

Renardo L. Hicks
717.237.6081
rhicks@eckertseamans.com

July 21, 2025

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Matthew Homsher, Secretary
Office of the Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

RE: Amended Petition for Declaratory Order of CH Renewables Acquisitions, LLC
Docket No. P-2025-3054496

Dear Secretary Homsher:

Enclosed for electronic filing in the above matter please find CH Renewables Acquisitions, LLC's ("CH Renewables") Amended Petition for Declaratory Order. Please note that CH Renewables is requesting expedited consideration of this Petition.

Copies will be served in accordance with the attached Certificate of Service.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

/s/ *Renardo L. Hicks*

Renardo L. Hicks

RLJ/jls
Enclosures

cc: Certificate of Service (w/encs)
Joe Cardinale, Esq. (w/ encs)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this day I served a copy of the **Amended Petition for Declaratory Order of CH Renewables Acquisitions, LLC** upon the persons listed below in the manner indicated in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54.

Via Email Only

Tori L. Giesler, Esquire
First Energy
2800 Pottsville Pike
PO Box 16001
Reading PA 19612-6001
tgiesler@firstenergycorp.com

Office of Small Business Advocate
555 Walnut St.,
1st Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101
ra-sba@pa.gov

Allison Kaster, Esquire
PA Public Utility Commission
Bureau of Investigation & Enforcement
Second Floor West
400 North Street
Harrisburg PA 17120
akaster@pa.gov

Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut St.
5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101
ra-oca@paoca.org

Date: July 21, 2025

/s/ Lauren M. Burge
Lauren M. Burge, Esq.

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Petition for Declaratory Order of : Docket No. P-2025-3054496
CH Renewables Acquisitions, LLC :

**AMENDED PETITION FOR DECLARATORY ORDER
OF CH RENEWABLES ACQUISITIONS, LLC**

Pursuant to Section 331(f) of the Public Utility Code and Section 5.42 of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission’s (“Commission” or “PUC”) regulations, CH Renewables Acquisitions, LLC and its subsidiaries REPA Brook Hollow Solar, LLC, REPA Breezewood Hills Solar LLC, REPA Five Points Solar, LLC, and REPA Huckleberry Ridge Solar LLC, and REPA New Derry Solar, LLC (collectively, “CH Renewables”), file this Amended Petition requesting that the Commission issue a declaratory order to “terminate controversy” and “remove uncertainty.”¹ Through this Amended Petition, CH Renewables respectfully requests that the Commission issue a declaratory order finding that option agreements—including the “Option to Lease Agreements” at issue here—are “other legally binding contracts” that provide sufficient evidence of site control necessary to meet the interconnection requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 75.36(7). As further discussed below, **CH Renewables respectfully requests that the Commission consider this matter on an expedited basis and issue a Declaratory Order as expeditiously as possible because FirstEnergy’s actions are anticompetitive and likely to cause CH Renewables irreparable harm.**

In support of this Amended Petition, CH Renewables avers as follows:

¹ 66 Pa. C.S. § 331(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.42.

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. On April 9, 2025 CH Renewables filed a Petition for Declaratory Order at Docket No P-2025-3054496 (“Initial Petition”), requesting that the Commission terminate a controversy and remove uncertainty by issuing a Declaratory Order confirming that Option to Lease Agreements are, in fact, “other legally binding contracts” that provide sufficient evidence of site control to meet the requirements of Section 75.36(7) of the Commission’s regulations at 52 Pa. Code § 75.36(7).

2. Specifically, the Initial Petition alleged that FirstEnergy subsidiary Penelec rejected CH Renewables’ interconnection application for its Clement Run site; FirstEnergy subsidiary Penn Power rejected the interconnection application for CH Renewables’ Wayside Church location; and FirstEnergy subsidiary West Penn Power rejected the interconnection application for CH Renewables’ Brook Hollow location.²

3. On July 16, 2025 Assistant Counsel Joseph Cardinale, from the Commission’s Law Bureau, advised Counsel for Petitioner by email that:

“The Commission has been considering CH Renewables’ Petition for Declaratory Order regarding what legal contracts constitute site control for purposes of interconnection requests, and we recently learned that FirstEnergy has approved all of the projects that are the subject of CH Renewables’ Petition.

