



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
COMMONWEALTH KEYSTONE BUILDING
400 NORTH STREET
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE
M-2025-3052826

July 25, 2025

Devin Ryan, Esq.
Post & Schell P.C.
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant St., Suite 3010
Pittsburgh PA 15219
dryan@postschell.com

Re: PPL Electric Utilities Corporation CSP RFP Procedure for CSP Contract Bidding, Act 129 Phase V Energy Efficiency and Conservation Plan, filed with the Commission on July 11, 2025, at Docket No. M-2025-3052826

Dear Mr. Ryan:

This letter acknowledges that Commission staff has reviewed the Act 129 Conservation Service Provider (“CSP”) Contracts RFP Procedure, filed with the Commission on July 11, 2025, for the provision of PPL Electric Utility Corporation’s (“PPL”) Phase V Energy Efficiency & Conservation Plan. With this Letter, Commission staff tolls the 15-day deadline to review CSP Contract RFP Procedures and requests a response to a data request.

The *Phase V Implementation Order*,¹ *inter alia*, required all Electric Distribution Companies subject to Act 129 to submit, for Commission review, all CSP RFP competitive bidding procedures. (*Phase V Implementation Order*, Section G, pages 222-227). The Commission must review, and may order the modification of, these proposed CSP RFP competitive bidding procedures. 66 Pa. C.S. § 2806.1(a)(7).

PPL is advised that the above-referenced Act 129 CSP Contracts RFP Procedure is not approved at this time, for the reasons set forth below. Commission staff tolls the 15-day deadline and requests a response to the following data request, to facilitate the review of the RFP Procedures. Once the response to the data request is received, Commission staff will finalize review of the RFP Procedures.

¹ *Energy Efficiency and Conservation Program Implementation Order*, Docket No. M-2025-303052826 (June 18, 2025) (*Phase V Implementation Order*).

Data Request

1. On page 2 of the filing, Section 4(a) addresses the bid evaluation percentages. Section 4(a)(1) indicates that “Quality/Technical” will be scored in a range equaling “*30-70%”. Sections 4(a)(2) and 4(a)(3) indicate that the “Variety of Offerings” and “Evaluated Cost” will both be scored in ranges equaling “*10-30%” each. If “Quality/Technical” is evaluated and scored at 30% , it is not mathematically possible to reach a total evaluation score of 100% with the other two categories having a maximum potential of 30% each. Please provide a reason for why these numbers were chosen, and how the evaluation scoring will work.

The determinations in this Secretarial Letter have been made by PUC staff under authority delegated by the Commission. Parties have the right to seek reconsideration of this staff action. Parties may seek reconsideration of these directives by petitioning the Commission within 20 days after service of this Secretarial Letter. *See* 52 Pa. Code § 5.44 (relating to petitions for appeal from actions of the staff).

Please direct any questions to Joseph Sherrick, Bureau of Technical Utility Services, at (717) 787-2359 or Frank Capasso, Assistant Counsel, Law Bureau, at (717) 425-5440.

Sincerely,



Matthew L. Homsher
Secretary

cc: Darren Gill, Deputy Director, TUS
Joseph Sherrick, TUS
Nicholas DeMarco, TUS
Francesco D. Capasso Jr., LAW
Kriss Brown, LAW
Kathy Aunkst, Secretary’s Bureau
Devin Ryan (dryan@postschell.com)
Darryl Lawrence, Consumer Advocate (consumer@paoca.org)
NazAarah Sabree, Small Business Advocate (ra-sba@pa.gov)