

PLEASE REPLY TO  
412.331.8998

June 6, 2014

Secretary Rosemary Chiavetta  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
P.O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg PA 17105-3265

Docket No. A-2014-2415047 Application of Lyft, Inc.

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Transmitted herewith is Protestant's Answer to Preliminary Objections of Lyft Inc. to the Petition for Leave to Intervene and Protest of JB Taxi LLC t/a County Taxi Cab.

Very truly yours,

/s/ electronically filed

David W. Donley  
Attorney for Protestant  
412.331.8998

DAVID W. DONLEY ATTORNEY AT LAW  
3361 STAFFORD STREET - PITTSBURGH PA 15204-1441  
412.331.8998 DWDONLEY@CHASDONLEY.COM

BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

DOCKET A-2014-2415047  
APPLICATION OF LYFT, INC

-----  
ANSWER TO PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS OF LYFT INC.  
TO THE PETITION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE AND  
PROTEST OF JB TAXI LLC T/A COUNTY TAXI CAB  
-----

Comes now JB Taxi LLC t/a County Tax Cab (Protestant) and files this Answer to the Preliminary Objections of Lyft, Inc. in the above-captioned matter. This Answer is filed pursuant to 52 Pa.Code §5.101(f.) Protestant challenges each of the Preliminary Objections and argues that no valid basis has been stated for the relief requested by Applicant. In support, protestant further pleads as follows:

1. Protestant has complied in all material respects with the requirements for seeking leave to intervene and to protest. With respect to leave to intervene, Protestant's petition conforms to the requirements set forth at 52 Pa.Code §§5.71 through 5.74, and presents a sound basis to conclude that Protestant will directly affected by and bound by the Commission determination in this proceeding were unfair competition authorized. Protestant further avers in its request for leave to intervene that Protestant's interests will not be adequately represented should leave be denied. Accordingly, the Commission should find Protestant is eligible to intervene. 52 Pa.Code §5.72(a)(2)

Protestant's case also suggests that intervention by existing providers of passenger transportation service may be in the public's interest, and accordingly, permitted by 52 Pa.Code §572(a)(3). Specifically, Protestant avers that the public's interest will be materially harmed by the impact of experimental service, as proposed by Lyft, upon existing transportation providers, including Protestant. (Protestant's petition

at Paragraphs 7(d) and (f).) Additionally, if existing providers are deprived of the opportunity to participate, Protestant believes that the record is not likely to be adequately and completely developed. (Protestant's petition at Paragraphs 7(e) and (g).) For these reasons, the Commission should find that good cause exists to grant leave to intervene on the basis that it is necessary and appropriate to the administration of the Public Utility Code.

With respect to the contents of its protest, Protestant has met the Commission's standard as set forth 52 Pa Code 5.51 because Protestant has complied with each of the elements enumerated at 52 Pa Code §5.52 and 52. Pa Code §3.381(c). Applicant's generalized reference to "numerous failures" does not justify the relief requested.

2. While no dispute exists that an application was filed on April 3, 2014, the Preliminary Objections do not reflect Applicant's failure present its application with the certification customarily required of Applicant's at Part 10 of the application form and reading,

10. Certification: Applicant certifies that it is not now engaged in unauthorized intrastate transportation for compensation between points in Pennsylvania and will not engage in said transportation unless and until authorization is received from the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. Application for Motor Common Carrier of Persons in Experimental Service (See Application for Motor Common Carrier Service in Experimental Service. *Revised 12/1/2013*)

Applicant instead elects to experiment with a certification of its own liking.

3. The requirements for standing to intervene are not the same as and may be less restrictive than those required to protest an application. The Preliminary Objections are not correct is stating that the requirements of Section 5.52(a) are the same as those set forth at Section 5.72(a)(3). A petitioner is eligible to be granted standing where its participation is in the public's interest. 52 Pa Code §5.72(3). Protestant's petition should be granted because the Public Utility Code and the Commission's policy anticipate that the impact of a new competitor or a new class of competitors upon existing certificated passenger transportation providers will be evaluated.

The Commission is authorized to grant of a certificate of public convenience only if where the agency determines that the granting of such certificate is necessary or proper for the service, accommodation, convenience, or safety of the public. 66 Pa.C.S. 1103. See also, *Elite Industries, Inc. v. Pa. PUC*, 793 A. 2d 160 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2002). In this respect, an adequate basis is not suggested by the application that Applicant currently complies or in the future intends to comply with the marketplace it seeks to enter.

Applicant challenges Protestant's standing on the basis of Commission precedent yet anticipates the Commission should waive all precedent, regulations and requirements that may be inconsistent with Applicant's ongoing operations in apparent defiance of the Public Utility Code as well as its proposed operations moving forward <sup>1</sup>. The Commission should deny Applicant's Preliminary Objections as to any issue of standing because, (1) showing good cause, Protestant has in this proceeding specifically requested that the Commission's precedent on the issue of standing be revisited where applications styled as "experimental" are presented and (2) the standards for reviewing the merits of passenger applications are to include, among other factors, a determination of whether the operations of a new entrant would endanger or impair Protestant's operations to an extent that would be contrary to the public interest. 52 Pa Code 41.14(c)

a. Applicant intends to compete directly for the patrons now using other classes of service and to enter as much of the Pennsylvania marketplace as it can . The self-serving label of "experimental service" and the rhetoric of "ride-sharing" do not justify a finding that patrons using transportation services not classified as "experimental" are the current and future target of Applicant's marketing efforts. As such, Protestant

-----  
1. See Part IV of page 3 of Attachment A to the application reading, "To the extent that the proposed service is deemed inconsistent with any existing regulations, Applicant requests waiver of such regulations pursuant to the Commission's authority under 66 Pa.C.S. § 501 and 52 Pa. Code § 5.43."

should be afforded the opportunity to challenge the assumptions underlying Applicant's case.

