



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

BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATION
&
ENFORCEMENT

March 20, 2026

Via Electronic Filing

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

Re: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v.
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation
Docket No. R-2025-3057164
I&E Statement in Support of Settlement

Dear Secretary Homsher:

Enclosed for electronic filing is the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement's Statement in Support of the Joint Petition for Non-Unanimous Settlement which was filed on March 13, 2026.

Copies are being served on the parties per the attached Certificate of Service. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Michael Podskoch'.

Michael A. Podskoch, Jr.
Prosecutor
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement
PA Attorney ID No. 330132
(717) 783-6151
mpodskoch@pa.gov

MAP/nb
Enclosures

cc: Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge Christopher P. Pell (via email – cpell@pa.gov)
Administrative Law Judge Barbara Shadie-Nause (via email – bshadienau@pa.gov)
Per Certificate of Service

Intervenors”), the Energy Justice Advocates (“EJA”), the Joint Solar Advocates (“JSA”),¹ PP&L Industrial Customer Alliance (“PPLICA”),² the Retail Energy Supply Association (“RESA”), the Sustainable Energy Fund (“SEF”), and Walmart Inc. (“Walmart”) (collectively the “Joint Petitioners”).

The only active parties who oppose any aspect of the Settlement are the Customer-Generator Coalition (“CGC”) and the Professional Dairy Managers of Pennsylvania (“PDMP”). Their opposition is limited to the provisions of the Settlement concerning the Company’s Maximum Registered Peak Load (“MRPL”) proposal. IGS Solar, the only other active party in this matter, does not take a position regarding the Settlement.³

Following extensive review of the Company’s filing and discovery responses, and participation in numerous settlement discussions, I&E is of the opinion that the terms and conditions of the Joint Petition are in the public interest. Accordingly, I&E recommends that Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) Christopher P. Pell and Administrative Law Judge Barbara Shadie Nause and the Commission approve the Settlement in its entirety.

I. INTRODUCTION

I&E serves as the prosecutory bureau for purposes of representing the public interest in ratemaking and service matters before the Office of Administrative Law Judge.⁴ By representing the public interest in rate proceedings before the Commission, I&E works to balance the interests of customers, utilities, and the regulated community as a whole to ensure that a utility’s rates are

¹ JSA supports Section III.J of the Settlement but takes no position on any other Section of the Settlement.

² PPLICA and DOD/FEA do not take a position on Paragraph 91(b)(ii) in the Large Load Interconnections section of the Settlement.

³ There have been seven *pro se* formal complaints filed by customers opposing the proposed rate increase. These complainants were not active parties to this proceeding. A complete copy of the Settlement is being served on all formal complainants.

⁴ *Implementation of Act 129 of 2008; Organization of Bureaus and Offices*, Docket No. M-2008-2071852, p. 5 (Order Entered August 11, 2011).

just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory.⁵ In negotiated settlements, it is incumbent upon I&E to identify how amicable resolution of any such proceeding may benefit the public interest and to ensure that the public interest is served.

On September 30, 2025, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation filed proposed Original Tariff Electric – Pa. P.U.C. No. 202 and Original Tariff Electric – Pa. P.U.C. No. 2S with a proposed effective date of December 1, 2025. The rates set forth therein, if approved by the Commission, would increase PPL Electric’s annual jurisdictional revenues by \$356.3 million, or 33.4%.

On October 2, 2025, OSBA filed its Notice of Appearance. On October 6, 2025, CEO filed a Petition to Intervene. That same day, CAUSE-PA filed a Formal Complaint. On October 9, 2025, OSBA filed a Formal Complaint and Public Statement. That same day, I&E filed its Notice of Appearance. On October 16, 2025, CAUSE-PA filed its Notice of Appearance. That same day, CGC filed a Petition to Intervene.⁶ On October 17, 2025, Mr. Epstein filed a Petition to Intervene. On October 23, 2025, OCA filed its Notice of Appearance and a Formal Complaint and Public Statement.

On October 23, 2025, the Commission entered an Order pursuant to Section 1308(d) of the Public Utility Code suspending the implementation of the proposed rates by operation of law until July 1, 2026, and opening an investigation into the lawfulness, justness, and reasonableness of the proposed rates, rules, and regulations contained therein.⁷ The case was assigned to the

⁵ See 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 1301(a); 1304.

