

---

Garrett P. Lent

glent@postschell.com  
717-612-6032 Direct  
717-731-1985 Direct Fax  
File #: 209803

May 27, 2026

***VIA ELECTRONIC FILING***

Matthew Homsher, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, 2nd Floor North  
P.O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

**Re: Letter Of Notification Of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, Filed Pursuant To 52 Pa. Code Chapter 57 Subchapter G, For Approval To Rebuild Approximately 1.1 Miles Of New Parallel Double Circuit 230 kV Transmission Taps That Are Needed to Connect the Existing Susquehanna-Harwood #1 & #2 Transmission Lines on the New Tomhicken 230 kV Switchyard That Are Respectively Located in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania.  
Docket No. A-2025-3059443**

Dear Secretary Homsher:

Attached for filing is the Answer of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (“PPL Electric”) to the Motion for Consolidation of Dockets A-2025-3059443 and A-2026-3061547 of the Office of Consumer Advocate (“OCA”) in the above-referenced proceeding. Copies will be provided as indicated on the Certificate of Service.

Very truly yours,



Garrett P. Lent

GPL/bfc  
Attachment

cc: The Honorable Erin L. Gannon (*via email; w/attachment*)  
The Honorable John Coogan (*via email; w/attachment*)  
Certificate of Service

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served upon the following persons, in the manner indicated, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(d)(3).


### VIA E-MAIL

Jacob Guthrie  
Josiah B. Harmar  
Melanie Joy El Atieh  
PA Office of Consumer Advocate  
555 Walnut Street  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor Forum Place  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923  
[JGuthrie@paoca.org](mailto:JGuthrie@paoca.org)  
[JHarmer@paoca.org](mailto:JHarmer@paoca.org)  
[melatieh@paoca.org](mailto:melatieh@paoca.org)  
(*Counsel for OCA*)

Erika Cook  
38 Red Rock Road  
Sugarloaf, PA 18249  
[Elcook33@gmail.com](mailto:Elcook33@gmail.com)

John Zola  
17 Dagostin Road  
Sugarloaf, PA 18249  
[zolajj@gmail.com](mailto:zolajj@gmail.com)

Dated: May 27, 2026

  
Garrett P. Lent

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Letter of Notification of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, Filed Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code Chapter 57 Subchapter G, For Approval to Build Approximately 1.1 Miles of New Parallel Double Circuit 230 kV Transmission Taps that are Needed to Connect the Existing Susquehanna-Harwood #1 & #2 Transmission Lines to the New Tomhicken 230 kV Switchyard that are Respectively Located in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Docket No. A-2025-3059443

Application of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, Filed Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code Chapter 57 Subchapter G, for Approval to (1) Bifurcate and Rebuild 4.4 Miles of the Existing Sunbury-Susquehanna #1 230 kV Transmission Line; (2) Construct 0.9 Miles of New Transmission Line Tap for Future 230 kV Double-Circuit Operation; (3) Raise Approximately 0.5 Miles of the Sunbury-Susquehanna 500 kV Transmission Line; and (4) Construct 11.2 Miles of New Double-Circuit 230 kV Transmission Line for Future Double-Circuit 500 kV Capacity, Located in Black Creek, Conyngham, Hazle, Hollenback, Nescopeck, and Sugarloaf, Townships in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Docket No. A-2026-3061547

Petition of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation For Findings that A Structure To Shelter Electrical and Control Equipment At The Proposed Nescopeck Switchyard in Nescopeck Township, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania Is Reasonably Necessary For The Convenience Or Welfare Of The Public

Docket No. P-2026-3061609

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 : Docket Nos. A-2026-3061549, *et al.*  
 Through Its Proposed Exercise Of The :  
 Power Of Eminent Domain To Acquire :  
 Certain Portions Of Lands In Hazle :  
 Township, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania :  
 For The Sugarloaf 500/230 kV :  
 Transmission Line Associated With The :  
 Proposed Sugarloaf 500/230 kV :  
 Transmission Line Project Is Necessary Or :  
 Proper For The Service, Accommodation, :  
 Convenience, Or Safety Of The Public :

---

**ANSWER OF PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION TO THE MOTION TO  
CONSOLIDATE OF THE OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE**

---

**TO THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION:**

Pursuant to Section 5.61 of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission’s (“Commission”) regulations,<sup>1</sup> PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (“PPL Electric” or the “Company”) hereby files this Answer to the Motion for Consolidation of Docket Nos. A-2025-3059443 and A-2026-3061547 (“Motion to Consolidate”) of the Office of Consumer Advocate (“OCA”) dated May 7, 2026. In its Motion to Consolidate, OCA avers that the above-captioned proceedings should be consolidated because of common questions of law and fact, reduction in public confusion regarding the proceedings, and promotion of judicial economy.