The Commission should understand Applicant's purpose is to compete with existing passenger transportation providers, specifically including Protestant and other call-and-demand operators. Before the Commission in this proceeding are factual issues as to what distinction between "experimental service" and "call and demand" service may be worthy of recognition and which are simply illusory and brought forward with a purpose to evade the burdens, limitations and restrictions adopted by the Commission and observed by existing providers because the public's interest requires. The jargon of Transportation Network Company (TNC) and peer-to-peer ridesharing may be little more than a means of requesting service and confirming dispatch of a vehicle. While Applicant wishes to style its operation as "experimental," there may be no factual or legal basis to assume the public's interest is to be served by a special type of competitor which is free to ignore service requests from patrons who, for example, may (1) want insurance coverage to apply (2) not have access to the technology required at the time the service is needed, (3) not be traveling to or from a location believed by drivers to be desirable starting or stopping points or (4) not have the benefit of credit or favorable reviews maintained in the Applicant's data base.

b. Protestant incorporates its Answers to Paragraphs 1 through 3(a) in response to the argument offered in this Preliminary Objection.

c. Protestant incorporates its Answers to Paragraphs 1 through 3(a) in response to the argument offered in this Preliminary Objection.

d. The *YellowX* decision may not provide a sound basis for evaluating Applicant's proposal because it addresses circumstances that are materially different in several respects, most notably the absence of a design to operate without effective insurance coverage for the traveling public. (Reference Docket A-2014-2410269, *Application of Yellow Cab Company of Pittsburgh, Inc.*, Order entered May 22, 2014.) Other reasons that the Commission should deny Preliminary Objections based upon the *YellowX*

decision are that (1) the application was unopposed (2) for all intents and purposes, the applicant in that proceeding would control both the “experimental service” operations and those of the dominant, existing provider and (3) the Commission’s finding in the cited proceeding that an App-based technology is “...a wider ranging, faster and more user friendly scheduling of transportation services” may not be supported by any particular evidence. (*YellowX* supra, slip opinion at Page 6.) In all events with respect to the cited decision, any impact upon existing providers will remain substantially under the control of the same regulated entity.

e. Protestant incorporates its Answers to Paragraphs 1 through 3(d) in response to the argument offered in this Preliminary Objection.

f. Protestant incorporates its Answers to Paragraphs 1 through 3(d) in response to the argument offered in this Preliminary Objection.

#### Conclusion

WHEREFORE, for the reasons stated above, Protestant requests that the Preliminary Objections to Protestant’s Petition for Leave to Intervene and Protest be denied in all respects and that Protestant be permitted to intervene in this proceeding for the purpose of opposing the Application

Respectfully submitted,

*electronically filed*  
David W. Donley  
Attorney for Protestant  
3361 Stafford Street  
Pittsburgh PA 15204-1441  
412.331.8998 voice  
412.331.5720 facsimile  
PA Id. 19727

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the foregoing Protest upon the parties, listed below, in accordance with the requirements of § 1.54 (relating to service by a party)

By first-class mail, postage prepaid

James P. Dougherty, Esquire  
Barbara A. Darkes, Esquire  
Adeolu A. Bakare, Esquire  
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC  
PO Box 1166  
Harrisburg PA 17108-1166

Bryan L. Heulitt Jr, Esquire  
Philadelphia Parking Authority  
701 Market Street. Suite 5400  
Philadelphia PA 19106

Ray F. Middleman, Esquire  
Paul S. Guarnieri, Esquire  
Malone Middleman PC  
11676 Perry Highway, Suite 3100  
Wexford PA 15090

Michael S. Henry, Esquire  
Michael S. Henry LLC  
2336 South Broad Street  
Philadelphia PA 19145

Carl W. Hovenstine, Vice President  
Pauls Cab Service Inc  
735 Market Street  
Sunbury PA 17801

Lloyd R. Persun, Esquire  
Persun & Heim PC  
PO Box 659  
Mechanicsburg PA 17055-0659

Mr. Samuel R. Marshall, President  
The Insurance Federation of Pennsylvania  
1600 Market Street, Suite 1720  
Philadelphia PA 19103

Mr. Ernest Delbo  
Shamokin Yellow Cab  
212 W Independence Street  
Shamokin PA 17872

Administrative Law Judge Mary D. Long  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Piatt Place - Suite 220  
301 5th Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Administrative Law Judge Jeffrey A. Watson  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Piatt Place - Suite 220  
301 5th Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Dated this 6th day of June, 2014

electronically filed  
David W. Donley  
Attorney for J.B. Taxi t/a County Taxi Cab  
3361 Stafford Street  
Pittsburgh PA 15204-1441  
(412) 331-8998  
Pa ID 19727 A-2014-2415047