⁶ CGC later filed Motions to Amend its Petition for the purpose of updating the list of participating entities on October 29, 2025, December 2, 2025, and February 19, 2026. The First and Second Motions to Amend were granted jointly in the ALJs’ Prehearing Order #3 on January 12, 2026, and the (Corrected) Third Motion to Amend was granted by the ALJs at the hearing on March 9, 2026.

⁷ Also on October 23, 2025, Vice Chair Kimberly Barrow issued a Statement urging the parties to this proceeding to take a critical look at the following issues: PPL Electric’s extended stay out; PPL Electric’s capital structure; tracking capital from parent company; customer service issues and impact on ROE; cost allocation; and universal service.

Office of Administrative Law Judge for the prompt scheduling of such hearings as may be necessary culminating in the issuance of a Recommended Decision.

On October 27, 2025, JSA filed a Petition to Intervene. October 28, 2025, EJA filed a Petition to Intervene and Protest. That same day, Dimension filed a Petition to Intervene. On October 29, 2025, EI filed a Petition to Intervene. On October 31, 2025, Petitions to Intervene were filed by the following parties: RESA, PDMP, Walmart, and SEF. That same day, Formal Complaints were filed by PPLICA and Convergent. On November 4, 2025, DOD/FEA filed a Petition to Intervene. On November 5, 2025, IGS filed a Petition to Intervene.

A telephonic Prehearing Conference was held on November 5, 2025, before ALJs Pell and Nause wherein procedural matters were discussed including the scheduling of evidentiary hearings on February 17-20, 2026.

In-person public input hearings were held on December 8, 2025, in Scranton, PA; December 9, 2025, in Catasauqua, PA, December 10, 2025, in Harrisburg, PA; December 11, 2025, in Lancaster, PA; and December 18, 2025, in Wilkes-Barre, PA. Two telephonic public input hearings were held on December 15, 2025.

The evidentiary hearings were held on February 17, 2026, in Harrisburg, PA wherein several parties moved for the admission of their pre-served testimony and exhibits into the record. I&E moved for the admission of the following evidence:

- I&E Statement No. 1 – Direct Testimony of Zachari Walker
- I&E Exhibit No. 1
- I&E Statement No. 2 – Direct Testimony of Christopher Keller
- I&E Exhibit No. 2
- I&E Statement No. 3 – Direct Testimony of Drew Breuning

- I&E Exhibit No. 3
- I&E Statement No. 4 – Direct Testimony of Ethan H. Cline
- I&E Statement No. 5 – Direct Testimony of Benedict Tarr
- I&E Exhibit No. 5
- I&E Statement No. 2-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Christopher Keller
- I&E Exhibit No. 2-R
- I&E Statement No. 1-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Zachari Walker
- I&E Exhibit No. 1-SR
- I&E Statement No. 2-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Christopher Keller
- I&E Exhibit No. 2-SR
- I&E Statement No. 3-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Drew Breuning
- I&E Statement No. 4-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Ethan H. Cline
- I&E Statement No. 5-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Benedict Tarr
- Verifications of Zachari Walker, Christopher Keller, Drew Breuning, Ethan H. Cline, and Benedict Tarr

Additionally, following corrections by PPL Electric to exhibits AC-1 through AC-3 on February 12, 2026, a modified litigation schedule was adopted to address the resulting changes to PPL Electric’s Maximum Registered Peak Load (“MRPL”) proposal. The modified schedule provided for two additional rounds of pre-served testimony solely on the MRPL issue, and a one-day hearing on March 9, 2026.⁸ The remaining hearing dates were cancelled.

⁸ I&E did not present testimony on the MRPL issue and did not participate in the hearing on March 9, 2026. I&E takes no position on the MRPL section of the Settlement.

II. STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT

“The prime determinant in the consideration of a proposed Settlement is whether the settlement is in the public interest.”⁹ The Commission has recognized that a settlement “reflects a compromise of the positions held by the parties of interest, which, arguably fosters and promotes the public interest.”¹⁰

Commission policy encourages settlements because, in the Commission’s judgment, the results achieved from a negotiated settlement are often preferable to those achieved at the conclusion of a fully litigated proceeding.¹¹

I&E represents that all issues raised in testimony have been satisfactorily resolved through discovery and discussions with the Company or are incorporated or considered in the resolution proposed in the Settlement. This Settlement exemplifies the benefits to be derived from a negotiated approach to resolving what can appear at first blush to be irreconcilable regulatory differences. The Joint Petitioners have carefully discussed and negotiated all issues raised in this proceeding, and specifically those addressed and resolved in this Settlement. Further line-by-line identification of the ultimate resolution of the disputed issues beyond those presented in the Settlement is not necessary as I&E represents that the Settlement maintains the proper balance of the interests of all parties. I&E is satisfied that no further action is necessary and considers its investigation of this rate filing complete.

