

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA



DARRYL A. LAWRENCE
Consumer Advocate

OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE
555 Walnut Street, 5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101-1923
(717) 783-5048
(800) 684-6560

 @pa_oca
 /pennoca
FAX (717) 783-7152
consumer@paoca.org
www.oca.pa.gov

July 24, 2026

Via Electronic Filing

Matthew L. Homsher, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: 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, Hazle, Hollenback, Nescopeck, and Sugarloaf Townships in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania; Docket No. A-2026-3061547;

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 Baidwan Investments LLC 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; Docket No. A-2026-3061549 et al.; and,

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

Matthew L. Homsher, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
July 24, 2026
Page 2

Dear Secretary Homsher:

Attached for electronic filing, please find the Office of Consumer Advocate's Memorandum Regarding Site Visits Along Alternative Routes in this proceeding.

Copies have been served on the parties as indicated on the enclosed Certificate of Service.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jacob Guthrie
Jacob Guthrie, Esq.
Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 334367
Email: JGuthrie@paoca.org

Enclosures

cc: Administrative Law Judge Steven K. Haas (Via Email Only: sthaas@pa.gov)
Administrative Law Judge Emily A. Farren (Via Email Only: efarren@pa.gov)
Certificate of Service

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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, : Hazle, Hollenback, Nescopeck, and Sugarloaf Townships in : Luzerne County, Pennsylvania :	Docket Nos. A-2026-3061547
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 Certain Portions of Lands in Black Creek, Hazle, : Hollenback, Nescopeck, and/or Sugarloaf Townships, : 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 :	A-2026-3061549 <i>et al.</i>
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 :	P-2026-3061609

I hereby certify that I have this day filed electronically on the Commission’s electronic filing system and served a true copy of the following document, the Office of Consumer Advocate’s Memorandum Regarding Site Visits Along Alternative Routes, upon parties of record in this proceeding in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code Section 1.54 (relating to service by a participant), in the manner and upon the persons listed below.

Dated this 24th day of July, 2026.

SERVICE BY E-MAIL ONLY

Michael J. Shafer, Esq.
Michelle L. Bartolomei
PPL Services Corporation
645 Hamilton Street
Suite 700
Allentown, PA 18101
mjshafer@pplweb.com
mbartolomei@pplweb.com
Counsel for PPL

Justin P. Richards, Esq.
Elliott Greenleaf, P.C.
15 Public Square, Suite 210
Wilkes-Barre, PA 18701
jpr@elliottgreenleaf.com
*Counsel for Michael and Deena Bereznak;
Mark L. Clark; Erika K. and Anthony J.
Cook; Michael F. Dunleavy; Jill Groce;
John G. and Melissa Kramer; Wendy
Larock and Patricia Kisenwether; Paul
and Mary Malone; Robert J. Pope; Jason
and Melissa Ritz; Sugar Maple Trails,
LLC; William John and Cynthia A.
Tressler; Jason D. Zola; Daniel E. Zola;
Erik D. Sharkey; Tiffany M. Sharkey;
George Larock; and Jane A. Reakes*

Daniel E. Zola, Esq.
Zola Law Offices, Inc.
129 Susquehanna Boulevard
West Hazleton, PA 18202
azola@zolalaw.com
*Counsel for Jason D. Zola;
and Daniel E. Zola*

John D. Butala
Victoria A. Butala
260 Mountain Road
Drums, PA 18222
victoria.butala@gmail.com
Pro Se

David B. MacGregor, Esq.
Garrett P. Lent, Esq.
Lindsay A. Berkstresser, Esq.
Megan E. Rulli, Esq.
Hayley E. Wilburn, Esq.
Thomas Connolly
Brittney Corey
Post & Schell, P.C.
17 North Second Street
12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
dmacgregor@postschell.com
glent@postschell.com
lberkstresser@postschell.com
mrulli@postschell.com
hwilburn@postschell.com
tconnolly@postschell.com
bcorey@postschell.com
Counsel for PPL

