

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

JESSE TASHLIK, Complainant

v.

PIKE COUNTY LIGHT & POWER COMPANY, Respondent

Docket No. C-2025-3057163

EXCEPTIONS TO INITIAL DECISION

Complainant Jesse Tashlik hereby files these Exceptions to the Initial Decision and respectfully states as follows:

I. THE INITIAL DECISION ERRONEOUSLY CONCLUDES THAT COMPLAINANT PRESENTED NO EVIDENCE OF A VIOLATION

The Initial Decision concludes that Complainant presented no testimony or evidence that Pike County Light & Power Company violated any standard practice, code, tariff, or requirement.

This finding is contrary to the record.

Through discovery, Pike admitted:

1. There are no engineering documents depicting designs for the service at 208 Avenue I.
2. There are no engineering drawings, sketches, or plans showing the mid-span taps installed to serve 208 Avenue I.
3. Pike's engineering guidelines do not prohibit the use of midspans and do not describe specific scenarios in which a midspan can or cannot be used.
4. Pike presented no witness at hearing.

These admissions constitute evidence directly relevant to the reasonableness of Pike's service design and to Pike's claim that the challenged configuration was required by engineering and physical constraints.

II. PIKE PRESENTED NO ENGINEERING EVIDENCE SUPPORTING ITS POSITION

Pike repeatedly asserted that the service configuration was necessary due to physical restrictions, customer choices, clearance requirements, and engineering considerations.

However, Pike admitted that no engineering drawings, plans, sketches, or design documents exist for the challenged installation.

Pike further admitted that no written engineering criteria govern when midspan taps may or may not be used.

Despite these admissions, Pike presented no witness capable of explaining:

- a. Why four mid-span taps were required;
- b. Why a direct service arrangement was not utilized;
- c. Why relocation of the pole would not be a preferable design;
- d. What engineering analysis was performed;
- e. How the configuration was determined to be reasonable.

The Initial Decision nevertheless accepted Pike's position without requiring Pike to produce any engineering testimony or documentation supporting its conclusions.

III. THE INITIAL DECISION FAILS TO ADDRESS EVIDENCE RELATING TO PIKE'S TARIFF OBLIGATIONS

Complainant presented evidence and argument concerning Pike's failure to comply with tariff provisions requiring designation of the point of attachment and meter location.

Complainant further presented evidence regarding Pike's relocation estimate and the absence of supporting engineering documentation.

The Initial Decision does not meaningfully address these issues and instead concludes that Complainant failed to prove a violation.

The failure to analyze material evidence constitutes error.

IV. THE INITIAL DECISION IMPROPERLY DISREGARDS EVIDENCE RELEVANT TO REASONABLE SERVICE UNDER 66 PA.C.S. §1501

The issue before the Commission is whether Pike provided reasonable service.

Evidence demonstrating that Pike:

- a. Created a service configuration unsupported by engineering drawings or plans;
- b. Possessed no written criteria governing the challenged configuration;
- c. Presented no witness to explain the design;
- d. Produced no engineering analysis supporting the design;

is directly relevant to whether Pike provided reasonable service.

The Initial Decision improperly treated this evidence as having no significance.

V. RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Complainant respectfully requests that the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission:

1. Sustain these Exceptions;
2. Reject the Initial Decision;
3. Remand this matter for further proceedings; or
4. Grant such other relief as the Commission deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Jesse Tashlik Complainant