III. SETTLEMENT TERMS

A. REVENUE REQUIREMENT (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.A.49-51)

The Settlement provides for a total base rate revenue increase of \$275 million, to become

⁹ *Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Philadelphia Electric Company*, 60 PA PUC 1, 22 (1985).

¹⁰ *Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. C S Water and Sewer Associates*, 74 PA PUC 767, 771 (1991).

¹¹ See 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.231(a); 69.401.

effective on or after July 1, 2026, as opposed to the Company’s proposed increase of \$356.3 million.

I&E witness Zachari Walker recommended in direct testimony a rate increase of \$258,878,000¹² and later recommended in surrebuttal testimony a rate increase of \$298,122,000 based on the Company’s updated revenue request presented in rebuttal testimony.¹³ All parties who presented testimony on revenue requirement support the \$275 million rate increase. The \$275 million rate increase represents a compromise among the Joint Petitioners’ proposals and is therefore in the public interest.

The Settlement as to revenue requirement shall not be itemized, except for the following items: (1) the \$32,000,000 for reportable storm damage expenses as described below; (2) the approximately \$3,779,000 for annual amortization of the regulatory asset for the eligible storms costs in excess of the 3% cap on the Storm Damage Expense Rider (“SDER”), as set forth in Schedule D-9 of Exhibit Fully Projected Future 1; (3) \$17,291,887 annual amortization of negative net salvage based on a 10-year amortization period instead of a 5-year amortization period ; (4) the approximately \$211,000 for annual amortization of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (“IIJA”) regulatory asset, as set forth in PPL Electric St. No. 22 and Schedule D-10 of Exhibit Fully Projected Future 1; (5) the roll-in of the Distribution System Improvement Charge (“DSIC”) capital investment and associated depreciation and tax effects in base rates per the Company’s proposal, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (“TJCA”) rider, and the Smart Meter Rider – Phase 2 (“SMR-2”); and (6) the return on equity (“ROE”) for purposes of the DSIC will be set by and equivalent to the ROE set forth in the Commission’s Quarterly Report on the Earnings Jurisdictional Utilities.

¹² I&E Statement No. 1, p. 3.

¹³ I&E Statement No. 1-SR, p. 4.

The Settlement also provides that additional changes to PPL Electric's distribution base rates may not go into effect until two years after the effective date of rates in this proceeding. I&E did not propose this stay-out term but supports the Settlement in its entirety as being in the public interest.

Additionally, the Settlement provides that on or before October 1, 2026, PPL Electric will provide all active parties an update to PPL Electric Exhibits JJS-2 and JJS-3, which will include actual capital expenditures, plant additions, and retirements by month for the 12 months ending June 30, 2026. On or before October 1, 2027, PPL Electric will update PPL Electric Exhibits JJS-2 and JJS-3 filed in this proceeding for the 12 months ending June 30, 2027. In PPL Electric's next base rate proceeding, the Company will prepare a comparison of its actual expenses and rate base additions for the 12 months ended June 30, 2027, to its projections in this case. This data will allow the parties and the Commission to better gauge the accuracy of PPL Electric's projected investments in future proceedings, and therefore I&E supports this provision as being in the public interest.

B. REVENUE ALLOCATION (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.B.52-53)

Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, PPL Electric's revenue requirement increase will be allocated among the Company's rate classes in accordance with the methodology set forth in the Allocated Cost of Service Study ("ACOSS") attached as Appendix B to the Joint Petition. The proposed allocation was thoroughly reviewed during this case, and I&E witness Ethan Cline did not recommend any adjustments to the proposal, as the proposed allocation generally moves each customer class closer to the desired relative rate of return of 1.0 (wherein the revenue received from a particular class is equal to the corresponding costs of providing service to that class).¹⁴ Mr. Cline also recommended that any proposed rates be scaled back

¹⁴ I&E Statement No. 4, pp. 6-9, I&E Statement No. 4-SR pp. 8-9.

proportionally if the final revenue granted to PPL Electric was less than the requested \$356 million,¹⁵ which will be done per Paragraph 53 of the Settlement.

