

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Application of Greater Hazleton Community	:	
Area New Development Organization Inc. t/a	:	
CAN DO, INC., Pursuant to Section 1102(a)	:	
of the Code, for Approval of (1) the Right to	:	
Offer, Render, Furnish or Supply Waster Service	:	
to the Public in an Additional Portion of Hazle	:	
Township, together with portions of Sugarloaf	:	A-2026-3059809
Township and West Hazleton Borough,	:	
Luzerne County, Pennsylvania and	:	
(2) Abandonment of Portions of its Water	:	
Service Territory in Hazle Township, Luzerne	:	
County, Pennsylvania and East Union Township,	:	
Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania	:	

**INTERIM ORDER #3**  
**DISMISSING PRELIMINARY OBJECTION OF GREATER HAZLETON**  
**COMMUNITY AREA NEW DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION INC. T/A CAN DO,**  
**INC. (WATER DIVISION) TO THE PROTEST OF LISA LOGAN**

This Interim Order denies the preliminary objection of Greater Hazleton Community Area New Development Organization Inc., t/a CAN DO, INC. (CAN DO) to the Protest of Lisa Logan.

**HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING**

On January 13, 2026, CAN DO filed an application with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission), pursuant to Section 1102(a) of the Public Utility Code (Code), 66 Pa.C.S. § 1102(a), for approval of (1) the right to offer, render, furnish or supply water service to the public in an additional portion of Hazle Township, together with portions of Sugarloaf Township and West Hazleton Borough, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania and (2)

abandonment of portions of its water service territory in Hazle Township, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania and East Union Township, Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania.<sup>1</sup>

Notice of the application was published in the January 31, 2026 edition of the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*, 56 Pa.B. 737. The notice specified a protest deadline of February 16, 2026.

On February 13, 2026, Lisa Logan (Ms. Logan) filed a protest in opposition to the application.

On February 25, 2026, the Commission issued an initial telephonic prehearing conference notice to alert the parties that a prehearing conference would be held on March 25, 2026. Also on February 25, 2026, the undersigned issued a prehearing order.

On March 5, 2026, CAN DO filed a preliminary objection to Ms. Logan's Protest. A notice to plead accompanied the preliminary objection.

On March 9, 2026, Ms. Logan filed an answer to CAN DO's preliminary objection.

CAN DO's preliminary objection is ripe for disposal and is denied for the reasons set forth herein.

### DISCUSSION

Commission regulations permit the filing of preliminary objections. 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a). Preliminary objection practice before the Commission is similar to Pennsylvania civil practice with respect to preliminary objections. *Equitable Small Transp. Intervenors v. Equitable Gas Co.*, 1994 Pa. PUC LEXIS 69, Docket No. C-00935435 (July 18, 1994).

---

<sup>1</sup> On January 22, 2026, CAN DO filed an amended application to correct an administrative error related to Exhibit 6.

Commission regulations provide as follows:

**§ 5.101. Preliminary objections.**

(a) *Grounds.* Preliminary objections are available to parties and may be filed in response to a pleading except motions and prior preliminary objections. Preliminary objections must be accompanied by a notice to plead, must state specifically the legal and factual grounds relied upon and be limited to the following:

- (1) Lack of Commission jurisdiction or improper service of the pleading initiating the proceeding.
- (2) Failure of a pleading to conform to this chapter or the inclusion of scandalous or impertinent matter.
- (3) Insufficient specificity of a pleading.
- (4) Legal insufficiency of a pleading.
- (5) Lack of capacity to sue, nonjoinder of a necessary party or misjoinder of a cause of action.
- (6) Pendency of a prior proceeding or agreement for alternative dispute resolution.
- (7) Standing of a party to participate in the proceeding.

52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(1)-(7).

In deciding preliminary objections, the Commission must determine whether, based on well-pleaded factual averments of the non-moving party, recovery or relief is possible. *Dep't of Auditor General v. State Emps.' Ret. Sys.*, 836 A.2d 1053 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2003); *P.J.S. v. Pa. State Ethics Comm'n*, 669 A.2d 1105 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1996). Any doubt must be resolved in favor of the non-moving party by refusing to sustain the preliminary objections. *Boyd v. Ward*, 802 A.2d 705 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2002). All of the non-moving party's averments must be viewed as true for purposes of deciding the preliminary objections, and only those facts specifically admitted may be considered against the non-moving party. *Ridge v. State Emps' Ret. Bd.*, 690 A.2d 1312 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1997).

