

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA



DARRYL A. LAWRENCE
Consumer Advocate

OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE
555 Walnut Street, 5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101-1923
(717) 783-5048
(800) 684-6560

 @pa_oca
 /pennoca
FAX (717) 783-7152
consumer@paoca.org
www.oca.pa.gov

December 18, 2025

Via Electronic Filing

Matthew L. Homsher, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: Petition of PPL Electric Utilities
Corporation for Approval of its Second
Distributed Energy Resources
Management Plan;
Docket No. P-2024-3049223

Dear Secretary Homsher:

Please find enclosed a copy of the Office of Consumer Advocate's Petition for Reconsideration and/or Clarification in this proceeding. Copies have been served on the parties as indicated on the enclosed Certificate of Service.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Christy Appleby
Christy Appleby, Esq.
Senior Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 85824
CAappleby@paoca.org

Enclosures

cc: Administrative Law Judge John M. Coogan (Via Email: jcoogan@pa.gov)
Office of Special Assistants (Via Email: ra-osa@pa.gov)
Certificate of Service

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Petition of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation :
for Approval of its Second Distributed Energy : Docket No. P-2024-3049223
Resources Management Plan :

I hereby certify that I have this day filed electronically on the Commission’s electronic filing system and served a true copy of the following document, the Office of Consumer Advocate’s Petition for Reconsideration and/or Clarification, upon parties of record in this proceeding in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant), in the manner and upon the persons listed below.

Dated this 18th day of December 2025.

SERVICE BY E-MAIL ONLY

Steven C. Gray, Esquire
Rebecca Lyttle, Esquire
Office of Small Business Advocate
555 Walnut Street
1st Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101
sgray@pa.gov
relyttle@pa.gov
Counsel for OSBA

Devin T. Ryan, Esquire
Kim Klock, Esquire
Dave MacGregor, Esquire
Megan Rulli, Esquire
Post & Schell P.C.
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street, Suite 3010
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
dryan@postschell.com
kklock@pplweb.com
dmacgregor@postschell.com
mrulli@postschell.com
Counsel for PPL

Allison Kaster, Esquire
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Bureau of Investigation & Enforcement
400 North Street, 2nd Floor West
Harrisburg, PA 17120
akaster@pa.gov
Counsel for I&E

Beren Argetsinger, Esquire
Keyes & Fox LLP
PO Box 166
Burdett, NY 14818
bargetsinger@keyesfox.com
Counsel for Sunrun, Inc.

Bernice I. Corman, Esquire
BICKY CORMAN LAW PLLC
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
bcorman@bickycormanlaw.com
*Counsel for Tesla, Inc., Sun Directed,
American Home Contractors, Sunrun, Inc.,
and Solar Energy Industries Association*

Adam E. Gersh, Esquire
Flaster Greenberg P.C.
1717 Arch Street, Suite 3300
Philadelphia, PA 19103
adam.gersh@flastergreenberg.com
Counsel for Sunrun, Inc.

Andrew J. Karas, Esquire
Emily A. Collins, Esquire
Fair Shake Environmental Legal Services
647 E. Market Street
Akron, OH 44302
akaras@fairshake-els.org
ecollins@fairshake-els.org
*Counsel for Natural Resources Defense
Council*

Adeolu A. Bakare, Esquire
Rebecca Kimmel, Esquire
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
100 Pine Street
P.O. Box 1166
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166
abakare@mcneeslaw.com
rkimmel@mcneeslaw.com
Counsel for PPLICA

Counsel for:
Darryl A. Lawrence
Consumer Advocate

Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923

Dated: December 18, 2025

/s/Christy Appleby
Christy Appleby, Esq.
Senior Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 85824
CAAppleby@paoca.org

Melanie Joy El Atieh, Esq.
Deputy Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 209323
MElAtieh@paoca.org

Harrison W. Breitman, Esq.
Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 320580
HBreitman@paoca.org

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Petition of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation :
for Approval of its Second Distributed :
Energy Resources Management Plan : Docket No. P-2024-3049223
:
:

PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND/OR CLARIFICATION
OF THE
OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE

The Office of Consumer Advocate (OCA) submits this Petition for Reconsideration and/or Clarification pursuant to Section 703(g) of the Public Utility Code and Sections 5.41 and 5.572 of the Commission’s regulations. 66 Pa.C.S. § 703(g); 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.41, 5.572. The OCA requests that the Commission reconsider and/or clarify its final determination in the captioned docket, as set forth in the Order entered December 3, 2025 (*Second PPL DER Order*). In the case below, the OCA requested that the Second PPL DER Plan exclude small DER installments below 200 kW and that the Company be required to complete an Orchestration Plan. In the *Second PPL DER Order*, the Commission adopted the OCA’s recommendation for the development of an Orchestration Plan but did not address the OCA’s recommendation that small DER installments below 200 kw be excluded. *See Second PPL DER Order* at Ordering Paragraph 5. The OCA believes these two issues are interrelated as the size of the DER installments included within the Second DER Plan impact the overall scope of the Orchestration Plan. If the Commission intended in its Order to include both small and large DER installments, the OCA respectfully requests that the Commission reconsider its determination to include DER installments less than 200 kW as the

OCA does not believe that they are cost-effective or necessary for the reasons set forth in the OCA's testimony. However, if the Commission intended to adopt the OCA's full recommendation that small DER installments below 200 kW be excluded from the Company's Plan, the OCA respectfully requests that the Commission clarify its Order and Ordering Paragraphs.

I. INTRODUCTION

This proceeding concerns PPL's Petition for approval to implement its Second DER (Distributed Energy Resources) Plan following the conclusion of its existing DER pilot program. *See also, Petition for PPL Electric Utilities Corporation for Approval of its First Distributed Energy Resources Management Plan*, Docket No. P-2019-3010128, Order (Dec. 17, 2020) (*PPL First DER Petition*). Parties to the case include PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL); the OCA, the Office of Small Business Advocate (OSBA); the Joint Solar Parties (JSP), comprised of American Home Contractors, Inc., Enphase Energy, Inc., the Solar Energy Industries Association, SolarEdge Technologies, Inc., Sun Directed, Sunnova, Inc, Tesla, Inc. and Trinity Solar, Inc.; PPL Industrial Customer Alliance (PPLICA); and the Sustainable Energy Fund (SEF).

On June 30, 2025, ALJ Coogan issued his Recommended Decision (RD), recommending that PPL's proposed Petition for a Second DER Plan be denied.

On December 3, 2025, the Commission entered the *Second PPL DER Order*, determining in Ordering Paragraph 5:

That within twelve (12) months of the entry date of the Commission's Opinion and Order in this proceeding, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation shall file a Distributed Energy Resources Orchestration with the Commission and provide an evaluation of three (3) different interconnection approaches.

Second PPL DER Order at 63.

The OCA recommended that the Commission deny PPL's proposed Second DER Plan. In its Ordering Paragraph 5, the Commission adopts the OCA's alternative recommendation as

discussed in its Reply Exceptions. *Second PPL DER Order* at Ordering Paragraph 5. As discussed in the OCA's Reply Exceptions, the OCA recommended:

requiring PPL to file a DER "Orchestration Plan" that consists of, but is not limited to, the following:

- 1) PPL's DER integration strategy, including a technology maturity and investment plan, for electric vehicles, energy storage systems, solar, thermostats, microgrids, and other controllable loads;
- 2) Alternatives analysis that considers the size and type of DER, third-party services and procurements (including third-party/aggregator DERMS integration), and the enabling costs for integration, and;
- 3) A cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness framework used to evaluate the alternatives analysis and selected approach.

Moreover, PPL should be required to provide an evaluation of three different flexible interconnection approaches that are applicable to both exporting and importing facilities including export (i.e., generation) and import (i.e., load) limitation schemes, scheduled interconnections, and actively managed interconnections. An evaluation of each approach includes the following:

- 1) A description;
- 2) Industry benchmarks and examples;
- 3) Benefits & Risks;
- 4) Current implementation status of approach; and,
- 5) Future state & next steps, including future rate and DER program offerings.

OCA Reply Exc. at 22-23; OCA M.B. at 42-43 (citing OCA St. 1 at 54-55; OCA St. 1SR at 3).