The agreed upon revenue allocation and proportional scale back represents a compromise among the Joint Petitioners' proposals and is supported by I&E as being in the public interest.

C. RATE DESIGN (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.C.54-58)

Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, the residential customer charge will be increased to \$15.00 per month, which was lowered from the originally proposed \$17.00 per month. I&E witness Cline did not recommend a specific dollar amount change to the proposed customer cost increase, but recommended that customer charges be included in any scale back of rates.¹⁶ I&E thus considers the lowering of the requested revenue increase and the corresponding lowering of the residential customer charge to be appropriate in this case.

I&E supports the rate design overall as defined within the Settlement as being in the public interest.

D. DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT CHARGE ("DSIC") (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.D.59-61)

I&E did not submit testimony regarding PPL Electric's DSIC proposal but supports the Settlement in its entirety as being in the public interest.

E. STORM DAMAGE EXPENSE RIDER ("SDER") (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.E.62-65)

Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, under the SDER, the R Factor for July 1, 2026, and thereafter, unless modified by the Commission in a subsequent base rate case, shall equal \$32,00,000, which for purposes of this SDER constitutes the amount of expense from reportable storms currently recovered through base rates. To the extent that actual eligible storm damage

¹⁵ I&E Statement No. 4, p. 10.

¹⁶ *Id.*

expenses associated with reportable storms are more or less than the \$32,000,000 that PPL Electric is recovering through base rates, this over/under collection will be refunded/recouped during the applicable SDER recovery period. The SDER rate effective July 1, 2026, shall continue to reflect and be designed to recover the amortizations of extraordinary storm events, including the two extraordinary storm events from 2024. As part of its compliance Retail Tariff filing, PPL Electric will revise the SDER tariff language to clarify what costs can be amortized and the methodology through which those amortization amounts will be recovered, as specified in Appendix G attached to the Joint Petition.

I&E witness Walker presented testimony critical of the Company's SDER proposals.¹⁷ However, I&E finds that the SDER terms as defined within the Settlement represent a reasonable compromise and are therefore in the public interest.¶

F. CUSTOMER SERVICE, LOW INCOME, AND UNIVERSAL SERVICE ISSUES (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.F.66-86)

I&E submitted limited testimony regarding PPL Electric's customer service, low income, and universal service issues. Pursuant to the Settlement, the Company has withdrawn without prejudice its proposal to recover Universal Service and Conservation Plan ("USECP") employees' salaries and wages through the Universal Service Rider ("USR"). I&E witness Christopher Keller recommended that the Commission reject the Company's proposal to move salaries and wages for employees that administer programs under its USECP from base rates to the USR and therefore supports this provision as being in the public interest.¹⁸

Pursuant to the Settlement, beginning January 1, 2027, PPL Electric will increase its maximum Customer Assistance Program ("CAP") credits as follows:

¹⁷ I&E Statement No. 1, pp. 11-18; I&E Statement No. 1-SR, pp. 8-14.

¹⁸ I&E Statement No. 2, pp. 15-17; I&E Statement No. 2-SR, pp. 12-15.

FPL Tier	Account Classification	12-Month Maximum Credit Limit
0% to 50%	Electric Heat	\$5,040
51% to 100%	Electric Heat	\$4,000
101% to 150%	Electric Heat	\$3,440
0% to 50%	Non-Electric Heat	\$3,120
51% to 100%	Non-Electric Heat	\$2,400
101% to 150%	Non-Electric Heat	\$2,000

Also beginning January 1, 2027, PPL Electric will increase its Low Income Usage Reduction Program (“LIURP”) annual budget by \$1.5 million for a total of \$13.5 million. PPL Electric also agrees to roll over any unspent budgeted amounts in any year to the next year’s LIURP budget. I&E witness Keller recommended that any increase in maximum CAP credits and LIURP funding be balanced against costs for other customers, especially other low income customers.¹⁹ I&E finds that the increases in PPL Electric’s maximum CAP credits and LIURP budget as defined within the Settlement are fair and reasonable and therefore in the public interest.