PPL Electric submits that consolidation of these proceedings is neither necessary nor proper under the circumstances. While these proceedings involve certain similar facts and legal principles, OCA’s request would combine dissimilar requests for approval to site and construct

---

<sup>1</sup> 52 Pa. Code § 5.61

high-voltage (“HV”) transmission line facilities: one letter of notification that is an abbreviated request for such approval because the subject HV lines are less than 2 miles in length and located entirely within existing right-of-way (“ROW”) or property owned by the customer to be served, and one full siting application that involves, *inter alia*, the construction of different, new HV transmission lines where none presently exist. The nature and content of the letter of notification and full siting application give rise to distinct considerations that are not suited for consolidation, would result in the confusion of issues distinct to each proceeding, and would unduly delay the resolution of the letter of notification proceeding.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **A. TOMHICKEN 230 KV SWITCHYARD PROJECT**

1. The proceeding at Docket No. A-2025-3059443 (“Letter of Notification”) was initiated on December 19, 2025, when PPL Electric filed the above-captioned “Letter Of Notification Of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, Filed Pursuant To 52 Pa. Code Chapter 57 Subchapter G, For Approval To Build Approximately 1.1 Miles of New Parallel Double Circuit 230 kV Transmission Taps that are Needed to Connect the Existing Susquehanna-Harwood #1 & #2 Transmission Lines to the New Tomhicken 230 kV Switchyard that are Respectively Located in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania” (hereinafter, the “Letter of Notification”) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“Commission”). In the Letter of Notification, PPL Electric requested Commission approval to build approximately 1.1 miles of new double-circuit 230 kilovolt (“kV”) transmission taps (“Tap Lines”) that are needed to connect the existing Susquehanna-Harwood #1 and #2 230 kV Transmission Lines to the new Tomhicken 230 kV Switchyard (“Tomhicken Switchyard”). The Project also includes the construction of two new 0.1-mile-long 230 kV transmission lines (“Connecting Lines”) from the Tomhicken 230 kV Switchyard to a new

customer-owned 230-34 kV substation. The new 230 kV Connecting Lines, Tap Lines, and Tomhicken 230 kV Switchyard (together, the “Tomhicken 230 kV Switchyard Project”) are located in Hazle Township, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania.

2. PPL Electric filed the Letter of Notification pursuant to the provisions of 52 Pa Code § 57.72(d)(iii) and (vi), which provide that an LON may be file with the Commission in lieu of a full siting application where the HV line is located entirely within existing transmission line ROW and within the property of the sole customer to be served by the line so long as the ROW will not be substantially altered, and where the HV line has a proposed route of 2 miles or less, respectively.

3. On December 23, 2025, the Commission issued a Secretarial Letter acknowledging receipt of the Letter of Notification.

4. On December 30, 2025, OCA filed a Notice of Intervention and Public Statement.

5. On January 7, 2026, the OCA filed a Protest.

6. On January 14, 2026, the Commission issued a Prehearing Conference Order.

7. On January 15, 2026, the Commission issued an Initial Call-In Telephonic Prehearing Conference Notice for Letter of Notification proceeding. Administrative Law Judges Erin L. Gannon and John M. Coogan (the “ALJs”) were assigned to preside over the Letter of Notification Proceeding.

8. On January 21, 2026, the Commission issued a Secretarial Letter acknowledging receipt of the Letter of Notification and providing a copy of the Publication Notice to appear in the Saturday, January 31, 2026, issue of the Pennsylvania Bulletin.

9. On February 19, 2026, PPL Electric filed Affidavits and Proofs of Publication showing that Public Notice for the Letter of Notification was published in the Wilkes Barre

Citizens' Voice and Wilkes Barre Times Leader on January 28, 2026, and February 4, 2026, pursuant to ALJ Gannon's directive in a January 12, 2026, email.