“Since there is no longer a case or controversy here, I am reaching out to you to determine if CH Renewables will be filing a Motion to Withdraw its Petition for Declaratory Order.³”

4. On July 17, 2025, CH Renewables counsel Renardo L. Hicks responded by email stating:

While I wish I could say that there is no longer a case or controversy, that is simply not true. I have copied an email below which I sent to First Energy on Wednesday of last week (7/9/2025) regarding ongoing

² See Initial Petition at 2–3.

³ See Attachment 1.

applications in dispute for the reasons outlined in our Petition. Please note that there were 4 separate applications in dispute with West Penn Power at that time, and one of them denied two days earlier on 7/7/2025. I have received no response to my email below.

Consequently, there remains a case and controversy that can, and should, be addressed by a decision on our Petition. As a result, we will not be withdrawing our Petition and hope this matter can be quickly addressed by the Commission to permit my client to continue implementing its business plans in PA, which are consistent with the Alternative Energy Portfolio Standards Act and the Commission's regulations. Time is truly "of the essence" here.⁴

5. On July 18, 2025, in response to the above email from counsel for CH Renewables, Assistant Counsel Joseph Cardinale, from the Commission's Law Bureau, responded by email as follows:

We have determined that since there are new applications that have been denied which are not part of the existing Petition for Declaratory Order, CH Renewables needs to file an Amended Petition with the applications that have been denied. Since the applications that are part of the existing Petition have been resolved there is no controversy or uncertainty for the Commission to address here and will be denied if not amended.⁵

6. However, as of the date of this Amended Petition, FirstEnergy subsidiary West Penn Power *continues* to reject Option to Lease Agreements as adequate proof of site control and there **remains "uncertainty" and an active "controversy" which requires termination by the Commission via declaratory order.**⁶

7. Specifically, West Penn Power *has not reversed its decision* as to the Brook Hollow location that was referenced in the Initial Petition in this matter; additionally, since the filing of the Initial Petition, West Penn Power has rejected four additional interconnection applications on the same grounds: (1) CH Renewables' New Derry project on April 9, 2025; (2) CH Renewables'

⁴ See, Attachment 2.

⁵ See, Attachment 3.

⁶ 66 Pa. C.S. § 331(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.42.

Huckleberry Ridge project on May 2, 2025; (3) CH Renewables' Five Points project on May 16, 2025; and (4) CH Renewables' Breezewood Hills project on July 7, 2025.

8. While Petitioner acknowledges that 2 of the 3 rejected interconnection applications referenced by Petitioner in the Initial Petition have been resolved, the Brook Hollow application referenced in the Initial Petition, and the other applications referenced in paragraph 7 above, illustrate how West Penn Power, a FirstEnergy company, continues to create controversy by rejecting interconnection applications based upon the same apparent flawed policy interpretation of the Commission's regulations regarding site control.

9. As of the date of this Amendment, West Penn Power clings to the policy position that exclusive Option to Lease Agreements are not "other legally binding contracts" that provide sufficient evidence of site control to meet the requirements of Section 75.36(7) of the Commission's regulations. Consequently, as of the date of this Amended Petition, FirstEnergy *has not approved all of the projects that are the subject of CH Renewables' Initial Petition and has rejected additional applications referenced in paragraph 7 above based upon their disputed and controversial policy interpretation of the Commission's site control regulation at 52 Pa. Code § 75.36(7)*. Without any knowledge of the source or substance of information from which the Commission "learned that FirstEnergy has approved all of the projects that are the subject of CH Renewables' Petition," as evidenced by the attached Verification, FirstEnergy has simply not approved all of the projects that were referenced in the Initial Petition of CH Renewals.

10. We agree that the specific examples of denied applications in the Initial Petition, which were subsequently approved by Penelec and Penn Power (Clement Run and Wayside Church) have terminated the controversy as to those two interconnection applications in dispute; however, the continued application of FirstEnergy's flawed policy interpretation of the Commission's regulation by

West Penn Power demonstrates the existence of ongoing controversies regarding five additional interconnection applications which require the Commission's assistance to terminate these specific disputes by issuing a Declaratory Order and remove uncertainty by confirming that exclusive Option to Lease Agreements are, in fact, "other legally binding contracts" that provide sufficient evidence of site control to meet the requirements of Section 75.36(7).