Regarding the remaining terms in this section, I&E shares the concerns of the interested Joint Petitioners. Further, I&E played an active role in the settlement negotiations regarding these terms and monitored the proposals and counter proposals offered by the parties throughout this proceeding. Therefore, I&E does not oppose these settlement terms as a reasonable compromise that provides PPL Electric, the Joint Petitioners, and the Commission with

¹⁹ I&E Statement No. 2-R, pp. 5-11.

regulatory certainty and resolution of the customer service, low income and universal service issues raised by the interested parties, which is in the public interest.

G. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT (Joint Petition ¶ III.G.87)

Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, PPL Electric has withdrawn without prejudice its request for capitalized treatment of the costs associated with first removal of hazard and danger trees after the acquisition of additional rights-of-way (“ROW”) to address off-right-of-way trees. I&E witness Walker recommended that the Commission disallow the Company’s entire capitalized Fully Projected Future Test Year (“FPFTY”) claim for the first removal of hazard and danger trees after the acquisition of the enhanced ROW of \$25,000,000 and therefore supports this provision as being in the public interest.²⁰

H. RELIABILITY (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.H.88-90)

I&E supports the terms in this section of the Settlement as they relate to PPL Electric’s obligation to provide safe and reliable electric distribution service.

I. LARGE LOAD INTERCONNECTIONS (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.I.91-97)

I&E did not submit testimony regarding PPL Electric’s LP-6 tariff proposal governing the rates, terms and conditions of service to large load (data center) customers. Nevertheless, I&E shares the concerns of the interested Joint Petitioners. Further, I&E played an active role in the settlement negotiations regarding these terms and monitored the proposals and counter proposals offered by the parties throughout this proceeding. Therefore, I&E does not oppose these settlement terms as a full and fair compromise that provides PPL Electric, the Joint

²⁰ I&E Statement No. 1-SR, p. 24.

Petitioners, and the Commission with regulatory certainty and resolution of the large load interconnection issues raised by the interested parties, which is in the public interest.²¹

J. MAXIMUM REGISTERED PEAK LOAD (“MRPL”) (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.J.98-105)

I&E did not submit testimony regarding PPL Electric’s MRPL proposal but supports the Settlement in its entirety as being in the public interest.

K. ELECTRIC VEHICLE (“EV”) TIME-OF-USE (“TOU”) CHARGING REBATE PROGRAM AND DIRECT CURRENT FAST CHARGER (“DCFC”) RATE (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.K.106-117)

I&E did not submit testimony regarding PPL Electric’s EV TOU Charging Rebate Program proposal or EV distribution rates but supports the Settlement in its entirety as being in the public interest.

L. IT UPGRADES (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.L.118-119)

I&E did not submit testimony regarding PPL Electric’s proposed IT upgrades but supports the Settlement in its entirety as being in the public interest.

M. RETAIL TARIFF (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.M.120-122)

I&E submitted limited testimony regarding PPL Electric’s retail tariff proposal. Pursuant to the Settlement, PPL Electric’s Opportunity Pennsylvania Program costs will not be recovered through base rates in this proceeding. I&E witness Keller recommended that the Commission reject the Company’s Economic Development proposal and therefore supports this provision as being in the public interest.²²

Regarding the remaining terms in this section, I&E shares the concerns of the interested Joint Petitioners. Further, I&E played an active role in the settlement negotiations regarding

²¹ Though I&E is aware the Commission will likely release a model tariff to address these issues in the near future, I&E does not object to the terms proposed herein.

²² I&E Statement No. 2, pp. 30-32; I&E Statement No. 2-SR, pp. 29-33.

these terms and monitored the proposals and counter proposals offered by the parties throughout this proceeding. Therefore, I&E does not oppose these settlement terms as a full and fair compromise that provides PPL Electric, the Joint Petitioners, and the Commission with regulatory certainty and resolution of the retail tariff issues raised by the interested parties, which is in the public interest.

N. SUPPLIER TARIFF (Joint Petition ¶ III.N.123)

I&E did not submit testimony regarding PPL Electric's supplier tariff proposal but supports the Settlement in its entirety as being in the public interest.

O. BEHIND-THE-METER NON-EXPORTING BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEMS (Joint Petition ¶ III.O.124)

I&E did not submit testimony regarding PPL Electric's behind-the-meter non-exporting battery energy storage proposal but supports the Settlement in its entirety as being in the public interest.