The Commission appears to have adopted only a portion of the OCA's recommendation. After review of the Commission's Order, the OCA seeks to understand the scope of the Commission's *Second PPL DER Order*. The purpose of the OCA's Petition for Reconsideration and/or Clarification is to either request that the Commission reconsider its determination to require that the Orchestration Plan be implemented for small and large DER installments or to seek that the Commission clarify its determination regarding whether PPL's DER Plan should be for DER installments over 200 kW. If the Commission intended in its Order to include both small and large DER installments, the OCA respectfully requests that the Commission reconsider its determination

to include DER installments less than 200 kW. However, if the Commission intended to adopt the OCA's full recommendation that small DER installments below 200 kW be excluded from the Company's Second DER Plan, the OCA respectfully requests that the Commission clarify its Order and Ordering Paragraphs.

II. LEGAL STANDARDS

The standards for granting a petition for reconsideration are as follows:

A petition for reconsideration, under the provisions of 66 Pa. C.S. § 703(g), may properly raise any matters designed to convince the Commission that it should exercise its discretion under this code section to rescind or amend a prior order in whole or in part. In this regard we agree with the Court in the Pennsylvania Railroad case, wherein it stated that “[p]arties...cannot be permitted by a second motion to review and reconsider, to raise the same questions which were specifically considered and decided against them...” *What we expect to see raised in such petitions are new and novel arguments, not previously heard, or considerations which appear to have been overlooked or not addressed by the Commission.* Absent such matters being presented, we consider it unlikely that a party will succeed in persuading us that our initial decision on a matter or issues was either unwise or in error.

Duick v. Pennsylvania Gas and Water Co., 56 Pa. P.U.C. 553, 599 (1985) (quoting *Pennsylvania R.R. Co. v. Pa. P.U.C.*, 118 Pa. Super. 180 (1935)) (*Duick*) (emphasis added).

III. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AND/OR CLARIFICATION

A. Summary

In this Petition, the OCA raises a request for reconsideration and/or clarification. The Commission's *Second DER Order* granted PPL's Petition for Approval of its Second Distributed Energy Resources Management Plan, as modified by the Order. One of those modifications is to adopt the OCA's recommendation that PPL implement an Orchestration Plan. However, the Commission's *Second PPL DER Order* did not provide a clear disposition regarding whether the Commission also adopted the OCA's recommendation that DER installments under 200 kW should not be included in the Second DER Plan. The Commission appears to have adopted a

portion of the OCA's recommendation to require that the Company undertake an Orchestration Plan within twelve months, but the Order did not substantively address the other portion of the OCA's recommendation regarding how small DER installments should not be included in the PPL's Second DER Plan. Although the Commission summarizes the OCA's concerns regarding the size of the DER installations included, the Commission appears to have overlooked the impact of the OCA's recommendation regarding the size of the installations on the Orchestration Plan. *Second PPL DER Order* at 35. The Commission's disposition regarding the Exceptions and the Ordering Paragraphs do not discuss at all the OCA's recommendation that installations less than 200 kW be excluded.

To the extent that the Commission is not limiting PPL's Second DER Plan to small DER installments under 200 kw, the OCA requests that the Commission reconsider its decision for the reasons set forth below. For the reasons set forth in the testimony of OCA witness Nelson and discussed in the OCA's Reply Exceptions, the OCA does not believe that it is necessary or cost-effective to include devices under 200 kW in the Second DER Plan. In the alternative that the Commission intended to adopt the OCA's full recommendation that the DER installments under 200 kW should be excluded, the OCA respectfully requests that the Commission clarify its Order. While the OCA does not agree that it is cost-effective or necessary to include small DER installments less than 200 kW in the PPL Second DER Plan, clarity on this issue is necessary for the scope of the Orchestration Plan.

B. The OCA respectfully requests that the Commission reconsider and/or clarify its Second PPL DER Order.

As noted above, the Commission adopted the OCA's recommendations regarding the need for an Orchestration Plan. However, although it summarizes the OCA's language in its Reply Exceptions regarding a concern about whether it is cost-effective to pursue small DER

installations, the Commission's *Second PPL DER Order* does not appear to address this aspect of the OCA's Reply Exceptions.

In its Reply Exceptions, the OCA highlighted its concerns about installations for small DER installments:

Most installments of distributed energy resources (DER) in PPL's service territory are small; about 98 percent are under 25 kW. OCA St. 1 at 36. From a reliability and safety perspective, mandatory, active monitoring is not needed for small DERs but only for large DERs (200 kW and above) because large DERs represent a significant fraction of the demand on a distribution circuit, creating an acute risk to reliability and safety. While PPL should not simply ignore small DERs with no intention to monitor, manage, or influence their impacts on the distribution system, it is very important to ratepayer interests that more cost-effective methods be explored for small DERs.