John G. Dean, Esq.
Maryrose E. Babyak, Esq.
Elliott Greenleaf, P.C.
15 Public Square, Suite 210
Wilkes-Barre, PA 18701
jgd@elliottgreenleaf.com
meb@elliottgreenleaf.com
*Counsel for Richard and Bridget Caputo; and
John F. and Jill M. Zola*

Louise A. Knight, Esq.
3610 Logan Court, Unit 3B
Camp Hill, PA 17011
attylknight@gmail.com
*Counsel for Richard and Bridget Caputo; and
John F. and Jill M. Zola*

Respectfully submitted,

Counsel for:
Darryl A. Lawrence
Consumer Advocate

Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
Forum Place, 5th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923
717-783-5048

Dated: July 24, 2026

/s/ Jacob Guthrie
Jacob Guthrie, PA Attorney I.D. # 334367
Assistant Consumer Advocate

Olivia M. Spergel, PA Attorney I.D. # 337929
Assistant Consumer Advocate

Melanie Joy El Atieh, PA Attorney I.D #209323
Deputy Consumer Advocate

Email: OCASugarloaf2026@paoca.org

**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) : Docket No. A-2026-3061547
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, Hazle, Hollenback, Nescopeck, :
and Sugarloaf Townships in Luzerne County, :
Pennsylvania :

Application of PPL Electric Utilities :
Corporation under 15 Pa.C.S. § 1511(c) for a :
Finding and Determination that the Service to : Docket Nos. A-2026-3061549 *et al*
Be Furnished by the Applicant Through Its :
Proposed Exercise of the Power Of Eminent :
Domain to Acquire Certain Portions of Lands :
in Black Creek, Hazle, Hollenback, :
Nescopeck, and/or Sugarloaf Townships, :
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 :

Petition of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation :
for Findings that a Structure to Shelter :
Electrical and Control Equipment at the : Docket No. P-2026-3061609
Proposed Nescopeck Switchyard in :
Nescopeck Township, Luzerne County, :
Pennsylvania is Reasonably Necessary for the :
Convenience or Welfare of the Public :

MEMORANDUM OF THE OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE
REGARDING SITE VISITS ALONG ALTERNATIVE ROUTES

Pursuant to the directive from Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) Emily A. Farren and Steven K. Haas, of the Office of Administrative Law Judge (OALJ) of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission), at the Prehearing Conference convened on July 10, 2026, the Office of Consumer Advocate (OCA) submits the following Memorandum regarding convening site visits along alternative routes. Specifically, while the OCA does not currently support convening site visits along alternative routes, the OCA respectfully requests that the ALJs permit parties to renew requests for site visits along alternative routes at a future point in time if supported by the evidence presented.

I. BACKGROUND

On April 7, 2026, PPL submitted a transmission line siting application requesting 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, Hazle, Hollenback, Nescopeck, and Sugarloaf Townships in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania (Phase 2 Application). The Phase 2 Application is docketed at A-2026-3061547 and is associated with a number of dockets which include applications for Commission authorization for PPL to exercise eminent domain and a zoning

petition.¹ In the Phase 2 Application, PPL requested that the Application, as well as the associated condemnation application and zoning petition dockets, be consolidated for purposes of hearings and, if necessary, decision.² Consolidation was granted at the July 10, 2026, Prehearing Conference.³

As part of the Phase 2 Application, PPL submitted an Alternatives and Siting Analysis, including identifying three potential transmission line routes and providing the basis for the selection of the proposed route.⁴ Pursuant to the Commission's regulations, the potential routes other than the proposed route, defined as "alternative routes," can share no more than 25% of the same right-of-way as the proposed route.⁵

At the July 10, 2026, Prehearing Conference, the parties discussed whether site visits should be convened for purposes of taking the testimony of a landowner whose property would be included in the right-of-way of an alternative route.⁶ On July 17, 2026, PPL submitted a memorandum arguing that such testimony should not be taken in this proceeding.

