

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120**

Michael and Sharon Hartman

v.

PPL Electric Utilities Corporation

Public Meeting March 27, 2025

3008272-OSA

Docket No. C-2019-3008272

**JOINT STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER JOHN F. COLEMAN, JR. AND
COMMISSIONER RALPH V. YANORA**

Before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) is the Petition of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL) for Stay or Supersedeas Pending Judicial Review (Petition). The Petition is directed to our Opinion and Order entered February 28, 2025, at the above-captioned docket. In that Opinion and Order, the Commission found, *inter alia*, that PPL's measures related to the construction of a transmission line rebuild project were inadequate to effectively control or prevent erosion or excessive water runoff on the right-of-way through portions of the Complainants' property in violation of Section 1501 of the Public Utility Code (Code), 66 Pa. C.S. § 1501.

Upon review, we believe that PPL's request for a stay of our prior Opinion and Order should be denied. However, we do not agree that the Commonwealth Court's decision in *Marple Twp.*¹ should serve as a basis to deny PPL's requested relief. We reiterate that *Marple Twp.* is distinguishable and does not apply here because this case is a Section 701 formal complaint, not a Section 619 zoning exemption request.²



**JOHN F. COLEMAN, JR.
COMMISSIONER**



**RALPH V. YANORA
COMMISSIONER**

Date: March 27, 2025

¹ *Twp. of Marple v. Pa. PUC*, 294 A.3d 965 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2023)(*Marple Twp.*).

² *Marple Twp.* involved a petition for a zoning exemption under Section 619 of the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), 53 P.S. § 10619. The court found that the Commission, in deciding whether to grant a zoning exemption, was obligated to consider the environmental impacts of placing a building at a proposed location. The decision turned upon the court's view that Section 619 was "constitutionally inadequate" unless the Commission completed an appropriately thorough environmental review of a building siting proposal and, in addition, factored the results into its ultimate determination regarding the reasonable necessity of the proposed siting under the MPC.