P. MISCELLANEOUS TERMS (Joint Petition ¶¶ III.P.125-132)

I&E's agreement to settle this case is made without any admission or prejudice to any position that I&E might adopt during subsequent litigation or the continuation of this litigation in the event the Settlement is rejected by the Commission or otherwise properly withdrawn by any of the Joint Petitioners.

If the ALJs recommend that the Commission adopt the Settlement as proposed, I&E has agreed to waive the right to file Exceptions. However, I&E has not waived its right to file Exceptions with respect to any modifications to the terms and conditions of the Settlement, or any additional matters, that may be proposed by the ALJs in the Recommended Decision. I&E also reserves the right to file Reply Exceptions to any Exceptions that may be filed by any party to this proceeding.

The Settlement is also conditioned upon the Commission’s approval of all terms and conditions contained therein, and should the Commission fail to approve or otherwise modify the terms and conditions of the Settlement, the Joint Petition may be withdrawn by I&E or any of the signatories.

IV. VICE CHAIR BARROW’S OCTOBER 23, 2025 STATEMENT

The ALJs directed that the Joint Petition and the Statements in Support address the items set forth in Vice Chair Barrow’s Statement dated October 23, 2025.

These issues were investigated by I&E in this proceeding. Specifically, I&E witness Drew Breuning discussed PPL Electric’s upward-trending financial position in the 10 years since its last rate case filing in his critique of the Company’s proposed cost of equity.²³ I&E witness Breuning also made recommendations opposing PPL Electric’s proposed capital structure and return on equity (“ROE”).²⁴ I&E is satisfied that factors such as the Company’s capital structure, ROE, and potential rate shock to customers given the length of time between rate case filings were appropriately considered when determining the agreed-upon revenue increase.

While I&E did not submit testimony discussing all issues raised in Vice Chair Barrow’s Statement, I&E finds that these issues were fully investigated in discovery and addressed in the parties’ testimony and that the Settlement reaches a full and fair resolution of these issues.

V. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the Commission’s Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement represents that it supports the Joint Petition for Non-Unanimous Settlement as being in the public interest and respectfully requests that Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge Christopher P. Pell and

²³ I&E Statement No. 3, pp. 54-55.

²⁴ I&E Statement No. 3, pp. 6, 15-19, 31, 55-56; I&E Statement No. 3-SR, pp. 2, 6, 26-28.

Administrative Law Judge Barbara Shadie Nause recommend, and the Commission subsequently approve, the foregoing Settlement, including all terms and conditions contained therein.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Podskoch, Jr.
Prosecutor
PA Attorney ID No. 330132



Adam J. Williams
Prosecutor
PA Attorney ID No. 310019

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Dated: March 20, 2026

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. R-2025-3057164
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am serving the foregoing **Statement in Support of Settlement** dated March 20, 2026, in the manner and upon the persons listed below:

Served via Electronic Mail Only

Devin T. Ryan, Esq.
Alice A. Wade, Esq.
Hayley E. Wilburn, Esq.
Post & Schell, P.C.
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street, Suite 3010
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
dryan@postschell.com
alice.wade@postschell.com
hwilburn@postschell.com

David B. MacGregor, Esq.
Garret P. Lent, Esq.
Erin R. Kawa, Esq.
Anthony D. DeCusatis, Esq.
Post & Schell, P.C.
17 North Second Street, 12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601
dmacgregor@postschell.com
glent@postschell.com
ekawa@postschell.com
adecusatis@postschell.com

Kimberly A. Klock, Esq.
Michael J. Shafer, Esq.
PPL Services Corporation
645 Hamilton Street, Suite 700
Allentown, PA 18104
kklock@pplweb.com
mjshafer@pplweb.com

Christy M. Appleby, Esq.
Harrison W. Breitman, Esq.
Jacob D. Guthrie, Esq.
Josiah B. Harmar, Esq.
Johnathan M. Longhurst, Esq.
Joel Cheskis, Esq.
Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923
OCA25PPLBRC@paoca.org

Eric J. Epstein
4100 Hillsdale Road
Harrisburg, PA 17112
epstein@efmr.org

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

Ria M. Pereira, Esq.
Elizabeth R. Marx, Esq.
John W. Sweet, Esq.
Lauren N. Berman, Esq.
Levi A. Phillips, Esq.
Pennsylvania Utility Law Project
118 Locust Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
pulp@pautilitylawproject.org