11. Further, in this case, the Commission should note that FirstEnergy's apparent adoption of a policy which is contrary to the plain language of the Commission's regulations at 52 Pa. Code § 75.36(7) creates a controversy that must be terminated and creates uncertainty for all interconnection applicants that should be removed by issuing a Declaratory Order. Unless this flawed policy interpretation of Commission regulations used by FirstEnergy companies to reject otherwise proper interconnection applications is declared unlawful, uncertainty will continue regarding whether such improper rejections will happen again. The Commission should close the door to this improper result and remove any uncertainty regarding whether an exclusive Option to Lease Agreement is an "other legally binding contract" under the Commission's regulations.

12. FirstEnergy's changing policy interpretation on interconnection site control and failure to implement a uniform policy amongst its subsidiaries is strong evidence of an ongoing "controversy" that creates "uncertainty" and is based on an impermissibly narrow reading of Section 75.36(7) of the Commission's regulations and is not supported by its own past practice or the plain language of the regulation.

13. This incorrect and arbitrary interpretation of Section 75.36(7) causes direct harm to CH Renewables, as it prevents CH Renewables from timely completing interconnections to the grid, which in turn negatively affects each project's place in the interconnection queue and creates the

potential for CH Renewables to lose a unique business opportunity to control land and property that cannot be fully compensated by money damages.

14. Further, FirstEnergy’s inconsistent and inaccurate interpretation of CH Renewables’ Option to Lease Agreements also constitutes unfair competition⁷ that irreparably damages the reputation of CH Renewables and cannot be fully compensated by monetary damages, and which will invariably increase the overall cost of the project.

15. Through this Amended Petition, CH Renewables renews its request that the Commission expeditiously terminate this controversy and remove uncertainty by issuing a declaratory order confirming that Option to Lease Agreements are, in fact, “other legally binding contracts” that provide sufficient evidence of site control to meet the requirements of Section 75.36(7).

II. LEGAL STANDARDS

16. Section 331(f) of the Public Utility Code provides that the Commission “in its sound discretion, may issue a declaratory order to terminate a controversy or remove uncertainty.”⁸ The Commission’s regulations likewise provide that a party may seek a declaratory order from the Commission to terminate a controversy or remove uncertainty.⁹

17. The Commission’s regulations require that a petition for declaratory order must state clearly and concisely the controversy or uncertainty which is the subject of the petition; cite the

⁷ The regulation at issue here is related to the implementation of Pennsylvania’s Alternative Energy Portfolio Standards Act, 73 P.S. §§ 1648.1–1648.8 (“AEPS Act”), which incentivizes the use of electricity generated by renewables resources such as wind, solar, and biomass. The Commonwealth Court’s 2020 ruling in *Hommrich v. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission* held that other PUC regulations added criteria that restricted eligibility for net metering and inhibited the development of alternative energy. *Hommrich*, 231 A.3d 1027 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2020). Here, FirstEnergy’s interpretation of the Commission’s regulation at Section 75.36(7) is also in conflict with the AEPS Act’s goal of incentivizing the use of electricity generated by renewable energy.

⁸ 66 Pa. C.S. § 331(f); *Borough of Olyphant v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n*, 861 A.2d 377 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2004).

⁹ 52 Pa. Code § 5.42.

statutory provision or other authority involved; include a complete statement of the facts and grounds prompting the petition; and include a full disclosure of the interest of the petitioner.¹⁰

18. The Commission may issue a declaratory order without an evidentiary hearing.¹¹ For purposes of petitions for declaratory orders, the Commission assumes the facts as alleged are true and issues a decision on the issues accordingly.¹²

III. CONTROVERSY TO BE TERMINATED / UNCERTAINTY TO BE REMOVED

19. Section 75.36 of the Commission’s regulations provides additional requirements for interconnection requests.¹³ Specifically, Section 75.36(7) provides that “[w]hen an interconnection customer is not currently a customer of the EDC, upon request from the EDC, the interconnection customer shall provide proof of site control evidenced by a property tax bill, deed, lease agreement *or other legally binding contract.*”¹⁴

20. The Commission’s regulations do not specifically define “site control,” yet the Commission has recognized site control as dominion over real property to the extent necessary to develop a project. *See Petition of W. Penn Power Co.*, Docket No. P-880286, Opinion and Order entered December 1, 1994, 1994 WL 932218 at n.6 (1994) (site control refers to the developer’s obligation to secure an appropriate site for the proposed facilities).