10. On March 12, 2026, Erika Cook filed a Protest.
11. On March 13, 2026, John Zola filed a Protest.
12. On March 16, 2026, PPL Electric and OCA filed Prehearing Memoranda.
13. On March 20, 2026, the ALJs issued a Scheduling Order which, in part, adopted a procedural schedule for the Letter of Notification proceeding.
14. On March 24, 2026, the ALJs issued an In-Person Evidentiary Hearing Notice, setting the hearing in the above-captioned matter for Thursday, September 17 and Friday, September 18, 2026 at 10:00 AM.
15. On March 26, 2026, the ALJs issued Prehearing Order #1, ordering that Erika Cook and John Zola be added to the list of active parties in the Letter of Notification proceeding.
16. On April 2, 2026, PPL Electric filed Preliminary Objections to the Protests of Erika Cook and John Zola.
17. On April 7, 2026, both Erika Cook and John Zola filed Answers to the Preliminary Objections of PPL Electric.
18. On April 13, 2026, OCA filed a Notice of Entry of Appearance.
19. Also on April 13, 2026, OCA filed Answers to the Preliminary Objections of PPL Electric to the Protests of Erika Cook and John Zola.
20. On April 14, 2026, the ALJs issued Prehearing Order #2, denying the Preliminary Objections of PPL Electric to the Protests of Erika Cook and John Zola.
21. On April 21, 2026, PPL Electric filed a Notice of Appearance.
22. On May 5, 2026, the ALJs issued a Public Input Hearings Notice.

23. On May 7, 2026, OCA filed the instant Motion to Consolidate.

24. On May 13, 2026, PPL Electric filed its direct testimony in the Tomhicken 230 kV Switchyard Project proceeding, consisting of PPL Electric Statement Nos. 1-4.

25. On May 19, 2026, Erika Cook filed a Motion to Deny the Pending Applications and Zoning Exemption Petition Submitted by PPL Electric Without Prejudice<sup>2</sup>, pending an “ongoing, active land-use and zoning litigation between NP Hazleton Holdings 1, LLC and the Hazle Township Board of Supervisors that is currently pending in Luzerne County Court of Common Pleas, Case # 202513744.”<sup>3</sup>

26. OCA has also issued several sets of interrogatories throughout the course of the Letter of Notification proceeding, most recently serving its Set IX Interrogatories on May 20, 2026.

27. The Tomhicken 230 kV Switchyard Project is the first project of two that will be needed to serve new and future load within the area in which it will be constructed. The Tomhicken 230 kV Switchyard Project is referred to as “Phase 1” of these two projects. It is needed forthwith to interconnect a customer requesting transmission-level service in Hazle Township, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania to the 230 kV system.

## **B. SUGARLOAF 500/230 KV TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT**

28. The proceeding at Docket No. A-2026-3061547 (“Full Siting Application”) was initiated on April 6, 2026, when PPL Electric filed an Application with the Commission for approval to (1) rebuild approximately 4.4 miles of the existing single-circuit Sunbury-Susquehanna #1 230 kilovolt (“kV”) Transmission Line for double-circuit 230 kV operation (“Susquehanna-Nescopeck #1 and #2 230 kV Transmission Lines”) from the existing Susquehanna

---

<sup>2</sup> PPL Electric continues to review Ms. Cook’s Motion to Deny Applications/Petition Without Prejudice and reserves all rights to respond to the same in accordance with the Commission’s regulations at 52 Pa. Code, Ch. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Cook Motion to Deny Applications/Petition Without Prejudice at 6.

Switchyard to the proposed Nescopeck 230 kV Switchyard (“Nescopeck Switchyard”); (2) construct a new approximately 0.9-mile-long 230 kV transmission line tap for future 230 kV double-circuit operation (“Sunbury-Nescopeck #1 230 kV Transmission Line” or “Tap Line”) from the existing single-circuit Sunbury-Susquehanna #1 230 kV Transmission Line to the new Nescopeck Switchyard; (3) raise approximately 0.5 miles of the Sunbury-Susquehanna 500 kV Transmission Line to accommodate the undercrossing of the proposed Susquehanna-Nescopeck #1 and #2 230 kV Transmission Lines and the proposed Sunbury-Nescopeck #1 230 kV Transmission Line; and (4) construct a new 11.2-mile-long 230 kV transmission line (“Sugarloaf 500/230 kV Transmission Line”) for future double-circuit 500 kV capacity between the proposed Nescopeck Switchyard, new Tomhicken Switchyard<sup>4</sup>, and the existing Harwood 230/69 kV Substation (“Harwood Substation”). Collectively, the new and rebuilt transmission lines are referred to in the Full Siting Application as the “Sugarloaf 500/230 kV Transmission Line Project”.

