

Jay Larry Moyer  
370 W. Johnson Street (C-1)  
Philadelphia, PA 19144  
267-693-2633

October 19, 2018

Ms. Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor North  
P. O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

RE: C-2015-2511904

Dear Ms. Chiavetta:

This letter is to inform the Commission of several recent interactions with PPL and the company's attorney. These interactions occurred since the Exceptions were filed in the above case, and they are pertinent to the case.

As I indicated in my exceptions dated September 24, 2018, I contacted PPL seeking assistance in locating the "virtual net meter aggregation post" which PPL professed to make available online. On Tuesday, September 25, 2018, after filing my exceptions, I had a conversation with Ms. Tammy Nalesnik, who returned my earlier call. I described the "post" which the company had described, and asked Ms. Nalesnik if she could direct me to my generation and aggregation details on that online "post". Ms. Nalesnik said she was not aware of any such "post". She

said that there is no other detailed online information besides that available on the “Energy Analyzer”. She also indicated that she would ask PPL’s attorney, Mr. Devin Ryan, to contact me regarding my question.

On Tuesday, October 16, 2018, I had a follow-up phone conversation with Mr. Ryan. I began by referring to the earlier phone conversation with Tammy Nalesnik on September 25, 2018 and to the “virtual net meter aggregation post” which PPL has claimed to make available on its website. I reminded him that Ms. Nalesnik was not aware of any such online “post” that could provide me with generation or aggregation data related to my renewable system.

Mr. Ryan then indicated that he could explain how to navigate PPL’s website and offered to demonstrate the various steps to me. I initially accepted his offer and agreed to sign in to my PPL accounts. He directed me to open my solar account, which I did. I followed for a few minutes on my computer as he navigated the site. It became clear that we were utilizing the company’s “Energy Analyzer”, as I have done often in the past. These steps were, in fact, the same ones I had used in previous efforts to locate the “post”. It soon became apparent that there was no information about generation or aggregation. The solar account referred only to “electricity usage”, which was reported as “0 kwh”.

I further expressed my confusion about Mr. Ryan's optimism in light of what I had heard from Ms. Nalesnik and stopped navigating the site because it offered nothing new. I also expressed my view that a customer service representative of PPL seemed a more appropriate person to explain the company's website.

At that point, Mr. Ryan informed me that he had advised PPL not to engage with me in any way about the net metering post unless he was present. He asserted that the issue of the "post" was not raised in the present complaint and could not be litigated now. He also expressed concern that there was some risk of ex parte communication. The nature of that risk was not clear, but he seemed to imply that it was in some way related to the PRO SE status of my case. When the conversation ended, I continued to explore the information on my solar account and could find nothing related to generation or aggregation.

What Mr. Ryan failed to acknowledge is that my question regarding the "virtual net meter aggregation post" was in response to the Initial Decision of ALJ Joel H. Cheskis, who alluded to the post in his Initial Decision. Judge Cheskis reiterated a claim from earlier proceedings that monthly information for my generation and aggregation is available "by other means". The "post" is merely one of the "other means" alluded to by ALJ Judge Cheskis. When Judge Cheskis claims that information is available "by other means", he is, in fact, quoting PPL's

own claim as described in the Opinion and Order from an earlier case.

(consolidated cases C-2011-2273645 and C-2014-2444864, issued May 19, 2016)

It is disingenuous to suggest that I am responsible for raising the issue of the virtual metering post or any of the “other means” which PPL claims to make available to virtual metering customers. I ask the Commission to note that my comments about the “post” were offered in response to the Initial Decision of Judge Cheskis.

Respectfully,

Larry Moyer