Joseph L. Vullo, Esq.
Burke Vullo Reilly Roberts
1460 Wyoming Avenue
Forty Fort, PA 18704
jlvullo@bvrrlaw.com

Devin McDougall, Esq.
Logan Welde, Esq.
Lauren Otero, Esq.
Earthjustice
1617 John F. Kennedy Boulevard
Suite 2020
Philadelphia, PA 19103
dmcdougall@earthjustice.org
lwelde@cleanair.org
lotero@cleanair.org

Michael Zimmerman, Esq.
Environmental Defense Fund
257 Park Ave. S.
New York, NY 10010
mzimmerman@edf.org

Alan M. Seltzer, Esq.
John F. Povilaitis, Esq.
Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC
409 N. Second Street, Suite 500
Harrisburg, PA 17101
alan.seltzer@bipc.com
john.povilaitis@bipc.com

Daniel A. Garcia, Esq.
Sarah M. Rambin, Esq.
Steptoe and Johnson, PLLC
1 PPG Place, Suite 3300
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
Daniel.Garcia@Steptoe-Johnson.com
Sarah.Rambin@Steptoe-Johnson.com

Brian J. Pulito, Esq.
Steptoe and Johnson, PLLC
201 Chestnut Street, Suite 200
Meadville, PA 16335
Brian.Pulito@Steptoe-Johnson.com

Emma H. Bast, Esq.
Jessica R. O'Neill, Esq.
Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future
1429 Walnut Street, Suite 701
Philadelphia, PA 19102
bast@pennfuture.org
oneill@pennfuture.org

Deanne M. O'Dell, Esq.
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
213 Market Street, 8th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
dodell@eckertseamans.com

Lauren M. Burge, Esq.
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott LLC
600 Grant Street, 44th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
lburge@eckertseamans.com

Todd S. Stewart, Esq.
HMS Legal LLP
501 Corporate Circle, Suite 302
Harrisburg, PA 17110
tsstewart@hmslegal.com

Barry A. Naum, Esq.
Steven W. Lee, Esq.
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
1100 Bent Creek Boulevard, Suite 101
Mechanicsburg, PA 170850
bnaum@spilmanlaw.com
slee@spilmanlaw.com

Jamie L. Martines, Esq.
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
301 Grant Street, Suite 3440
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
jmartines@spilmanlaw.com

Daniel B. Markind, Esq.
Flaster Greenberg, PC
1717 Arch Street, Suite 3300
Philadelphia, PA 19103
daniel.markind@flastergreenberg.com

Mitchell H. Kizner, Esq.
Flaster Greenberg, PC
Commerce Center
1810 Chapel Avenue West
Cherry Hill, NJ 08002
Mitchell.Kizner@flastergreenberg.com


Judith D. Cassel, Esq.
Micah R. Bucy, Esq.
Whitney E. Snyder, Esq.
Kathryn C. Read-Fisher, Esq.
HMS Legal LLP
501 Corporate Circle, Suite 302
Harrisburg, PA 17110
jdcassel@hmslegal.com
mrbcy@hmslegal.com
wesnyder@hmslegal.com
kcr@hmslegal.com

Adeolu A. Bakare, Esq.
Victoria A. Geddis, Esq.
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
100 Pine Street
P.O. Box 1166
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166
abakare@mcneeslaw.com
vgeddis@mcneeslaw.com

Susan E. Bruce, Esq.
Rebecca Kimmel, Esq.
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
100 Pine Street
P.O. Box 1166
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166
sbruce@mcneeslaw.com
rkimmel@mcneeslaw.com

Lt. Colonel Carlos S. Ramirez-Vazquez, Esq.
John J. McNutt, Esq.
U.S. Army Legal Services Agency
Office of The Judge Advocate General
9275 Gunston Road (JALS-TCAP)
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060
carlos.s.ramirezvazquez.mil@army.mil
john.j.mcnutt.civ@army.mil

Renardo L. Hicks, Esq.
Bryce R. Beard, Esq.
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellot, LLC
213 Market Street, 8th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
rhicks@eckertseamans.com
bbeard@eckertseamans.com


Michael A. Podskoch, Jr.
Prosecutor
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement
PA Attorney ID No. 330132
(717) 783-6151
mpodskoch@pa.gov