29. On April 22, 2026, the Commission issued a Secretarial Letter acknowledging receipt of the Letter of Notification.

30. On May 7, 2026, OCA filed a Protest and Public Statement.

31. On May 19, 2026, Erika Cook filed a Motion to Deny the Pending Applications and Zoning Exemption Petition Submitted by PPL Electric Without Prejudice<sup>5</sup>, pending an “ongoing, active land-use and zoning litigation between NP Hazleton Holdings 1, LLC and the

---

<sup>4</sup> The Tomhicken Switchyard has not yet been constructed and is the subject of a Letter of Notification (“LON”) which was filed on December 19, 2025, at Docket No. A-2025-3059443. A Decision has not yet been issued in this matter.

<sup>5</sup> PPL Electric continues to review Ms. Cook’s Motion to Deny Applications/Petition Without Prejudice and reserves all rights to respond to the same in accordance with the Commission’s regulations at 52 Pa. Code, Ch. 5.

Hazle Township Board of Supervisors that is currently pending in Luzerne County Court of Common Pleas, Case # 202513744.”<sup>6</sup>

32. The Sugarloaf 500/230 kV Transmission Line Project is the second project of two that will be needed to serve new and future load within the area in which it will be constructed. The Sugarloaf 500/230 kV Transmission Line Project is referred to as “Phase 2” of these two projects. It is needed to serve the customer that will be served through Phase 1 of the projects, whose load will increase in stages to approximately 965 MW by 2033. It is also needed to serve additional customers in the area who have applied for service, with a combined requested load of over 5,000 MW by 2033. The Sugarloaf 500/230 kV Transmission Line Project will resolve projected load violations created by these load additions.

## **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

33. Section 5.81 of the Commission’s regulations allows for the consolidation of one or more proceedings if they share sufficient common questions of law or fact and where a joint proceeding would avoid unnecessary costs or delay:

(a) The Commission or presiding officer, with or without motion, may order proceedings involving a common question of law or fact to be consolidated. The Commission or presiding officer may make orders concerning the conduct of the proceeding as may avoid unnecessary costs or delay.

52 Pa. Code. § 5.81.

34. There are other considerations that must be evaluated in ruling on a motion for consolidation, which are:

- Will the presence of additional issues cloud a determination of the common issues?
- Will consolidation result in reduced cost of litigation and decision-making for the parties and the Commission?

---

<sup>6</sup> Cook Motion to Deny Applications/Petition Without Prejudice at 6.

- Do issues in one proceeding go to the heart of an issue in the other proceeding?
- Will consolidation unduly protract the hearing, or produce a disorderly and unwieldy record?
- Will different statutory and legal issues be involved?
- Does the party with the burden of proof differ in the proceedings?
- Will consolidation unduly delay the resolution of one of the proceedings?
- Will supporting data in both proceedings be repetitive?<sup>7</sup>

35. In ruling on a Motion to Consolidate, each factor must be evaluated and balanced against one another; although no one consideration “is dispositive of a consolidation, any more so than the presence of a common question of law or fact.”<sup>8</sup>

36. In addition, the Commission’s regulations at Ch. 57, Subch. G make clear the distinction between a “letter of notification” and a “full siting application.” Indeed, a letter of notification is an abbreviated submission that can be used only when a utility demonstrates that the subject HV line project satisfies the criteria of 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(d)(1). The Commission has an extensive history of approving these “abbreviated” letters of notification where the project that is the subject of the letters complies with 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(d)(1)(iii) and (vi), wherein the transmission line project is located entirely within existing ROW and property owned by the customer to be served and will not substantially alter the ROW, and where the transmission line project has a proposed route of two miles or less, respectively.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> *Catherine A. Mishler v. The Peoples Natural Gas Company*, 2008 Pa. PUC LEXIS 1094, \*\*9-10, Docket Nos. C-2008-2041160 and C-2008-2038933 (Order entered Dec. 1, 2008).

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at \*10.