Ms. Logan avers in her protest (Logan Protest) that she relies on a private groundwater well located within a critical watershed for water service to her property. She argues that the service proposed in the application has the potential to alter groundwater recharge, hydrologic balance, and water quality within this sensitive watershed, and that any change in withdrawals, infrastructure, or serve patterns in this area has the potential to affect groundwater recharge, well yield, and water quality. Logan Protest at 2. Ms. Logan argues, therefore, “I have direct, personal standing in this matter because any hydrologic change affects my household’s only water source.” *Id.* at 3.

In its preliminary objection, CAN DO argues that Ms. Logan lacks standing to protest the application. CAN DO asserts: Ms. Logan’s property is not located within the service area proposed for expansion or abandonment; Ms. Logan is not a customer of CAN DO; and that Ms. Logan’s water will not be affected by approval of the application. Accordingly, CAN DO argues that Ms. Logan failed to demonstrate the “direct, immediate, and substantial interest” required for standing and, consequently, her protest should be dismissed with prejudice.

In her answer to CAN DO’s preliminary objection, Ms. Logan admits she is not a customer but asserts, nonetheless, that she has standing as her interest in the application is “direct, immediate, and substantial.”

The Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure permit protests under Section 5.51, 52 Pa. Code § 5.51. Under this section, a person objecting to the approval of an application filed with the Commission may file a protest to the application.

There are three requirements for a party to have standing: (1) the party must have a substantial interest in the subject matter of the litigation; (2) the interest must be direct; and (3) the interest must be immediate and not a remote consequence. *George v. Pa.*

*Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 735 A.2d 1282 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1999) (citing *Ken R. ex rel. C.R. v. Arthur Z.*, 682 A.2d 1267 (Pa. 1996)).

A 'substantial' interest is an interest in the outcome of the litigation which surpasses the common interest of all citizens in procuring obedience to the law. A 'direct' interest requires a showing that the matter complained of caused harm to the party's interest. An 'immediate' interest involves the nature of the causal connection between the action complained of and the injury to the party challenging it and is shown where the interest the party seeks to protect is within the zone of interests sought to be protected by the statute or the constitutional guarantee in question.

*Id.*, quoting *S. Whitehall Twp. Police Serv. v. S. Whitehall Twp.*, 555 A.2d 793, 795 (Pa. 1989).

In accepting as true the material averments in the Protest, as we must do in ruling on the preliminary objection, Ms. Logan's only water source is a private well located within the watershed, and the service expansion proposed in the application has the potential to affect the quality and reliability of that water source. The proposed service expansion may alter groundwater recharge, hydrologic balance, and water quality within the watershed. Further, any change in withdrawals, infrastructure, or serve patterns in the proposed expansion area has the potential to affect the groundwater recharge, well yield, and water quality in Ms. Logan's area. We find that these concerns certainly confer upon Ms. Logan the requisite standing to protest the application, and she must be given an opportunity to prove these allegations at a hearing.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Preliminary Objection filed by Greater Hazleton Community Area New Development Organization Inc., t/a CAN DO, INC. to the Protest of Lisa Logan is denied.

Date: March 20, 2026

/s/  
Steven K. Haas  
Administrative Law Judge

/s/  
Emily A. Farren  
Administrative Law Judge

**A-2026-3059809 - EXPANSION OF ITS SERVICE TERRITORY TO INCLUDE AN  
ADDITIONAL PORTION OF HAZLE TOWNSHIP, TOGETHER WITH PORTIONS OF  
SUGARLOAF TOWNSHIP AND WEST HAZLETON BOROUGH, ALL IN LUZERNE  
COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**

JONATHAN NASE ESQUIRE  
COZEN O'CONNOR  
17 NORTH SECOND STREET  
SUITE 1410  
HARRISBURG PA 17101  
717-773-4191  
jnase@cozen.com  
Served via eService March 20, 2026

DAWN KURTZ CROMPTON ESQUIRE  
COZEN O'CONNOR  
17 North Second Street Suite 1410  
HARRISBURG PA 17101  
717-703-5892  
dcrompton@cozen.com  
Served via eService March 20, 2026

PATRICIA KISENWETHER  
N/A  
96 MOUNT LAUREL TRL  
SUGARLOAF, PA PA 18249  
5705825665  
pkisenwether@gmail.com  
Served via eService March 20, 2026

LISA LOGAN  
293 Tomhicken Road  
SUGARLOAF PA 18249  
7272473036  
lisalogan2662@gmail.com  
Served via eService March 20, 2026

JENNIFER YANNI  
1278 Lakeview Dr  
WHITE HAVEN PA 18661  
5709729643  
jennifer.a.yanni@gmail.com  
Served via eService March 20, 2026