

December 30, 2025

**Via E-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; **Joint Solar Parties' Reply to PPL's Answer**

Dear Secretary Homsher:

Please find attached for filing in the above-captioned matter the Joint Solar Parties' Reply to PPL's Answer to the JSPs' Petition for Clarification and Stay/Supersedeas and the Office of Consumer Advocate's Petition for Reconsideration and Clarification, filed by PPL Electric Utilities on December 29, 2025.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 213-1672 if I can provide anything further, and thank you for your assistance.

Respectfully submitted,



Bernice I. Corman, PA BAR #332915  
BICKY CORMAN LAW, PLLC  
Phone: (202) 213-1672  
Email: [bcorman@bickycormanlaw.com](mailto:bcorman@bickycormanlaw.com)  
*Counsel to Joint Solar Parties*

cc: Service List  
The Honorable John M. Coogan  
Office of Special Assistants

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

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

---

**JOINT SOLAR PARTIES’ REPLY TO ANSWER OF PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES  
CORPORATION TO THE JOINT SOLAR PARTIES’ PETITION FOR  
CLARIFICATION AND STAY/SUPERSEDEAS AND THE OFFICE OF CONSUMER  
ADVOCATE’S PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND CLARIFICATION**

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.61 - 63, the American Home Contractors, Inc. (“AHC”), the Solar Energy Industries Association (“SEIA”), SolarEdge Technologies, Inc. (“SolarEdge”), Sun Directed, Tesla, Inc. (“Tesla”) and Trinity Solar, LLC (“Trinity Solar”) (referred to collectively as the Joint Solar Parties, or “JSPs”),<sup>1</sup> by and through their Counsel, hereby respectfully submit their Reply to the Answer filed by PPL Electric Utilities (“PPL” or the “Company”) on December 29, 2025 (“PPL Answer”) to the Joint Solar Parties’ Petition for Clarification and Stay/Supersedeas (“JSPs’ Petition”) and the Office of Consumer Advocate’s Petition for Reconsideration and Clarification on December 29, 2025, as PPL’s Answer seeks affirmative relief – mainly that it’s annual cap of 3,000 DER Management Devices (“Devices”) be reset on January 1, 2026 and that it be cleared to launch its Second DER Management Program, despite the Commission’s issuance of a stay on December 24, 2025.<sup>2</sup> PPL also asks that information on its own e-mail identifying the date PPL hit its cap be struck, which constitutes a request for affirmative relief. Further, PPL’s Answer improperly raises new legal arguments not raised by it in its briefs or exceptions, or

---

<sup>1</sup> The composition of the JSPs is subject to change.

<sup>2</sup> Opinion and Order entered December 24, 2025 (“December 24<sup>th</sup> Order”).

inaccurately construes arguments by the JSPs as new, permitting the JSPs to Reply per 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.62 and 63.

First, PPL distorts a conventional, common sense, understanding of “status quo.”

The JSPs timely filed a Petition for a Clarification and Stay/Supersedeas on December 18, 2025, which, among other things, the Commission granted with its entry of its December 24<sup>th</sup> Order. Thus, the present state of affairs is that the Commission’s December 3, 2025 Opinion and Order (“December 3<sup>rd</sup> Order”) approving PPL’s Petition for Approval of its Second DER Management Plan is stayed “pending further review of, and consideration on, the merits.” Whether or not the Commission agrees with PPL that the lack of a Final Order (due to the Stay) means that PPL’s Pilot continues indefinitely, under that Pilot, and at the moment that the Commission’s stay was granted, PPL had ceased installing new Devices because it hit its annual cap on Device installation in November, 2025.<sup>3,4</sup> The Pilot that was extended by the Commission in its September 12, 2024 Order in Docket No. P-2019-3010128, called for a three-year pilot, and as many caps on DER Management Device installations annually.<sup>5</sup> It is fair to interpret the parties’ agreed-upon extension of the Pilot as permitting PPL to extend the last year of its Pilot, which would include continuing to install its Devices until it hit its last authorized installation cap.

