**BEFORE THE**

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

West Goshen Township :

 :

 v. : C-2017-2589346

 :

Sunoco Pipeline, L.P. :

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSES TO WEST GOSHEN TOWNSHIP’S DISCOVERY REQUESTS**

On September 12, 2017, West Goshen Township (West Goshen or Township) served Interrogatories with Requests for Documents on Sunoco Pipeline, L.P. (Sunoco or SPLP). Objections were timely served on September 21, 2017. On October 2, 2017, West Goshen filed a Motion to Dismiss Objections and Compel Production of Documents. On October 10, 2017, Sunoco filed its Response. West Goshen’s motion to compel is ripe for a decision.

Disposition

The standard for permissible discovery is set forth in Section 5.321 of the Commission’s regulations:

**§ 5.321. Scope.**

(c)  *Scope*. Subject to this subchapter, a party may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action, whether it relates to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or to the claim or defense of another party, including the existence, description, nature, content, custody, condition and location of any books, documents, or other tangible things and the identity and location of persons having knowledge of a discoverable matter. It is not ground for objection that the information sought will be inadmissible at hearing if the information sought appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c). Section 5.361 of the Commission’s regulations, however, provides various limitations on the scope of discovery:

**§ 5.361. Limitation of scope of discovery and deposition.**

 (a)  Discovery or deposition is not permitted which:

  (1)  Is sought in bad faith.

   (2)  Would cause unreasonable annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, burden or expense to the deponent, a person or party.

   (3)  Relates to matter which is privileged.

   (4)  Would require the making of an unreasonable investigation by the deponent, a party or witness.

52 Pa. Code § 5.361(a).

Pursuant to Section 5.321(c), a party may obtain discovery of any matter not privileged that is relevant to a pending proceeding and that is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c).

 While discovery is broad in Pennsylvania, parties are not entitled to engage in “fishing expeditions.” *Land v. State Farm Mut. Ins. Co.,* 410 Pa. Super. 579, 585, 600 A.2d 605, 608 (1991).

 In Pennsylvania, a party invoking the attorney-client privilege must establish the following elements: 1) the asserted holder of the privilege is or sought to become a client; 2) the person to whom the communication was made is a member of the bar of a court, or his subordinate; 3) the communication relates to a fact of which the attorney was informed by his client, without the presence of strangers, for the purpose of securing either an opinion of law, legal services or assistance in a legal matter, and not for the purpose of committing a crime or tort; and 4) the privilege has been claimed and is not waived by the client. *Red Vision Sys., Inc. v. Nat’l Real Estate Info. Servs., L.P.,* 108 A.3d 54, 62-63 (Pa.Super. 2015).

If the party asserting privilege satisfies these elements, then the party seeking disclosure must “set forth facts showing that disclosure will not violate the attorney-client privilege, e.g., because the privilege has been waived or because some exception applies.” *Salsman v. Brown*, 51 A.3d 892, 895 (Pa. Super. 2012).

The work product doctrine provides broad protection for any material, including theories, notes, strategies and the like, prepared by the attorney or attorney’s representatives in anticipation of litigation regardless of whether it is confidential. *Levy v. Senate of Pennsylvania*, 94 A.3d 436 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2013).

Township Interrogatory 1

# On October 30, 2017, counsel for West Goshen Township indicated through email that adequate or full responses to Interrogatory 1 had been provided by Sunoco; therefore, the motion shall be denied as moot with respect to Interrogatory 1.

# Township Interrogatory 6

Interrogatory 6: Identify and summarize all communications between any SPLP employees, representatives and consultants regarding the evaluation, selection and design of the location of Valve 344, including in Your response the names of the participants, the date(s), and the substance of the discussion(s). Please attach copies of all documents relating to said communications, including but not limited to meeting agendas, meeting minutes, notes, emails, correspondence and other documents.

SPLP Objection: SPLP objects to WGT 6 on the grounds that identifying and summarizing "all" communications related to the evaluation, selection, design and location of Valve 344 is unreasonable, oppressive, burdensome, and expensive, 52 Pa. Code § 5.361 (a)(2), and would require SPLP to make an unreasonable investigation, 52 Pa. Code § 5.361 (a)(4). SPLP further objects to WGT 6 to the extent it seeks information or documents that are protected by attorney/client privilege, the work product privilege, and/or any other privilege. 52 Pa. Code § 5.361 (a)(3). Without waiver of these objections and the General Objections enumerated above, SPLP will provide a response to this interrogatory.

# SPLP objects to Interrogatory 6 as unreasonable and unduly burdensome because locating all documents responsive to this request requires a time consuming and costly search of electronically stored information, including electronic email, which could potentially implicate tens of thousands of pages of documents. Without waiving its objections, SPLP nevertheless stated it would respond to this Interrogatory but has not done so to the satisfaction of the Township to date. In its October 2 Response, SPLP provided the following response: “Throughout 2016 and 2017, SPLP’s upper management held monthly meetings in which upper management insisted that the engineering group endeavor to construct Valve 344 at the SPLP Use Area because the SPLP Use Area was the preferred location.” SPLP retained an outside consultant to assist in reviewing its documents and communications responsive to this Request and the review is ongoing. SPLP intends to supplement its responses after it has completed review.

# SPLP has provided little information in the past 60 days regarding this Interrogatory, which is sufficiently narrowly tailored to seek communications among SPLP’s representatives relating to the location of Valve 344. The information sought appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c). The information sought relates to issues including: whether at the time of execution of the Settlement agreement, Sunoco had plans and withheld material information about its plans for the ME 2 phase pipeline and whether Sunoco always intended to site Valve 344 on the Janiec 2 Tract and misrepresented this intention at the time of the agreement.