¹⁰ *Id.* § 5.42(a)(1)–(4).

¹¹ *See, e.g., In re Petition of Pa. Elec. Co. for Declaratory Order Regarding Electric Service in the Borough of Jennerstown, Somerset Cnty., Pa.*, Docket No. P-910518, 1992 Pa. PUC LEXIS 150, 1992 WL 687123 (1992) (although no evidentiary hearing was held, the Commission issued a declaratory order on the basis of the “pleadings in the record”); *Re Newtown Artesian Water Co.*, Docket No. P-830449, 57 Pa. PUC 515, 1983 Pa. PUC LEXIS 30, 0083 WL 824706 (1983) (“While no hearing has been held to determine if the facts alleged in Newtown’s Petition are true, the Petition is duly verified and Middletown has filed no response to refute those facts.”).

¹² *Newtown Artesian Water Co.*, 0083 WL 824706; *Petition of Pa. Am. Water Co. for a Declaratory Order Regarding Service Territory in Westfall Twp., Pike Cnty., Pa.*, P-2022-3033109, Opinion and Order entered December 21, 2023 (reliance upon pleadings and data responses in the record).

¹³ 52 Pa. Code § 75.36.

¹⁴ *Id.* § 75.36(7) (emphasis added).

21. The “controversy” to be terminated by the Commission here is whether Option to Lease Agreements are “other legally binding contracts” that provide evidence of site control as required by 52 Pa. Code § 75.36(7), such that CH Renewables’ interconnection requests must be approved by FirstEnergy.

22. The inclusion of the phrase “other legally binding contracts” after reference to examples of a “property tax bill, deed or lease agreement” makes clear that other evidence is contemplated and can be used to demonstrate site control. Site control can include, but does not require, a demonstration of ownership (via a property tax bill or deed) or a leasehold interest (via a lease agreement) in a property. However, site control can also be satisfied by a demonstration of an exclusive option to purchase or acquire a leasehold site for the purpose of developing a project. Site control can also be satisfied by other legally binding contracts that reflect an exclusivity or other business relationship between the developer and the property owner such that the developer has the right to possess or occupy a site for the purpose of developing a project. In connection with an interconnection application, an Option to Lease agreement is a legally binding contract.

23. FirstEnergy has caused “controversy” and “uncertainty” by adopting a policy that only a tax bill, deed, or lease agreement suffice as evidence of site control—then reversing its decision as to some applications, in some of its affiliates, but not in others. FirstEnergy’s inconsistent and limited view of what constitutes adequate site control is premised on an incorrect and incomplete reading of Section 75.36(7) and entirely ignores the regulation’s plain language providing that “other legally binding agreements” are acceptable.

24. For all of the projects in question, CH Renewables has complied with the site control requirement of Section 75.36(7) by supplying legally enforceable written Option to Lease

Agreements to First Energy companies. The Option to Lease Agreements give CH Renewables legal dominion over real property to the extent necessary to design and construct the projects in question.

25. The Option to Lease Agreements that CH Renewables provided to FirstEnergy as part of its interconnection applications are legally binding agreements that provide evidence of site control for interconnection purposes. Both the overall purpose of the agreements and the plain language of the agreements demonstrate that these documents are legally binding contracts that are evidence of CH Renewables' control of the sites.

26. As discussed in the Initial Petition, FirstEnergy's inconsistent and unsupported position that it will only accept a tax bill, deed, or lease agreement as evidence of site control is blatantly contrary to the Commission's regulation and causes substantial uncertainty for CH Renewables and all others who attempt to interconnect . The more recent rejection of four interconnection applications by West Penn Power, referenced in paragraph 7 above, based upon its erroneous interpretation of a Commission regulation, demonstrates that this is an ongoing "controversy" that should be terminated by the Commission.

27. Consequently, CH Renewables requests that the Commission issue a declaratory order confirming that Option to Lease Agreements are "other legally binding contracts" that provide sufficient evidence of site control necessary to meet the interconnection requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 75.36(7).

IV. REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED DECISION

28. Importantly, it has been more than 3 months since the filing of the Initial Petition in this matter, and Petitioner submits that the lack of a declaratory ruling in this matter is, at least in part, related to West Penn Power's ongoing rejection of applications otherwise properly submitted. Consequently, CH Renewables respectfully requests that the Commission address the issues

presented in its Original Petition and this Amended Petition on an expedited basis, as time is of the essence with respect to terminating this controversy and removing uncertainty.