Regardless, the common sense meaning of “status quo” is that the Commission has frozen this matter in time – which as of the date the Commission issued its stay meant that PPL was not authorized to launch its “cap-less” Second DER Management Plan, and, importantly, that under the Pilot, no new installations were currently occurring or authorized. Preserving this outcome

---

<sup>3</sup> PPL asks that the JSPs’ presentation of information from a PPL e-mail identifying the date it hit its cap be struck on grounds it is extra-record. The date of this e-mail was November 3, 2025, or several months after closure of the record in this matter. Regardless, per 52 Pa.Code § 5.408, PPL has the ability to argue that the facts have not been properly noticed, or to provide alternative facts, which it has not done.

<sup>4</sup> Correlatively, as PPL concedes (*see* PPL Answer, n. 31), cessation of installation of new Devices rendered superfluous the need for PPL to test inverters for compatibility with Devices, as it was not installing them.

<sup>5</sup> Joint Petition for Settlement of All Issues, Docket No. P-2019-3010128, pp. 10 – 11.

allows for the cleanest setting for the Commission's and the Court's review and consideration of PPL's Petition for Approval of its Second DER Management Program, and the greatest conservation of the tribunals,' the parties', and the public's resources.

Second, PPL has raised a new legal argument it did not raise in any of its briefs exceptions – namely its claim made now for the first time that “most of the JSPs’ alleged harms are financial . . .” and that “mere financial harm, *generally*, is not a proper basis to support a finding of irreparable harm.” (emphasis added.) First, the argument must be disregarded as it is being newly raised in PPL's Answer. Critically as well is the fact that PPL has overlooked that the Commission used the word “generally,” and further, that in the leading case it cites,<sup>6</sup> the Commission undertook a painstaking analysis as to whether or not the claimed financial harm would support a finding of irreparable harm, an analysis not performed by the Commission, and not briefed or argued by PPL, depriving the JSPs of their due process right to respond. The Commission instead relied solely on assessment of the credibility of the testimony put forth by the parties, as was noted by PPL.<sup>7</sup>

Further, PPL overlooks that the JSPs did put forth substantial proof of speculative, non-compensable harms resulting from PPL's program, and on which Administrative Law Judge Coogan made findings of fact in support of his conclusions of law. For example, JSPs' proofs as to lost sales or increased harms did not prove only that economic harms are being suffered by the JSPs, importantly, they proved also that PPL customers are being denied the freedom to choose the products that they wish, and that meet the state's applicable standards, but not PPL's singular and inappropriate testing requirements.<sup>8</sup>

Similarly, PPL newly argues that the ability to challenge the improper amendment of

---

<sup>6</sup> On p. 21 of its Answer, PPL cited to *Petition of Librandi Machine Shop. Inc. for Declaratory Order, etc.*, 2022 Pa. PUC LEXIS 85, \*22.

<sup>7</sup> PPL Answer, p. 22.

<sup>8</sup> See June 30, 2025 Recommended Decision (“R.D.”), ¶¶ 43, 44 and 47.

Pennsylvania’s interconnection standards without notice and comment in a state-wide rule-making proceeding, was waived, claiming that the JSPs raised this challenge for the first time in their Petition.<sup>9</sup> PPL errs. The JSPs clearly voluminously argued, and Administrative Law Judge Coogan concluded, that utility-specific standards interpretations warrant notice and comment in state-wide proceedings.<sup>10</sup>

We note that PPL’s arguments that the JSPs have “re-hashed” their previous arguments is inaccurate and misleads. The JSPs were careful to note that their intent was not to re-hash previous arguments, but rather to make clear that where the Commission was setting aside the “substantial evidence” put forth by the JSPs and adopted by Administrative Law Judge Coogan, it would have been “not only helpful” but would indeed be “necessary” for the Commission to have set forth specific findings, to allow the appellate court “to perform a meaningful review of the Commission’s order.” *Commonwealth, Dep’t of Transp. v. Commonwealth, Public Utility Com.*, 335 A.2d 539, \*\*\* 5 - \*\*\*8.

