

March 21, 2022

Ms. Rosemary Chiavetta, Esquire
Secretary
PA Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Re: Docket No. C-2021-3028278
Rebecca Walizer v. Metropolitan Edison Company, et al.
Reply to Answer and New Matter of Met-Ed to Amended Complaint

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

In response to the Answer and New Matter received from by Margaret A. Morris, Esq. on March 7, 2022, I am submitting the following replies:

1. As stated
2. Agree Metropolitan Edison is the responding utility. Disagree that Met-Ed is NOT AN appropriate respondent with regard to this case. I believe FirstEnergy, Met Ed and MAIT should all be listed as respondents for the following reasons. Letters were sent within our neighborhood on **FirstEnergy letterhead** stating, “**First Energy is rebuilding an existing 69 kilo-volt transmission line...**” and another letter sent to a portion of our development stated “**Metropolitan Edison, a FirstEnergy company is planning upgrades to the transmission line adjacent to your property...**”. This indicates to me that FirstEnergy and Metropolitan Edison are PART of this transmission pole and line replacement. As per the provided *Opinion and Order* entered August 24, 2016 at Docket No. A-2015-2488903, I agree MAIT is the owner of this transmission line. Again, I believe all three should be included as respondents.
3. PP&L does service our electric service at 60 Bittersweet Drive, Hershey, Pennsylvania. We therefore, pay for the undergrounding of the PP&L transmission lines. They have undergrounded several lines recently within our township. I have no complaints about the rate hike even though I do not benefit from the undergrounding. I believe in supporting all efforts that benefit the safety, health and welfare of all. I am grateful PP&L realized that undergrounding was also in the BEST interest of the residents they serve.
4. I acknowledge MAIT is replacing the overhead transmission facilities extending 0.37 miles through the middle of open land within our development. I have been made aware the rebuild of the Transmission Line is a management decision belonging to MAIT however, Met-Ed “is planning upgrades to the transmission line...” as per letter received within our neighborhood and Met Ed owns the easement. I

do not believe I have been provided good “service” as I was not notified of this effort prior to the scheduled “upgrade” and I was not provided communication with anyone directly involved with the decision making of the Project which DOES directly affect me as so noted in my prior responses and mentioned below.

5. I believe I do have grounds for this complaint as so noted in my original complaint, my amended complaint and in my responses to the preliminary objections and within my replies to New Matter. I believe our health (mental and physical) and safety need to be considered, as well as the effect these above ground poles and lines have on our property values. Our neighborhood is now more vibrant and active than it was 30 years ago when it was being developed and I believe undergrounding will enable the currently unused space lying underneath the towering poles and transmission lines to be used as green space. It has been nearly 30 years since we purchased this home and I have learned a lot since then regarding the ramifications of overhead transmission lines. Undergrounding has grown as evidenced by the overwhelming number of factual articles found on the web including the increased number of available undergrounding symposiums and workshops available for professionals in the field indicating undergrounding is increasing and techniques have improved. In addition, many of the largest power companies, such as Florida Power and Light and Pacific Gas and Electric Company, are undergrounding now. There is evidence that although costs are initially much higher for undergrounding, the decrease in maintenance costs in the future help regain the difference. I believe Met-Ed is part of the process of the rebuild and needs to be included as a respondent.
6. No response required.
- 7a. As stated
- 7b. As stated
- 7c. As stated
8. As stated
9. As stated
10. As stated.

NEW MATTER

11. I agree the transmission line is not owned by Met-Ed. As stated in the mailing to our neighborhood, however, “Metropolitan Edison, a FirstEnergy company is rebuilding an existing 69 kilo-volt transmission line...” is validation that Metropolitan Edison has an important role in this project. The management decision MAY have been MAIT’s decision; however, Met-Ed is rebuilding the above ground transmission line.

12. The transmission line does NOT cross my property; My property is not subject to any easement. However, my property values could be negatively affected by the negative appearance of these towering poles and lines. My neighbors who have these lines and poles in their yards will have a negative affect on their land value, thus, my land value could be negatively affected, as well, with the comps used by the appraisers.

13. I remain with the belief as I have stated in this response, that all 3 parties, FirstEnergy, Metropolitan Edison and MAIT do have active parts in the decision and/or the process of the rebuild project of the transmission line within my neighborhood.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Walizer

Cc:

The Hon. Mark A. Hoyer, PA Public Utility Commission

The Hon. John Coogan, PA Public Utility Commission

Tori Giesler, Esquire, FirstEnergy Service Company

Margaret A. Morris, Esquire