

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Application of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, :  
Filed Pursuant To 52 Pa. Code Chapter 57 :  
Subchapter G, For Approval To (1) Construct :  
The New Three Mile Island – Chanceford 500 :  
kV Transmission Line and Chanceford – Peach :  
Bottom 500 kV Transmission Line And (2) : A-2024-3051167  
Rebuild the Existing Otter Creek – Conastone :  
230 kV Transmission Line for Future Double :  
Circuit 500 kV Operations as The Rebuilt :  
Chanceford – Doubs 500 kV Transmission :  
Line And the Rebuilt Otter Creek – Conastone :  
500/230 kV Transmission Line, Located In :  
Chanceford, East Hopewell, And Hopewell :  
Townships In York County, Pennsylvania :

Petition of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation For :  
Findings That a Structure to Shelter Electrical :  
And Control Equipment at The Proposed :  
Chanceford Switchyard in Chanceford Township, : P-2024-3051163  
York County, Pennsylvania Is Reasonably :  
Necessary for the Convenience or Welfare :  
Of the Public :

Application of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation :  
Under 15 Pa. C.S § 1511(c) For A Finding And :  
Determination That the Service to Be Furnished :  
By The Applicant Through Its Proposed Exercise :  
Of The Power of Eminent Domain to Acquire A :  
Certain Portion of The Lands of Daniel T. Curran : A-2024-3051213  
In Chanceford Township, York County, :  
Pennsylvania For the Proposed Chanceford :  
Switchyard Associated with The Proposed :  
Chanceford 500 kV Rebuild Project Is Necessary :  
Or Proper for The Service, Accommodation, :  
Convenience, Or Safety of The Public :

**INTERIM ORDER TRANSFERRING PROCEEDINGS TO BUREAU OF TECHNICAL  
UTILITY SERVICES**

On September 13, 2024, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation filed its Petition for finding that a structure to shelter electrical and control equipment at the proposed Chanceford Switchyard In Chanceford Township, York County, Pennsylvania is reasonably necessary for the convenience or welfare of the public, pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.41 and 53 P.S. § 10619, for a finding that one structure to shelter electrical control equipment at the proposed PPL Electric-owned 500 kilovolt switchyard in Chanceford Township, York County, Pennsylvania, is reasonably necessary for the convenience or welfare of the public and, therefore, exempt from any local zoning ordinance. The Petition was filed with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission at Docket Number P-2024-3051163.

On September 13, 2024, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation filed its Application of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, pursuant to 52 Pa. Code Chapter 57 subchapter G, for approval to (1) construct the new Three Mile Island – Chanceford 500 kV Transmission Line and Chanceford – Peach Bottom 500 kV Transmission Line and (2) Rebuild the existing Otter Creek – Conastone 230 kV Transmission Line for future double circuit 500 kV operations as the rebuilt Chanceford – Doubs 500 kV Transmission Line and the rebuilt Otter Creek – Conastone 500/230 kV Transmission Line, located in Chanceford, East Hopewell, and Hopewell Townships in York County, Pennsylvania. PPL Electric proposes to (1) construct approximately 1.4 miles of new double circuit 500 kilovolt transmission line, between the existing Three Mile Island – Peach Bottom 500 kV Transmission Line to the proposed PPL Electric-owned kV switchyard, and (2) rebuild approximately 12 miles of the existing single circuit Otter Creek – Conastone 230 kV Transmission Line<sup>1</sup> to a future double circuit 500 kV capacity. The Application was filed with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission at Docket Number A-2024-3051167.

On September 13, 2024, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation filed an Application under 15 Pa C.S. § 1511(c) for a finding and determination that the service to be furnished by the Applicant through its proposed exercise of the power of eminent domain to acquire a certain portion of the lands of Daniel T. Curran in Chanceford Township, York County, Pennsylvania for

the proposed Chanceford Switchyard associated with the proposed Chanceford 500 kV Rebuild Project is necessary or proper for the service, accommodation, convenience, or safety of the public. The Application was filed with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission at Docket Number A-2024-3051213.

A telephonic prehearing conference was scheduled in the proceedings filed at Docket Number P-2024-3051163, Docket Number A-2024-3051167, and Docket Number A-2024-3051213 for December 10, 2024, beginning at 10:00 a.m.