<sup>9</sup> *See, e.g., Letter of Notification of Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC for approval to construct the Farmers Valley-Ridgway 115 kV Interconnection Project in Sergeant Township, McKean County, Pennsylvania*, Docket No. A-2026-3060524, 2026 Pa. PUC LEXIS 89, at \*5 (Opinion and Order entered March 26, 2026) (“*Farmers Valley-Ridgway LON*”); *Letter of Notification of Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC for approval to construct the Middletown Junction – Smith Street 115 kV Transmission Line Tap located in East Manchester Township, York County, Pennsylvania*, Docket No. A-2023-3043841, 2024 Pa. PUC LEXIS 8, at \*\*4-5 (Opinion

37. Relatedly, 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(d)(5) states the action that the Commission is permitted to take with respect to a letter of notification, which is distinct from the actions that it may take with respect to a full siting application.<sup>10</sup> Where the Commission approves a letter of notification, “the HV line shall be located and constructed without the application process set forth in [Ch. 57, Subch. G].”<sup>11</sup> Where the Commission does not approve of a letter of notification, “it shall direct the applicant to comply with the application process set forth in [Ch. 57, Subch. G].”<sup>12</sup> However, with respect to a full siting application, the Commission must issue an order “either granting or denying the application, in whole or in part, as fed or upon the terms, conditions or modifications, or the location, construction, operation, or maintenance of the line as the Commission may deem appropriate.”<sup>13</sup>

### **III. ARGUMENT**

38. PPL Electric maintains that consolidation of the proceedings would be improper.

39. As an initial matter, there are separate questions of law and fact involved that should remain separate.

---

and Order entered January 18, 2024) (“*Middletown Junction – Smith Street LON*”) ; *Letter of Notification of PECO Energy Company filed Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code Chapter 57 Subchapter G, with respect to the Reconductoring and Reconfiguration of the Island Road-Penrose-Grays Ferry 230 kV Transmission Line located in the City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, PA*, Docket No. A-2010-2205696, 2011 Pa. PUC LEXIS 685, at \*6 (Opinion and Order entered February 25, 2011) (“*Island Road-Penrose-Grays Ferry LON*”) ; *Letter of Notification of West Penn Power Company filed pursuant to 52 Pa. Code Chapter 57 for construction of the Northpointe Loop 138 kV Transmission Line in South Buffalo Township, Armstrong County, Pennsylvania*, Docket No. A-111250F0104, 2005 Pa. PUC LEXIS 327, at \*\*2 and 5 (Opinion and Order entered August 25, 2005) (“*Northpointe Loop LON*”).

<sup>10</sup> 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(d)(5).

<sup>11</sup> *Energy Conservation Council of Pa. v. PUC*, 995 A.2d 465, 482 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2010) (emphasis added).

<sup>12</sup> 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(d)(5). *See also Letter of Notification of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, Filed Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code Chapter 57 Subchapter G, for Approval to Rebuild the Existing Breinigsville-Alburtis 500 kV Transmission Line in Lehigh County, Pennsylvania*, Docket No. A-2017-2635709 (Order entered August 3, 2018) (“Given PPL Electric’s failure to demonstrate the need for the proposed project and examine available alternatives, we must deny PPL Electric’s LON and direct PPL Electric to comply with the application process set forth in 52 Pa. Code § 57.72,” (emphasis added).

<sup>13</sup> 52 Pa. Code § 57.76(a).

40. The Letter of Notification was filed pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(d), in lieu of a full siting application. The filing of a letter of notification does not require the submission of the same amount of evidence as a full siting application.<sup>14</sup> So, while certain similar questions of law are present, there are significant differences in the evidentiary submissions required in each proceeding.<sup>15</sup>

41. The differences between the evidence and data to be submitted in support of the Letter of Notification means that consolidation with a Full Siting Application will cloud the determination of issues regarding the Letter of Notification. In addition, data supporting the Letter of Notification will be distinct from and not duplicative of data supporting the Full Siting Application. These distinct evidentiary issues demonstrate that consolidation is not warranted under several of the factors the Commission considers.

42. By way of further explanation, the evidence submitted as part of the Letter of Notification includes, similarly to the Full Siting Application:

- The name of the applicant and the address of its principal business office;
- The name, title, and business address of the applicant's attorney and person authorized to receive notice and communications with respect to the application, if this is not the attorney of the applicant;
- A general description of the proposed route of the HV line;
- A general statement of the need for the proposed HV line; and
- A statement of safety considerations to be incorporated into the design, construction, and maintenance of the proposed HV line.

52 Pa. Code § 57.72(c)(1)-(3), (5), and (6).

---

<sup>14</sup> Compare 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(d)(4) to 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(c).