II. CLARIFICATION IS REQUESTED REGARDING THE MEANING AND PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED ROUTE AND ALTERNATIVE ROUTES

The OCA requests the presiding officers to provide clarity over the meaning and purpose of the proposed route and alternative routes. The OCA's understanding is explained in this section

II.

¹ These docket numbers include: P-2026-3061609, A-2026-3061549, A-2026-3061550, A-2026-3061551, A-2026-3061552, A-2026-3061553, A-2026-3061554, A-2026-3061555, A-2026-3061556, A-2026-3061557, A-2026-3061560, A-2026-3061561, A-2026-3061562, A-2026-3061564, A-2026-3061566, A-2026-3061567, A-2026-3061568, A-2026-3061569, A-2026-3061570, A-2026-3061571, A-2026-3061572, A-2026-3061573, A-2026-3061576, A-2026-3061577, A-2026-3061578, A-2026-3061579, A-2026-3061581, A-2026-3061582, A-2026-3061583, A-2026-3061584, A-2026-3061585.

² Phase 2 Application ¶ 138.

³ Tr. at 12.

⁴ Phase 2 Application, Attach. 4 at 4-29 – 4-62.

⁵ 52 Pa. Code § 57.1.

⁶ Tr. at 18-19.

Through its application, the utility-applicant seeks the Commission's approval of the proposed route and only the proposed route.⁷ The reason the applicant includes alternative routes in the application is to demonstrate that the applicant had considered reasonable alternatives and that its decision to select the proposed route was not arbitrary or capricious.⁸ Given this, the Commission's regulations require the applicant to provide certified mail notice (i.e., specific notice) of its application only to landowners/tenants along the proposed route and not the alternative routes.⁹ Under the Commission's regulations, a landowner/tenant affected by a proposed route is automatically granted party status to the transmission line siting application because the affected property could be subject to an eminent domain application.¹⁰

In 1978, the Commission was requested to require by regulation that every landowner along the proposed and alternative routes be made a formal party to the proceeding so that the Commission's approval of the siting application, "however modified, will be binding on all." The Commission "declined to do so." The Commission explained:

Such a practice would be unnecessarily cumbersome, and could be unfair in that it would seem to require participation by landowners who may never be affected by the line. We prefer the procedure as proposed wherein if the application is amended those affected for the first time by the amendment will be given specific notice and opportunity to be heard and not otherwise.¹¹

Under Commission regulations, the current practice is that landowners/tenants along the alternative routes identified by the applicant do not receive specific notice (i.e., certified mail

⁷ 52 Pa. Code §§ 57.71-57.77.

⁸ *Paxtowne v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 398 A.2d 254, 256 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1979) (citing *West Penn Power Co. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 184 A.2d 143 (1962)) ("The applicable legal standards for review of the selection of a route for utility lines are whether the powers conferred upon the public utility have been wantonly, capriciously or arbitrarily exercised.").

⁹ See PUC Regulations at 52 Pa. Code §§ 52 Pa. Code 57.74(c)(1)(iv), 52.72(c)(4); see also 1978 *Re Overhead Electric Transmission Lines*, 1978 Pa. PUC LEXIS 203, * 16-17 (Mar. 1, 1978) (attached as Appendix A).

¹⁰ 52 Pa. Code § 57.75(i)(3).

¹¹ *Re Overhead Electric Transmission Lines*, *17.

notice) of the application because they may never be affected by the transmission line through condemnation proceedings. Rather, the Commission, by implication, concluded that it is sufficient that landowners/tenants along the alternative routes receive general notice of the application like other members of the public, through the publication in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* and in the transmission utility's publications within newspapers with general circulation in the affected areas.