Formal protests and petitions to intervene were required to be filed in accordance with Title 52 of the Pennsylvania Code, on or before December 5, 2024.

On October 4, 2024, an Interim Order was entered that, *inter alia*, directed PPL Electric Utilities Corporation to publish notices of the prehearing conference and deadline for the filing of protests and petitions to intervene, where applicable, in two newspapers of general circulation once per week for two consecutive weeks prior to the date of the prehearing conference.

On November 4, 2024, an Interim Order was entered which, *inter alia*, permitted the Parties to provide additional notice of the prehearing conference and Protest and Petition to Intervene filing deadlines.

On December 4, 2024, OCA filed its Notice of Intervention and Public Statement. OCA explained that it is determined that it is necessary to participate in these proceedings to protect the interests of PPL's customers. OCA stated that it would seek to ensure that each of the related filings will only be approved if they are found to be consistent with Commission regulations, the Public Utility Code and sound public policy. OCA also requested that an in-person public input hearing be held in the affected service territory. OCA did not file a Protest in these proceedings.

On December 10, 2024, a telephonic prehearing conference was convened as scheduled in the proceedings filed at Docket Number P-2024-3051163, Docket Number A-2024-

3051167, and Docket Number A2024-3051213. Garrett P. Lent, Esquire appeared and participated on behalf of PPL. Darryl A. Lawrence, Esquire appeared and represented OCA. Without objection, the proceedings filed at Docket Number P-2024-3051163, Docket Number A-2024-3051167, and Docket Number A2024-3051213 were consolidated for purposes of review and disposition by the Commission.

On December 20, 2024, an In-Person Public Input Hearing Notice was issued providing Notice that In-Person Public Input Hearings would be held at the Chanceford Township Municipal Office in Broque, Pennsylvania at 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on February 11, 2025.

On December 20, 2024, a Prehearing Order was entered requiring notice to be provided by PPL in a newspaper of general circulation, for two consecutive weeks. PPL filed an Affidavit of Publication on February 4, 2025, evidence that Notice was provided by the Company in a newspaper of general circulation in two consecutive weeks, in compliance with 52 Pa. Code § 57.75.

On or about February 10, 2025, Carroll County, Maryland, Board of Commissioners, caused a letter to be filed stating its opposition to the PPL Electric Utilities Corporation transmission line projects.

The first Public Input Hearing convened as scheduled on February 11, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. PPL was represented by Garrett Lent, Esquire. OCA was represented by David Evrard, Esquire. Six individuals testified at the hearing. The undersigned presiding officer convened the 6:00 p.m. in-person public input hearing, as scheduled.

At the 1:00 p.m. public input hearing, testimony was received by Patti Hankins, Bonnie Collins, Ralene M. Miller, Barron Shaw, Dolores Krick, and David G. Best.

Ms. Hankins, a Pylesville, Md. resident and member of the PJM Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee expressed various concerns about the Chanceford-Dobbs project.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Tr. 49.

She explained that the purpose for the project was to provide power to data centers located in Northern Virginia and Frederick, Maryland, and found it troubling that the project includes Dobbs in its name despite the project not ending anywhere near the Dobbs substation.<sup>2</sup>

Ms. Hankins expressed concern over the PPL line expansion project using the same right way as two PJM projects and one BGE project. She stated that the PJM 9A project is currently in suspension because of a pending third circuit case between Transource and the PUC, and she is unsure of which project will be built on that right of way and whether PJM ratepayers will be paying for it.<sup>3</sup> Referencing PPL's projected growth within the next 15-20 years, Ms. Hankins also questioned where the generation is coming from for that expected growth if the energy being generated by this expansion project will be sent to Dominion and APS.<sup>4</sup> She further questioned if energy was being sent out of Pennsylvania, and with no new natural gas plants being built in any recent time, how Pennsylvania plans to generate the energy necessary for when data centers inevitably move into the state.<sup>5</sup> She pointed out that due to laws restricting fossil fuel generation in Maryland and Virginia, the burden lies on landowners and ratepayers in Pennsylvania to supply Maryland and Virginia's energy needs.<sup>6</sup>

Ms. Hankins also discussed how the proposed project will be transferred to PSEG whenever it crosses into Maryland, and stated there have been several petitions to intervene in Frederick and Baltimore counties adamantly opposing the project in Maryland, which is directly tied to PPL in Pennsylvania.<sup>7</sup> She suggested that even if PPL were to start the project in Pennsylvania, its sister project will be through the process of dealing with the petitions to intervene and public outcry opposing the project.