<sup>15</sup> OCA Motion to Consolidate at 10.

43. However, that the evidence which is not required to be submitted as part of the Letter of Notification, but was required as part of the Full Siting Application, includes:

- The names and addresses of known persons, corporations and other entities of record owning property within the proposed ROW, together with an indication of HV line ROWs acquired by the applicant;
- A description of studies which had been made as to the projected environmental impact of the HV line as proposed and of the efforts which have been and which will be made to minimize the impact of the HV line upon the environment and upon scenic and historic areas;
- A description of the efforts of the applicant to locate and identify archaeologic, geologic, historic, scenic or wilderness areas of significance within 2 miles of the proposed ROW and the location and identity of the areas discovered by the applicant;
- The location and identity of airports within 2 miles of the nearest limit of the ROW of the proposed HV line;
- A general description of reasonable alternative routes to the proposed HV line;
- A list of the local, State and Federal governmental agencies which have requirements which shall be met in connection with the construction or maintenance of the proposed HV line and a list of documents which have been or are required to be filed with those agencies in connection with the siting and construction of the proposed HV line;
- The estimated cost of construction of the proposed HV line, and the projected date for completion;
- An exhibit depicting the proposed route on aerial photographs and topographic maps of suitable detail;
- An exhibit describing the proposed HV line, including the length of the line, the design voltage, the size, number and materials of the conductors, the design of the supporting structures and their height, configuration and materials of construction, the average distance between supporting structures, the number of supporting structures, the line to structure clearances and the minimum conductor to ground clearance at mid-span under normal load and average weather conditions and under predicted extreme load and weather conditions;
- An exhibit including a simple drawing of a cross section of the proposed ROW of the HV line and any adjoining ROWs showing the placement of the supporting structures at typical locations, with the height and width of the structures, the width of the ROW and the lateral distance between the conductors and the edge of the ROW indicated;

- An exhibit including a system map which shows in suitable detail the location and voltage of existing transmission lines and substations of the applicant and the location and voltage of the proposed HV line and associated substations; and
- An exhibit stating any identified litigation which has been concluded or is in progress which concerns property or matter relating to the proposed HV line, ROW route, or environmental matters.

52 Pa. Code § 57.72(c)(4) and (7)-(14).

44. The comparison provided above of the evidence required for a letter of notification as compared to that required for a full siting application shows the substantially more limited record that the Letter of Notification proceeding will produce with respect to the transmission lines that are the subject of the Letter of Notification.

45. Additionally, the data in these proceedings with respect to the transmission lines and facilities that are the subject of these proceedings will not be repetitive, because each of the projects involves the siting and construction of different HV transmission line facilities.

46. Consolidation of the proceedings herein would thus produce a more disorderly and unwieldy record than if the proceedings had been kept separate, because of the volume of evidence provided in each proceeding, regarding the separate transmission lines and facilities that are the subject of those proceedings, which must be kept separate.

47. OCA also states that, “[w]hile PPL pleads that other data center customer interconnections require the facilities proposed in the [Full Siting Application], the load growth of the data center customer interconnecting to the [facilities that will be constructed as a part of the Letter of Notification] is sufficient alone to require the Phase 2 facilities to avoid reliability violations.”<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> OCA Motion to Consolidate at 10.

48. However, what the OCA does not acknowledge here is that the construction of Phase 1 of the project will be required regardless of the construction of Phase 2. The requesting customer (“Customer”) independently requires Phase 1 to interconnect to the transmission grid, regardless of the outcome of the Full Siting Application, the subject of which is Phase 2. It is also not the case that, if Phase 1 is approved, Phase 2 will be required to resolve reliability violations that will come about due to the construction of Phase 1. While construction of Phase 2 will be required for the Customer to take service pursuant to its load ramping projections, construction of Phase 2 is not required for the Customer to interconnect to the grid and to begin to take service. There are wholly separate facts, customers, and considerations which necessitate Phase 2.

49. Additionally, a letter of notification is meant to be an abbreviated form of siting application, used in instances where the proposed transmission project would have a lesser impact due to its location, such as within an existing transmission line ROW, public road, project-requesting customer’s ROW, where the proposed route is minimal (2 miles or less), or where a transmission line require a voltage increase, reconductoring, or reconstruction where the ROW will not be substantially altered.<sup>17</sup>

50. Consolidation of the instant proceedings would directly conflict with PPL Electric’s right to engage in this abbreviated letter of notification process, even though the Company has put forth the evidence required to establish that the Letter of Notification it filed properly fell within the qualifications set forth in the Commission’s regulations at Section 57.72(d)(1)(iii) and (vi), resulting in detrimental prejudice to the Company.<sup>18</sup> No party to the Letter of Notification proceeding has disputed this fact in their pleadings or other submissions.