29. FirstEnergy's incorrect and arbitrary interpretation of Section 75.36(7) is anticompetitive and is causing direct, irreparable harm to CH Renewables—as it prevents CH Renewables from completing its pending projects and interconnecting those projects to the grid in a timely manner. FirstEnergy's incorrect, inconsistent, and arbitrary interpretation creates the potential for CH Renewables to lose a unique business opportunity to control land and property that cannot be fully compensated by monetary damages.

30. FirstEnergy's unsupportable rejection of CH Renewables' Option to Lease Agreements constitutes an unfair, anticompetitive strategy of delay, which damages the reputation of CH Renewables, invariably increases the overall cost of these projects, and which cannot be fully compensated by monetary damages.

31. FirstEnergy's rejection of CH Renewables' Option to Lease Agreements may cause CH Renewables to lose its place in the interconnection queue. Given that there is a limited amount of capacity available on the grid, if CH Renewables loses its place in the queue, it could result in the loss of a significant opportunity or, even losing the ability to interconnect these projects to the grid at all. This would jeopardize the projects' existence and would cause irreparable harm to CH Renewables, which cannot be remedied by monetary damages. Further, even if projects are ultimately able to interconnect to the grid, delays in interconnection may significantly damage CH Renewables' business reputation and increase the overall cost of the project.

32. To avoid or limit the irreparable harm caused by FirstEnergy's incorrect, inconsistent interpretation and anticompetitive practice and—given the clear and discrete nature of the legal issue

presented here—CH Renewables respectfully requests that the Commission consider this matter on an expedited basis and issue a Declaratory Order as expeditiously as possible.

V. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing, CH Renewables respectfully requests that the Commission issue an Order declaring that option agreements - such as the Option to Lease Agreements at issue here, are “other legally binding contracts” that provide sufficient evidence of site control necessary to meet the interconnection requirements at 52 Pa. Code § 75.36(7). CH Renewables further requests that the Commission consider this matter on an expedited basis.


Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Renardo L. Hicks

Renardo L. Hicks, Esquire (I.D. No. 40404)
Carl R. Shultz, Esquire (I.D. No. 70328)
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
213 Market St., 8th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
(717) 237-6000 (phone), (717) 237-6019 (fax)
rhicks@eckertseamans.com
cshultz@eckertseamans.com

Lauren M. Burge, Esq. (I.D. No. 311570)
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
600 Grant Street, 44th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 566-6000 (phone), (412) 566-6099 (fax)
lburge@eckertseamans.com

Date: July 21, 2025

Counsel for  Renewables Acquisitions, LLC

VERIFICATION

I, Laurence Pelosi, am Vice President of CH Renewables Acquisitions, LLC (“CH Renewables”), and I hereby state that the facts set forth in the foregoing Amended Petition are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, and that I expect CH Renewables to be able to prove the same at a hearing held in this matter. I understand that the statements herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S. § 4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities).

/s/ Laurence Pelosi

Dated: July 21, 2025

Laurence Pelosi
Vice President
CH Renewables Acquisitions, LLC

ATTACHMENT 1

From: Cardinale, Joe <jcardinale@pa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 2:49 PM
To: Renardo L. Hicks <rhicks@eckertseamans.com>
Cc: Capasso, Francesco <fcapasso@pa.gov>
Subject: [External] CH Renewables - Petition for Declaratory Order

Good afternoon Rick,

The Commission has been considering CH Renewables' Petition for Declaratory Order regarding what legal contracts constitute site control for purposes of interconnection requests, and we recently learned that FirstEnergy has approved all of the projects that are the subject of CH Renewables' Petition.

Since there is no longer a case or controversy here, I am reaching out to you to determine if CH Renewables will be filing a Motion to Withdraw its Petition for Declaratory Order.

If you could get back to me when you have a chance on what CH Renewables' intentions are I would greatly appreciate it.

Thanks, and I hope you are having a great summer.