Ms. Collins testified regarding the interests of her parents who live in Easte

---

<sup>2</sup> Tr. 50-52.

<sup>3</sup> Tr. 52-53.

<sup>4</sup> Tr. 54.

<sup>5</sup> Tr. 54-55.

<sup>6</sup> Tr. 55-56.

<sup>7</sup> Tr. 56-57.

Hopewell Township.<sup>8</sup> She explained that her parents have rejected multiple requests by PPL to expand the right of way on their property, and despite receiving a letter stating that PPL does not plan to utilize eminent domain, they will use the existing right of way on Ms. Collins' parents' property.<sup>9</sup> Ms. Collins questioned how PPL planned to use the existing right of way whenever the project demands an expansion which her parents rejected.

Ms. Miller, a Brogue resident, testified that Chanceford Township exists to provide food by way of agriculture, rather than to provide for people's electricity needs outside the township.<sup>10</sup> She asserted that she wished to protect the land in Chanceford township and express opposition to the PPL expansion project.

Mr. Shaw, a Fawn Grove resident, farmer, and PPL customer, testified the PPL project is a crisis in process.<sup>11</sup> Mr. Shaw contended that one company will be able to take land from private landowners to build power lines from West Virginia and Pennsylvania to supply electricity to states that have policies in place that don't allow for generation, i.e. Maryland and Virginia.<sup>12</sup> Mr. Shaw stated that Pennsylvania will be responsible for running electricity to data centers in Northern Virginia, and whenever data centers inevitably come to Pennsylvania, where the energy will come from for them to operate remains a mystery.<sup>13</sup> He went on to testify that all the power that goes out of the state increases the cost of power in the state, and questioned exactly how many billions of dollars Pennsylvanians have to pay due to Pennsylvania being the largest electricity exporter in the country.<sup>14</sup> He also stated that Loudon County in Northern Virginia makes billions of dollars in taxes because of the data centers powered by electricity being exported from Pennsylvania, which is more than the tax base in York and Lancaster Counties combined.<sup>15</sup>

Ms. Krick, an Airville resident, farmer, and PPL customer, testified that her electricity bill has more than doubled, and blamed having to pay for projects in other states out of

---

<sup>8</sup> Tr. 63.  
<sup>9</sup> Tr. 63-66.  
<sup>10</sup> Tr. 71-72.  
<sup>11</sup> Tr. 75-76.  
<sup>12</sup> Tr. 76.  
<sup>13</sup> Tr. 54-55, 76-77.  
<sup>14</sup> Tr. 78.  
<sup>15</sup> Tr. 79.

Pennsylvanian's pockets.<sup>16</sup> She expressed great dissatisfaction with the area being polluted with power lines, and the negative impact it has had on the farmland.<sup>17</sup> She stated that although Pennsylvania is not building a new thermal generation, it continues to export electricity to Maryland and Virginia.<sup>18</sup>

Finally, Mr. Best, a Felton resident and landowner of property in Chanceford Township where PPL has power lines, testified that he had heard nothing about any plans for rebuilding or expansion.<sup>19</sup> Mr. Best questioned why he had never been notified of any plans to expand the right of way on his property.<sup>20</sup>

A second in-person public input hearing was held on February 11, 2025, at 6:00 p.m., in Washington, Pennsylvania. The Testimony was received by Tamra Wall, Gloria A. Shaull, Braden Snyder, and Donna Wilt.

Ms. Wall, a Brogue resident living across the street from PPL power lines, expressed concern regarding the increased voltage traveling through the lines and the possible health hazards posed to the community.<sup>21</sup> She expressed dissatisfaction on the part of the community that the PPL is using the residents' land to carry electricity that will not be used in the area.<sup>22</sup>

Ms. Shaull, a Chanceford Township resident, testified she had health concerns for the community and expressed disapproval of adding more power lines.<sup>23</sup> Ms. Shaull also stated that she wanted to know exactly where PPL plans on building the structure to house electrical and control equipment at the proposed switchyard in Chanceford Township and how large it will be.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Tr. 82.  
<sup>17</sup> Tr. 82.  
<sup>18</sup> Tr. 83-84.  
<sup>19</sup> Tr. 84-87.  
<sup>20</sup> Tr. 87.  
<sup>21</sup> Tr. 106-108.  
<sup>22</sup> Tr. 108.  
<sup>23</sup> Tr. 110-111.  
<sup>24</sup> Tr. 98, 110.