Reply Exc. at 1, citing OCA St. 1 at 31-36; OCA St. 1SR at 33. As the OCA also discussed in its Reply Exceptions, regarding distribution system reliability and safety, and cost-effectiveness, the OCA presented credible witness testimony to show that PPL's DER plan should distinguish between small and large DER installments and that mandatory, active monitoring is only needed for large DERs because they represent a significant fraction of the demand on a distribution circuit, creating an acute risk to reliability and safety, while more cost-effective methods should be explored for small DERs. OCA Reply Exc. at 7; OCA St. 1 at 31-36; OCA St. 1SR at 33-36; *see also, Second PPL DER Order* at 35 (summary of OCA's recommendations). The OCA recommended in its Direct Testimony that the Commission should "exempt all DERs 200 kw and below from mandatory participation in active DER management" and allow the option for exempt DERs to participate in active management. OCA St. 1 at 6. The Commission's *Second PPL DER Order* does not specifically address this recommendation as discussed and raised in the OCA's Reply Exceptions.

As discussed in the OCA's Reply Exceptions, OCA witness Nelson testified that large DER installments (200 kW and above) "represent a significant fraction of the demand on a distribution circuit, creating an acute risk to reliability and safety." OCA Reply Exc. at 8; OCA St. 1 at 31. In contrast, small DER installments (below 200 kW) "are independently an insignificant portion of distribution demand" and therefore "should have the option for active monitoring and control to enable more cost-effective connections"; however, Mr. Nelson's testimony was clear that "there is no reason to make this mandatory" for small DER installments. OCA St. 1 at 31.

The Commission's *Second PPL DER Order* does not appear to make a determination about the size of the DER installations, and the size of the DER installations will impact the scope of the Orchestration Plan. While the Commission adopted the OCA's recommendation regarding the need for an Orchestration Plan, the Commission appears to have overlooked or not considered the OCA's recommendations regarding the cost-effectiveness and necessity for the Company to actively monitor small DER installments when the Commission adopted the OCA's recommendation regarding the filing of an Orchestration Plan and the elements to be included in the Orchestration Plan. *Second PPL DER Order* at 48, Ordering Paragraph 5. The Commission also provided in its summary of the OCA's position that the OCA had recommended that only active monitoring was needed for large DERs. *Second PPL DER Order* at 48. The Commission's Ordering Paragraphs, however, does not appear to make a determination regarding the size of the DER installments to be considered, but only recommends adoption of the OCA's proposal for an Orchestration Plan and that PPL shall conduct a Request for Proposal from third-party aggregators and original equipment manufacturers. *Second PPL DER Order* at Ordering Paragraph 5-6.

If the Commission intended in its Order to include both small and large DER installments, the OCA respectfully requests that the Commission reconsider its determination to include DER

installments less than 200 kW as not cost-effective or necessary for the reasons set forth in the OCA's testimony. However, if the Commission intended to adopt the OCA's full recommendation that small DER installments below 200 kW be excluded from the Company's Second DER Plan, the OCA respectfully requests that the Commission clarify its Order and Ordering Paragraphs.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, the OCA respectfully requests that the Commission grant reconsideration of the Second PPL DER Order, and reconsider its determination to include small DER installments less than 200 kW in the Company's Second DER Plan or, alternatively, clarify that the Commission's language that small DER installments below 200 kW are excluded from the Company's Second DER Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Christy M. Appleby
Christy M. Appleby
Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 85824
E-mail: CAppleby@paoca.org

Office of Consumer Advocate
5th Floor, Forum Place
555 Walnut Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923
Phone: (717) 783-5048
Fax: (717) 783-7152

Harrison W. Breitman
Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 320580
E-mail: HBreitman@paoca.org

Counsel for:
Darryl A. Lawrence
Consumer Advocate

DATED: December 18, 2025

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Petition of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation :
for Approval of its Second Distributed Energy : Docket No. P-2024-3049223
Resources Management Plan :

VERIFICATION

I, Darryl A. Lawrence, hereby state that the facts set forth in the Office of Consumer Advocate's Petition for Reconsideration and/or Clarification, are true and correct (or are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief) and that I expect 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).

DATED: December 18, 2025

Signature: /s/ Darryl A. Lawrence
Darryl A. Lawrence
Consumer Advocate

Address: Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923