Joe

www.puc.pa.gov

Joseph P. Cardinale, Jr.
Assistant Counsel
Law Bureau
Phone: 717-787-5558
Email: jcardinale@pa.gov
Consumer Hotline:
1-800-692-7380

ATTACHMENT 2

From: Renardo L. Hicks
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2025 7:40 AM
To: Cardinale, Joe <jcardinale@pa.gov>
Cc: Capasso, Francesco <fcapasso@pa.gov>
Subject: RE: CH Renewables - Petition for Declaratory Order

Good morning, Joe:

Thanks for inquiring about this matter. While I wish I could say that there is no longer a case or controversy, that is simply not true. I have copied an email below which I sent to First Energy on Wednesday of last week (7/9/2025) regarding ongoing applications in dispute for the reasons outlined in our Petition. Please note that there were 4 separate applications in dispute with West Penn Power at that time, and one of them denied two days earlier on 4/7/2025. I have received no response to my email below. Consequently, there remains a case and controversy that can, and should, be addressed by a decision on our Petition. As a result, we will not be withdrawing our Petition and hope this matter can be quickly addressed by the Commission to permit my client to continue implementing its business plans in PA, which are consistent with the Alternative Energy Portfolio Standards Act and the Commission's regulations. Time is truly "of the essence" here.

Thanks.

From: Renardo L. Hicks
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 1:22 PM
To: tgiesler@firstenergycorp.com
Subject: RE: Petition for Declaratory Ruling

BTW – The Docket Number for our Petition is P-2025-3054496.

From: Renardo L. Hicks
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 1:13 PM
To: tgiesler@firstenergycorp.com
Subject: Petition for Declaratory Ruling

I write regarding our long-pending Petition for Declaratory Ruling filed in April with the PA PUC at Docket No. _____. Since that time, I was pleased to learn that CH Holdings was informed that based upon new advice from the PUC, your legal department updated guidance to the companies and Penn Power and Penelec reversed their previous denials of applications for two of my clients and accepted exclusive Option to Lease Agreements as suitable proof of Site Control. I write to you because it does not appear that all of the First Energy companies in PA have done so. As recently as today, my client Crow Holdings has shared with me that 4 of their applications (one of them as recently as Monday 7/7/2025) have been denied by West Penn Power based upon the old policy position that I thought had been changed for all First Energy companies. I have referenced those 4 applications below.

Both my clients and I appreciate the apparent change in policy that caused Penn Power and Penelec to approve their applications. Can you confirm whether there is a different policy at West Penn Power or Med-Ed?

Of course, my clients would most like to have their applications approved if this site control issue is all that prevents that. I have recently been asked by the PUC to update our Petition to reflect the events we have experienced with First Energy companies since its filing; however, I would much prefer to work this through collaboratively, and perhaps even consider recommending withdrawing our petition if a policy change can be made clear in writing for all of the First Energy companies.

Please respond at your earliest convenience. My contact information is included below.

**WPP-GENIC 5914 - REPA Breezewood Hills Solar
LLC**

Site control was denied on 7/7/25.

WPP-GENIC 5906 - REPA Five Points Solar, LLC

Site control denied 5/16/25; CHR inquired about policy change 6/30/25 - no response.

**WPP-GENIC 6015- REPA Huckleberry Ridge Solar
LLC**

Site control denied 5/2/25; CHR inquired about policy change 6/12/25; WPP requested revisions 7/7 which did not include site control changes.

WPP-GENIC 6065 - REPA New Derry Solar, LLC

Site control denied 4/9; CHR sent full lease 6/5; no response.

ATTACHMENT 3

From: Renardo L. Hicks <rhicks@eckertseamans.com>
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2025 1:54 PM
To: Cardinale, Joe <jcardinale@pa.gov>
Cc: Capasso, Francesco <fcapasso@pa.gov>
Subject: Re: CH Renewables

No problem. Will do.

From: Cardinale, Joe <jcardinale@pa.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2025 1:52:24 PM
To: Renardo L. Hicks <rhicks@eckertseamans.com>
Cc: Capasso, Francesco <fcapasso@pa.gov>
Subject: [External] CH Renewables

Good afternoon Rick,

We have determined that since there are new applications that have been denied which are not part of the existing Petition for Declaratory Order, CH Renewables needs to file an Amended Petition with the applications that have been denied. Since the applications that are part of the existing Petition have been resolved there is no controversy or uncertainty for the Commission to address here and will be denied if not amended.

Joe

www.puc.pa.gov

Joseph P. Cardinale, Jr.
Assistant Counsel
Law Bureau
Phone: 717-787-5558
Email: jcardinale@pa.gov
Consumer Hotline:
1-800-692-7380