Mr. Snyder, an Airville resident and farmer granting an easement to PPL to run the transmission line across his farmland, raised multiple issues with respect to the 500,000-volt project. Mr. Snyder began by stating that although he was initially impartial to the running of the power lines, his subsequent experiences with PPL have swayed him to oppose the project.<sup>25</sup> He explained that he and PPL were unable to reach an agreement with respect to a new easement across his farmland. Upon its initial offer, Mr. Snyder contended that a representative from PPL stated that its offer had been based off an appraisal of his land but later denied the existence of said appraisal and refused to present any documentation of it upon Mr. Snyder's request.<sup>26</sup> He stated PPL had imposed a requirement upon Mr. Snyder to provide comparable to justify the price of his counteroffer, and his counteroffer which included annual compensation for various reasons was rejected by PPL.<sup>27</sup>

Mr. Snyder also stated that the terms and conditions of the new easement being negotiated did not match their existing easement, and there was very little effort on the part of PPL to correct those inconsistencies,<sup>28</sup> including the right for the landowner (Snyder) to use the land specifically for agricultural purposes being completely left out, putting Mr. Snyder in a position where he would be restricted from farming the land without selling it to PPL.<sup>29</sup>

Mr. Snyder stated that the proposed terms in the new easement extended PPL's rights too far providing no limitations to what it may do with his land without compensation to him as the landowner or consideration for his property being used.<sup>30</sup> He further asserted that there had been damage done to his property by PPL after the first reconstruction which still had yet to be addressed including damage to his soil and garbage and debris that has been left behind.<sup>31</sup> He also described wire, steel, concrete, and large rocks left on the soil surface that was not there prior to reconstruction and claimed that since it is agricultural land, it must be restored to its original condition in order to be used for its intended agricultural purpose.<sup>32</sup> Due to the loss of topsoil and

---

25 Tr. 112.  
26 Tr. 112-113.  
27 Tr. 113.  
28 Tr. 113.  
29 Tr 113-114.  
30 Tr. 115.  
31 Tr. 115-116.  
32 Tr. 116-117.

heavy compaction, Mr. Snyder contends that he has been experiencing yield losses of up to 34% in the affected areas and has costed him money, time, and wear and tear on his farm equipment.<sup>33</sup>

Mr. Snyder also stated that he had to purchase additional insurance to cover the issue of garbage being left on his property and explained the possible consequences of selling hay to a racehorse owner contaminated with garbage left by PPL which could lead to liability.<sup>34</sup> He stated he was assured by PPL that any liability issues or damages would be taken care of by PPL, but that would only be available to him if he were to sign the easement which he claims to be unfavorable.<sup>35</sup> He said that the last communication he had with PPL was a letter it had sent him stating it was unable to reach an agreement with him and it would continue to move forward with building the line despite there being no agreement.<sup>36</sup> Mr. Snyder provided documentation of PPL's right of way real estate siting and permitting requirements for transmission interconnection projects, Transmission Standard Form 5474, and PPL's right of way use guidelines for consideration.<sup>37</sup> He asserted that per PPL's documents, it requires a 200 foot right of way and they have only purchased 150 feet of right of way from him, meaning that PPL's assertion that it will be moving forward with the project means that it will be taking an additional 50 feet of his property without compensation.<sup>38</sup> Mr. Snyder questioned if PPL is planning to take this additional 50 feet of land via Eminent Domain, where would he fit in with regard to the requirement of the taking having to be for the benefit of the public.<sup>39</sup> While discussing the public benefit requirement, Mr. Snyder also raised the health concerns presented by the first two witnesses, and stated that there are "quite a few" people in the community living near 500,000 volt lines that have developed cancer.<sup>40</sup>

Finally, Ms. Wilt, an Airville resident, expressed safety and environmental concerns of the community.<sup>41</sup> She stated that because the power line has already increased in size over the past seven years, there are safety issues both with regard to junk left behind by PPL as

---

<sup>33</sup> Tr. 117.  
<sup>34</sup> Tr. 117-118.  
<sup>35</sup> Tr. 118.  
<sup>36</sup> Tr. 118.  
<sup>37</sup> Tr. 119.  
<sup>38</sup> Tr. 120.  
<sup>39</sup> Tr. 120.  
<sup>40</sup> Tr. 120-121.  
<sup>41</sup> Tr. 125-126.

