenge to these metrics must be done by formal complaint in a separate proceeding where it could be given sufficient time to develop a full and complete record, not rushed into the last few weeks before the formal hearings set for a base rate investigation. The Company and other parties will not be required to address the issue of performance metrics in the last few weeks before the hearing.

The third stated issue – that PPL Electric be required to report on its Integrated Volt/VAR control projects – has not been developed or supported sufficiently for even a superficial introduction of it, let alone a meaningful evaluation. There is not so much as an explanation of what a Volt/VAR control project is, let alone whether it could possibly be relevant to this proceeding. The abbreviated direct testimony[[1]](#footnote-1) fails to establish this recommendation as a legitimate issue for further scrutiny in this case.

Consequently, the Direct Testimony of Dick Munson is stricken.

**Motion for admission pro hac vice**

Counsel Heather Langeland moves for the admission pro hac vice of Michael Panfil and John Finnegan. Having set forth the necessary information to support her Motion, and no party having objected to the motion, it is granted as unopposed.

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Petition to Intervene of the Environmental Defense Fund is granted.

2. That the Motion of Heather Langeland for the admissions pro hac vice of Michael Panfil and John Finnegan is granted.

3. That the service list be amended to include Michael Panfil and John Finnegan.

4. That the Motion In Limine of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation to exclude the testimony of Dick Munson is granted.

5. That the Direct Testimony of Dick Munson is stricken.

6. That the issues raised by the Environmental Defense Fund in the Direct Testimony of Dick Munson are excluded from the scope of the evidentiary hearings in this case.

Dated: July 14, 2015 Susan D. Colwell

Administrative Law Judge
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1. " Q: Do you have any recommendation regarding integrated Volt/VAR controls?

   A: Yes. I recommend that the Company report on the performance of its Integrated Volt/Var Control projects and its future plans for full deployment." The complete Direct of Munson at 7-8 on this topic.

   . [↑](#footnote-ref-1)