---

<sup>17</sup> 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(d)(1)(i)-(vi). See also *Farmers Valley-Ridgway LON*, at \*4; *Middletown Junction – Smith Street LON*, at \*3; *Island Road-Penrose-Grays Ferry LON*, at \*1; *Northpointe Loop LON*, at \*2.

<sup>18</sup> 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(d)(iii) and (vi).

51. Moreover, consolidation of the Letter of Notification and the Full Siting Application is not proper because the action the Commission may take on the Letter of Notification is distinct from the action it may take on the Full Siting Application. As previously noted, the Commission may approve or deny a letter of notification pursuant to Section 57.72(d)(5).<sup>19</sup> Upon approval, the applicant may proceed with the construction of the project without engaging in the application process set forth in Ch. 57, Subch. G. However, where the Commission denies a letter of notification, “it shall direct the applicant to comply with the application process set forth in [Ch. 57, Subch. G].”<sup>20</sup> But with respect to a full siting application, the Commission may either grant or deny the application, with modifications as appropriate.<sup>21</sup>

52. Upon the denial of a letter of notification, a utility may either prepare a full siting application, or further appeal the denial, the denial of which would result in the need to prepare a full siting application. However, upon the denial of a full siting application, a utility only has one option, which is to further appeal the denial. While the actions that the Commission may take with respect to the proceedings are nominally the same, i.e., approve or deny, the outcome of these actions is wholly different with respect to the way that a utility may respond to a denial.

53. Finally, the consolidation of the proceedings will necessitate an unnecessary delay in the Letter of Notification proceeding, which was initiated nearly four months before the Full Siting Application.

54. Because of the gap between filings in these separate proceedings, a prehearing conference has already been held in the Letter of Notification proceeding, the active parties have

---

<sup>19</sup> 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(d)(5).

<sup>20</sup> 52 Pa. Code § 57.72(d)(5).

<sup>21</sup> 52 Pa. Code § 57.76(a).

been set, parties have engaged in substantial discovery<sup>22</sup>, and a procedural schedule has been set. All of these milestones have yet to occur in the Full Siting Application proceeding.

55. Consolidation will result in undue delay, and unnecessary confusion in the Letter of Notification proceeding, as well as to any new parties to the Full Siting Application proceeding, who will be put in the position of catching up with the procedural history of a proceeding that has been ongoing for more than five months.

56. PPL Electric submits that, for the reasons provided above, a consolidation of the above-captioned proceedings is neither necessary or proper. Rather, consolidation of these proceedings will confuse distinct evidentiary issues, confuse distinct legal issues, and would result in the undue delay of a properly-initiated Letter of Notification proceeding.

---

<sup>22</sup> As of the date of this Answer, OCA has served 10 sets of interrogatories, totaling approximately 80 interrogatories without including subparts and, including subparts, totaling approximately 226 interrogatories.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

WHEREFORE, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation respectfully requests that the Motion for Consolidation of Dockets A-2025-3059443 and A-2026-3061547 of the Office of Consumer Advocate be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Shafer (I.D. # 205681)  
PPL Services Corporation  
645 Hamilton Street, Suite 700  
Allentown, PA 18101  
Voice: 610-774-2599  
Fax: 610-774-4102  
E-mail: mjshafer@pplweb.com

  
David B. MacGregor (I.D. # 28804)  
Garrett P. Lent (I.D. # 321566)  
Lindsay A. Berkstresser (I.D. # 318370)  
Megan E. Rulli (I.D. # 331981)  
Hayley E. Wilburn (I.D. # 336055)  
Post & Schell, P.C.  
17 North Second Street  
12th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601  
Voice: 717-731-1970  
Fax: 717-731-1985  
E-mail: dmacgregor@postschell.com  
E-mail: glent@postschell.com  
E-mail: lberkstresser@postschell.com  
E-mail: mrulli@postschell.com  
E-mail: hwilburn@postschell.com

Date: May 27, 2026

Attorneys for PPL Electric Utilities Corporation