well as the health of all those in the community.<sup>42</sup> Like those who testified before her, Ms. Wilt made it a point to discuss the community's disapproval of the electricity being ran through these lines for the benefit of other states.<sup>43</sup> She pointed out that Maryland has declared itself a green state and she questioned why Pennsylvania is being destroyed in order to benefit states that identify themselves as being green states in name only.<sup>44</sup>

On February 13, 2025, a Prehearing Order was entered permitting the Parties to file objections to the proposed exhibits offered into evidence at the initial in-person public input hearing at 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., on February 11, 2025, on or before 4:30 p.m. on February 21, 2025. In addition, the Parties were permitted to file and serve responses to the objections along with a certificate of service with the Commission Secretary on or before March 3, 2025.

On February 21, 2025, OCA filed a letter stating it did not have any objections to the proposed exhibits identified in the Prehearing Order entered on February 13, 2025, being admitted into the record. On February 21, 2025, PPL also filed a letter stating it did not have any objections to the proposed exhibits identified in the Prehearing Order entered on February 13, 2025, being admitted into the record.

On February 26, 2025, the undersigned presiding officer received a letter from Jon Wall dated February 14, 2025. Mr. Wall stated that he was writing in protest of the proposed project to upgrade the existing power lines and towers directly across the road from his house. Mr. Wall further stated that his wife, Tammy, spoke at a public input hearing on February 11, 2025, and that they object to the proposed project. The undersigned presiding officer provided a copy of the letter to counsel for PPL and OCA.

On March 21, 2025, PPL filed a Status Report stating that it was PPL's understanding that OCA does not intend to file a protest and that no other interventions or protests have been filed in this proceeding. PPL requested that the above-captioned matters be transferred

---

<sup>42</sup> Tr. 126-127.  
<sup>43</sup> Tr. 127.  
<sup>44</sup> Tr. 127.

to the Bureau of Technical Utility Services of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission for review and disposition.

On March 25, 2025, OCA through its counsel filed a letter stating that OCA has determined not to file a Protest in this matter. OCA stated that it does not support the project and has determined to take a position of non-opposition to the Project. OCA explains that the Project arises out of the Competitive “Window” solicitation process conducted by grid operator PJM Interconnection, LLC, to identify projects that could resolve potential reliability violations it foresees occurring on its system in its planning projections for the years 2027 and 2028. According to OCA, those prospective violations result primarily from significantly increased load forecasts for the Northern Virginia (Dominion) and APS (FirstEnergy) zones related to the rapid growth of energy-intensive data centers. OCA explains a secondary contributor is the announced retirement of 11 GW of generation to the west and south of the Conastone substation in Maryland. OCA explains that among the reliability issues identified by PJM are various transmission line and transformer overloads, voltage deficiencies and “non-convergent contingencies” that indicate potential system instability or collapse. OCA stated that it largely agrees with PJM’s analysis and states the need to open a Competitive Window and the need for the Project are not the result of any significant new demand or shortage of electric generating capacity in Pennsylvania.

OCA further explains that, attached to its Letter as Appendix A are copies of the OCA’s formal discovery and responses received from PPL in this proceeding. OCA submits the standards it identified must be followed and that it is in overall public interest that the integrity of the bulk electricity system in the PJM footprint be maintained in accordance with the applicable standards. OCA concludes that the PJM 500 kV proposal, in its entirety, would address the potential reliability violations identified by PJM, and noted that it is mindful of the Public Input Hearing testimony of Ms. Patti Hankins, and specifically her observation that the Maryland Piedmont Reliability Project (MPRP), to which the PPL Project will ultimately connect, is being met with significant public opposition that may result in slowing or altering that project. Tr. At 48-62.

OCA requests that this matter be turned over to the Commission’s Bureau of

Technical Utility Services (TUS) for further investigation and that the Commission review the entire record in this matter, including the Public Input Hearing Testimony, Appendix A attached to OCA's letter, and any further findings produced by TUS before reaching its final determination.