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should not undo the Stay or other relief granted by its December 24, 2025 Order.

Respectfully submitted,



Bernice I. Corman, PA BAR #332915  
BICKY CORMAN LAW, PLLC  
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
PMB #5027  
Washington, DC 20036  
Phone: (202) 213-1672

---

<sup>9</sup> PPL Answer, ¶¶ 39, 40.

<sup>10</sup> See R.D., p. 45, *citing* briefs filed by the JSPs, as well as another intervenor, the Sustainable Energy Fund (“SEF”). See also the JSPs’ Reply Exceptions, p. 19, quoting relevant language from the R.D. at p. 45.

Email: [bcorman@bickycormanlaw.com](mailto:bcorman@bickycormanlaw.com)

*Counsel to Joint Solar Parties*

Date: December 30, 2025

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the foregoing upon the parties listed below via electronic mail and/or hand-delivery, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 154 (relating to service by a party):

Adeolu A. Bakare, Esquire  
Rebecca Kimmel, Esquire  
McNees, Wallace & Nurick LLC  
100 Pine Street  
P.O. Box 1166  
Harrisburg, PA  
[abakare@mcneeslaw.com](mailto:abakare@mcneeslaw.com)  
[rkimmel@mcneeslaw.com](mailto:rkimmel@mcneeslaw.com)  
*Counsel for PPLICA*

Kimberly A. Klock, Esquire  
Michael Shafer  
Assistant General Counsel  
*PPL Services Corporation*  
Two North Ninth Street  
Allentown, PA 18101-1179  
[Kklock@pplweb.com](mailto:Kklock@pplweb.com)  
[mjshafer@pplweb.com](mailto:mjshafer@pplweb.com)

Devin T. Ryan, Esquire  
David B. MacGregor, Esquire  
Post and Schell, P.C.  
17 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601  
[dryan@postschell.com](mailto:dryan@postschell.com)  
[dmacgregor@postschell.com](mailto:dmacgregor@postschell.com)  
*PPL Electric Utilities*

Steven C. Gray, Esquire  
Rebecca Lyttle, Esquire  
Office of Small Business Advocate  
Forum Place  
555 Walnut Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
[s.gray@pa.gov](mailto:s.gray@pa.gov)  
[relyttle@pa.gov](mailto:relyttle@pa.gov)

Christy M. Appleby, Sr. Assistant Consumer Advocate  
Harrison W. Breitman, Assistant Consumer Advocate  
Office of Consumer Advocate  
555 Walnut Street

Judith D. Cassel, Esquire  
Micah R. Bucy, Esquire  
Hawke, McKeon & Sniscak LLP  
501 Corporate Circle  
Suite 302  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
[jdcassel@hmslegal.com](mailto:jdcassel@hmslegal.com)  
[mrbucy@hmslegal.com](mailto:mrbucy@hmslegal.com)  
*Sustainable Energy Fund*

Allison Kaster, Esquire  
Director and Chief Prosecutor  
*Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement*  
*Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission*  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor West  
P.O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265  
[akaster@pa.gov](mailto:akaster@pa.gov)

Forum Place, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
[CAppleby@paoca.org](mailto:CAppleby@paoca.org)  
[HBreitman@paoca.org](mailto:HBreitman@paoca.org)  
[OCAPPLDER2024@paoca.org](mailto:OCAPPLDER2024@paoca.org)

Megan E. Rulli, Esquire  
Post and Schell, PC  
17 North Second Street  
12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
[mrulli@postschell.com](mailto:mrulli@postschell.com)

Dated this 30<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2025

/s/ Bernice I. Corman