Having established that the utility-applicant by way of its siting application is not seeking the Commission's approval of a "menu of options" of routes but rather is seeking approval of the proposed route only, it is an important protection for landowners/tenants along alternative routes that the selection and approval of a proposed route in this proceeding is not binding upon them given that there will be no condemnation proceedings to follow. However, this does *not* mean that the parties are restricted or prevented from presenting evidence and advocating for the ALJs and the Commission to approve modifications to the route or to approve an alternative route all together, whether the alternative route is one identified in the application or a different alternative identified by a party's witness. The regulations contemplate the ability of the ALJs and Commission to grant the application, in whole or in part, either "as filed", or "upon the terms, conditions or modifications, of the location...of the line as the Commission may deem appropriate."¹²

In the event the ALJs or Commission should direct modifications to the route, the Commission should direct the utility applicant to amend its siting and condemnation applications regarding the route, provide certified mail notice (i.e., specific notice) to affected landowners/tenants, and provide all parties to the proceeding a meaningful opportunity to be heard including through appropriate hearings regarding the amended route prior to rendering a final

¹² 52 Pa. Code § 57.76(a).

determination.¹³ Indeed, the regulations provide: “every party, utility, agency or municipality affected by the amendment” must be “given reasonable notice thereof and an opportunity to present evidence with respect to the amendment.”¹⁴ The only notice that is reasonable where the proposed route is modified is specific notice (i.e., certified mail notice) to the affected landowner/tenant along the modified/newly proposed route.

III. ALTERNATIVE ROUTE DUE PROCESS CONSIDERATIONS

It is the OCA’s understanding that alternative routes are subject to investigation and potential selection by the ALJs or Commission under specific circumstances. A couple paths could occur. One path is, *prior to* the close of the record, and based on record evidence, the ALJs or Commission could order the applicant to modify its route and provide reasonable notice and meaningful opportunity to be heard of all affected landowners/tenants and parties with respect to the amendment or modification to the route.¹⁵ A second path is, *after* the close of the record, and based on the record evidence, the Commission or ALJs could reopen the record, and direct the applicant to amend its siting application to propose an alternative route be selected.¹⁶ As explained above, unless and until an alternative route is subject to potential selection by the ALJs or Commission as a newly proposed route, landowners/tenants along the alternative route are not

¹³ See 52 Pa. Code §§ 52 Pa Code §§ 57.72(c), 57.75(c)(1)(iv), (f), 69.3102.

¹⁴ 52 Pa. Code § 57.75(f).

¹⁵ 52 Pa. Code § 57.75(f).

¹⁶ See, e.g., *In Re: Application of Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company (TrAILCo) For approval: 1) for a certificate of public convenience to offer, render, furnish or supply transmission service in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; 2) authorization and to locate, construct, operate and maintain certain high-voltage electric substation facilities; 3) authority to exercise the power of eminent domain for the construction and installation of aerial electric transmission facilities along the proposed transmission line routes in Pennsylvania; 4) approval of an exemption from municipal zoning regulation with respect to the construction of buildings; and 5) approval of certain related affiliated interest arrangements*, 2008 Pa. PUC LEXIS 35, *106 (Dec. 12, 2008) (Commission Order remanding record to assigned ALJs) and 2009 Pa. PUC LEXIS 1758, *12-13 (Aug. 25, 2009) (ALJ Order reopening record and permitting applying utility to amend its siting application and directing applying utility to serve the amendment on all parties of record).

entitled to a specific notice and opportunity to be heard as affected landowners.¹⁷ However, once an amendment is made, affected landowners/tenants affected must and “will be given specific notice and opportunity to be heard.”¹⁸

At such time as further appropriate proceedings are necessary to investigate a newly proposed route, landowners/tenants directly affected by that newly proposed route are assured the opportunity to receive specific notice, submit oral lay testimony at a site visit regarding the impact of the newly proposed route on their interests, and to submit written expert witness testimony during the course of the proceeding and at the evidentiary hearing should they so choose.

As provided above, it is an important protection for landowners/tenants along alternative routes that the selection of a proposed route in this proceeding is not binding upon them through condemnation proceedings. Under the Commission’s regulations, a landowner/tenant affected by a proposed route is automatically granted party status to the transmission line siting application if their property would be subject to an eminent domain application when they are served with the applications.¹⁹ By not requiring landowners/tenants along alternative routes to be provided with a specific notice and opportunity to be heard, by implication the Commission has assured that the outcome of the siting application would not be binding on landowners/tenants along the alternative routes through condemnation proceedings.²⁰ Should the ALJs or Commission determine to investigate an alternative route by requiring PPL to amend the Phase 2 Application and provide specific notice and an opportunity to be heard by landowners/tenants along the newly proposed

¹⁷ *Re Overhead Electric Transmission Lines*, 1978 Pa. PUC LEXIS 203, * 16-17 (Mar. 1, 1978).