On April 24, 2024, an Interim Order was entered admitting the following Exhibits offered at the first Public Input Hearing convened on February 11, 2025, at 1:00 p.m., into the Public Input Hearing Record:

- a. Patti Hankins Exhibit A consisting of 46 pages.
- b. Ralene Miller Exhibit A consisting of 1 page.
- c. Bonnie Collins Exhibit A consisting of 2 pages.
- d. Dolores Krick Exhibit A consisting of 3 pages.
- e. Dolores Krick Exhibit B consisting of 2 pages.
- f. Dolores Krick Exhibit C consisting of 13 pages.

In addition, the following Exhibits offered at the first Public Input Hearing convened on February 11, 2025, at 6:00 p.m., were admitted into the Public Input Hearing Record:

- g. Braden Snyder Exhibit A.

Formal protests and petitions to intervene were required to be filed in accordance with Title 52 of the Pennsylvania Code, on or before December 5, 2024. No Protests or Petitions to Intervene were timely filed in these proceedings. Despite the filing of a Notice of Intervention by OCA on December 4, 2024, and OCA's participation in these proceedings, including its participation at the prehearing conference and at the public input hearings, OCA has determined that it will not oppose the filings by the Company.

Consistent with 52 Pa. Code § 57.75, the Commission set the time and place for a prehearing conference and public input hearings and required the Applicant to cause the weekly publication for two consecutive weeks of a notice of hearing in a newspaper of general circulation within each municipality in which the HV line and facilities were proposed to be located. The

Commission also provided notice to each person or agency designated in § 57.74(b) and (c) as well as the OCA of the time and place of the prehearing conference and public input hearings in these proceedings.

No Protests or Petitions to Intervene have been timely filed in these proceedings. In addition, OCA, after filing a Notice of Intervention and participating in these proceedings, has issued a letter stating that it has determined not to file a Protest in this matter. Accordingly, PPL has requested that these matters be transferred to the Bureau of Technical Utility Services of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission for review and disposition.

Based upon the circumstances, it appears appropriate that these matters be transferred to the Commission's Bureau of Technical Utility Services for disposition.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

That the proceedings filed at Docket Number P-2024-3051163, Docket Number A-2024-3051167, and Docket Number A-2024-3051213 and identified above, filed by PPL Electric Utilities Corporation are hereby referred to the Commission's Bureau of Technical Utility Services for disposition.

Date: June 24, 2025

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Jeffrey A. Watson  
Administrative Law Judge

**A-2024-3051167 - APPLICATION OF PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORP FILED PURSUANT TO 52 PA. CODE CHAPTER 57, SUBCHAPTER G, FOR APPROVAL TO (1) CONSTRUCT THE NEW THREE MILE ISLAND - CHANCEFORD 500 KV LINE AND CHANCEFORD - PEACH BOTTOM 500 KV TRANSMISSION LINE AND (2) REBUILD THE EXISTING OTTER CREEK - CONASTONE 230 KV TRANSMISSION LINE FOR FUTURE DOUBLE CIRCUIT 500 KV OPERATIONS AND THE REBUILT CHANCEFORD - DOUBS 500 KV TRANSMISSION LINE AND THE REBUILT OTTER CREEK - CONASTONE 500/230 KV TRANSMISSION LINE, LOCATED IN CHANCEFORD, EAST HOPEWELL, AND HOPEWELL TOWNSHIPS IN YORK COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.**

*Revised: April 23, 2025*

MICHAEL J SHAFER ESQUIRE  
PPL SERVICES CORPORATION  
645 HAMILTON STREET  
SUITE 700  
ALLENTOWN PA 18101  
**610.774.2599**  
[mjshafer@pplweb.com](mailto:mjshafer@pplweb.com)  
Accepts eService – **Served 6/24/2025**

ALLISON C KASTER ESQUIRE  
DIRECTOR  
PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
BI&E LEGAL TECHNICAL  
STREET  
**717.783.7998**  
[akaster@pa.gov](mailto:akaster@pa.gov)  
Accepts eService – **Served 6/24/2025**

DAVID B MACGREGOR ESQUIRE  
GARRETT P LENT ESQUIRE  
POST & SCHELL PC  
17TH NORTH 2ND STREET  
12TH FLOOR  
HARRISBURG PA 17101-1601  
**717.731.1970**  
**717.731.1985** FAX  
[dmacgregor@postschell.com](mailto:dmacgregor@postschell.com)  
[glent@postschell.com](mailto:glent@postschell.com)  
Accepts eService – **Served 6/24/2025**  
*(Attorneys for PPL Electric Utilities Corporation)*