¹⁸ *Id.* at *17.

¹⁹ 52 Pa. Code § 57.75(i)(3).

²⁰ *Re Overhead Electric Transmission Lines*, 1978 Pa. PUC LEXIS 203, * 16-17 (Mar. 1, 1978).

route, the landowners/tenants whose interests would be affected by that newly proposed route are able to fully litigate all aspects of the amended siting application.²¹

As a result, should the evidence produced in this proceeding weigh in favor of investigating and litigating an alternative route instead of the proposed route identified by PPL in the Phase 2 Application, either an alternative route included in the Application or a different alternative route, landowners along that route will be entitled to specific notice and an opportunity to be heard on the full Phase 2 Application, including requesting site visits along their affected property.

IV. SITE VISITS ALONG ALTERNATIVE ROUTES MAY BE PREMATURE

To preserve judicial economy and due process rights for all parties, site visits should be used only for affected landowners/tenants along (1) the proposed route identified in the application; (2) a newly proposed route resulting from modifications or amendments voluntarily proposed by the applicant or directed by the adjudicators based on record evidence; or (3) an alternative route that is proposed by a party for consideration and supported by other record evidence. Options (1) and (2) are fully discussed above. Option (3) is discussed further below.

Based on information adduced during the course of discovery, public input hearings, or through pre-served, written testimony submitted in this proceeding, testimony regarding the impact of an alternative route to the property rights of landowners along an alternative route which is not yet subject to investigation in this proceeding may become relevant. Namely, parties may support the selection of an alternative route instead of the proposed route, including alternative routes that are not specifically identified in the Phase 2 Application. Because the parties' investigation into alternatives to PPL's proposed route are still nascent at this stage in the proceeding, the OCA submits that it is premature to schedule site visits along alternative routes that are not the subject

²¹ See, e.g., 52 Pa. Code §§ 57.75(e), 57.76(a).

of the instant investigation but requests the opportunity to do so in the future, should the record develop to indicate that an alternative be considered for selection.

Parties and non-parties to this case will have the opportunity to submit testimony at the public input hearings and evidentiary hearings regarding the appropriate route and facilities to be selected. Determinations regarding the weight of any testimony as to the impact of the selection of an alternative route and/or facilities should be reserved for the ALJs' recommendation to the Commission, instead of being precluded as a threshold matter.

As a result, the OCA recommends that the Commission convene site visits along alternative routes only where additional further record evidence supports holding site visits along an alternative route. Until the parties have a full and complete opportunity to investigate reasonable alternatives to PPL's proposed route, the OCA submits that it is prudent to conserve the parties' and Commission's resources by limiting site visits to rights-of-way along the proposed route. However, the OCA reserves the right, and requests that other parties' rights be preserved, to request additional site visits along the rights-of-way for alternative routes should the evidence presented indicate that such site visits are necessary for the Commission to reach a final determination as to the Phase 2 Application, as-filed or as modified.

V. CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the OCA respectfully requests that, should the ALJs determine that at this time site visits should be conducted along the proposed route identified by PPL in its Phase 2 Application, the ALJs' determination should be made without prejudice and subject to revisiting based on the evidentiary record developed in this proceeding.

Counsel for:
Darryl A. Lawrence
Consumer Advocate

Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923
(717) 783-5048

DATED: July 24, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Jacob Guthrie
Jacob Guthrie, PA Attorney I.D. # 334367
Assistant Consumer Advocate

Olivia M. Spergel, PA Attorney I.D. # 337929
Assistant Consumer Advocate

Melanie Joy El Atieh, PA Attorney I.D. # 209323
Deputy Consumer Advocate

Email: OCASugarloaf2026@paoca.org