PA DEPT ENVIRONMENTAL  
PROTECTION  
400 MARKET STREET  
10TH FLOOR RACHEL  
CARSON STATE OFFICE  
HARRISBURG PA 17101  
Attn: Regional Permit Coordination Office  
Served via first-class mail – **Served 6/24/2025**

KAREN CUMMINGS ESQUIRE  
PENNDOT  
PO BOX 8212  
HARRISBURG PA 17105-8212  
**717.787.3128**  
[kcummings@pa.gov](mailto:kcummings@pa.gov)  
Accepts eService – **Served 6/24/2025**

DAVID EVRARD ESQUIRE  
DARRYL A LAWRENCE ESQUIRE  
LORI ARNSPARGER  
OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE  
555 WALNUT STREET 5TH FLOOR  
FORUM PLACE  
HARRISBURG PA 17101  
**717.783.5048**  
[devrard@paoca.org](mailto:devrard@paoca.org)  
[dlawrence@paoca.org](mailto:dlawrence@paoca.org)  
[larnsparger@paoca.org](mailto:larnsparger@paoca.org)  
Served via eService on – **Served 6/24/2025**

NAZAARAH SABREE  
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS  
ADVOCATE  
555 WALNUT STREET  
FORUM PLACE 1ST FLOOR  
HARRISBURG PA 17101  
**717.783.2525**  
[ra-sba@pa.gov](mailto:ra-sba@pa.gov)  
Served via email – **Served 6/24/2025**

JEFF HILL MANAGER  
YORK COUNTY CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT  
ROAD  
SUITE 101 ROOM 139  
YORK PA 17402  
Served via first-class mail – **Served  
6/24/2025**

FELICIA DELL DIRECTOR  
YORK COUNTY PLANNING  
COMMISSION  
STREET  
YORK PA 17401  
Served via first-class mail – **Served  
6/24/2025**

JULIE WHEELER PRESIDENT  
YORK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
28 EAST MARKET STREET  
YORK PA 17401  
**717.771.9964**  
[jlwheeler@yorkcountypa.gov](mailto:jlwheeler@yorkcountypa.gov)  
Served via email – **Served 6/24/2025**

KENT HEFFNER CHAIRMAN  
CHANCEFORD TOWNSHIP  
SUPERVISORS  
FORKS ROAD  
Served via first-class mail – **Served  
6/24/2025**

JOHN SHANBARGER CHAIRMAN  
CHANCEFORD TOWNSHIP PLANNING  
COMMISSION  
FORKS ROAD  
BROGUE PA 17309  
Served via first-class mail – **Served  
6/24/2025**

DEAN MILLER CHAIRMAN  
EAST HOPEWELL TOWNSHIP  
SUPERVISORS  
FELTON PA 17322  
Served via first-class mail – **Served  
6/24/2025**

MELISSA HILLER SECRETARY  
EAST HOPEWELL TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
HICKORY ROAD  
Served via first-class mail – **Served  
6/24/2025**

AARON R MANIFOLD CHAIRMAN  
HOPEWELL TOWNSHIP SUPERVISORS  
3336 BRIDGEVIEW ROAD  
PO BOX 429  
STEWARTSTOWN PA 17363  
Served via first-class mail – **Served**  
**6/24/2025**

ANN YOST CHAIRMAN  
HOPEWELL TOWNSHIP PLANNING  
COMMISSION  
3336 BRIDGEVIEW ROAD  
PO BOX 429  
STEWARTSTOWN PA 17363  
Served via first-class mail – **Served**  
**6/24/2025**

TORI L GIESLER ESQUIRE  
FIRSTENERGY  
2800 POTTSVILLE PIKE  
PO BOX 16001  
READING PA 19612-6001  
**610.921.6658**  
[tgiesler@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:tgiesler@firstenergycorp.com)  
Accepts eService – **Served 6/24/2025**

DANIEL CURRAN  
13114 COLLINSVILLE ROAD  
BROGUE PA 17309  
Served via first-class mail – **Served**  
**6/24/2025**

DONALD SMITH  
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL  
400 NORTH STREET  
PO BOX 8212  
HARRISBURG PA 17105-8212  
[dojsmith@pa.gov](mailto:dojsmith@pa.gov)  
Served via first class mail – **Served**  
**6/24/2025**