# However, to the extent that some electronic communications/documents are duplicative and repetitive, one copy may be provided. Additionally, to the extent certain communications are between an attorney and client, SPLP may assert this attorney/client privilege regarding specific communications/documents. The Township has a right to dispute such an objection on the basis of privilege when it receives a privilege log or other information identifying specific information withheld.

# Otherwise, Sunoco shall be compelled to provide responses to Interrogatory 6 within twenty days of the date of entry of this order. This should allow for enough time to complete a thorough search of SPLP’s internal documents and communications referencing Valve 344. To the extent a found document or communication is attorney-client privileged information, it need not be produced. 52 Pa. Code § 5.361(a)(3).

# Township Interrogatory 10

Interrogatory 10: Identify all reports, plans, memoranda, notes, correspondence and other documents submitted by or on behalf of SPLP to any other state or local governmental or regulatory agency for any portion of the Mariner East Project within the Township, and produce copies of each.

SPLP Objection: SPLP objects to WGT 10 on the ground that is seeks information that is not relevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence insofar as it seeks information related to "any portion of the Mariner East Project within the Township," which is unrelated to the siting of Valve 344 or the meaning of the Settlement Agreement. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c). Without waiver of these objections and the General Objections enumerated above, SPLP will provide a response to this interrogatory with respect to Valve 344.

# SPLP objects to Interrogatory 10 because it is requesting documents submitted to regulatory agencies for portions of the Mariner East Project in West Goshen Township, which are irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence. SPLP argues that requesting documents related to the entire pipeline corridor in West Goshen Township amounts to a fishing expedition. SPLP objected to this request as unduly broad and burdensome.

## In its October 2 Response, SPLP responded by referring the Township to SPLP’s document production at SPLP000001-SPLP003907. SPLP also noted that documents responsive to this request are available on the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (“DEP’s”) website at http://www.dep.pa.gov/Business/ProgramIntegration/Pennsylvania-Pipeline-Portal/Pages/Mariner-East-II.aspx. Thus, SPLP contends that it made a thoughtful, thorough, and complete response to this Interrogatory.

Contrarily, West Goshen argues the interrogatory 10 is narrowly tailored in that it seeks only that documentation actually “submitted by or on behalf of SPLP to any state or local government or regulatory agency” relating to the portion of the Mariner East Project within the Township.” I am persuaded to agree with the Township that the information requested is relevant to its claims and within the scope of permissible discovery under 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c) in that the requested document may include information on SPLP’s chosen location for Valve 344, when that decision was made, and whether the SPLP’s Use Area was ever considered as a location for Valve 344. Therefore, SPLP shall be compelled to answer Interrogatory 10 within twenty days from the date of entry of this order.

##  Township Interrogatory 13

Interrogatory 13: Identify all communications between SPLP or any of its representative and the Township regarding the acquisition of properties, easements or other rights for the use of land or right of way for the installation or completion of the Mariner East Project, and produce copies of each.

SPLP Objection: SPLP objects to WGT 13 on the ground that it seeks information that is not relevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence insofar as it seeks information related to "properties, easements or other rights for the use of land or right of way for the installation or completion of the Mariner East Project," which is unrelated to the siting of Valve 344 or the meaning of the Settlement Agreement. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321 (c). Without waiver of these objections and the General Objections enumerated above, SPLP will provide a response to this interrogatory with respect to the siting of Valve 344.

# SPLP objects to Interrogatory 13 because it requests all communications between SPLP and the Township regarding property acquisitions related to the Mariner East Project. SPLP contends that this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence because it implicates other portions of the Mariner East project that are unrelated to the Valve or Settlement Agreement at issue here. The request pertains to the entire pipeline corridor in West Goshen Township, and is not limited to the areas relevant to this dispute, namely the SPLP Use Area and the Janiec 2 tract. Requesting communications pertaining to easements and acquisitions and attempted acquisitions related to the entire pipeline corridor in West Goshen Township constitutes a fishing expedition into SPLP’s other legal proceedings in the Township and is unrelated to the Settlement Agreement and Valve at issue here. Without waiving its objections, SPLP nevertheless stated it would respond to this Interrogatory with respect to the siting of Valve 344. In its October 2 Response, SPLP responded by referring the Township to SPLP’s document production at SPLP000001-SPLP00409 which are documents pertaining to the real estate transactions concerning Valve 344.

## I agree with the Township that the Interrogatory is narrowly tailored, in that it seeks communications between only SPLP and the Township regarding property transactions relating to the Mariner East Project. This information is reasonably calculated to identify the locations through which SPLP sought to run the Mariner East Project pipelines and is therefore relevant to whether SPLP attempted to site Valve 344 on the SPLP Use Area as agreed in the Settlement Agreement. Therefore, the requested information falls within the scope of permissible discovery under 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c).

## Township Interrogatory 14

Interrogatory 14: Identify acquisitions and attempted acquisitions of property, easements or other property rights within the Township related to the Mariner East Project in the last five years, and produce copies of any documents relating to Your response.

SPLP Objection: SPLP objects to WGT 14 on the grounds that identifying and producing documents regarding all acquisitions and attempted acquisitions in the Township in the past five years is unreasonable, oppressive, burdensome, and expensive, 52 Pa. Code § 5.361 (a)(2), and would require SPLP to make an unreasonable investigation, 52 Pa. Code § 5.361 (a)(4). SPLP further objects to WGT 14 on the ground that it seeks information that is not relevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence insofar as it seeks information unrelated to the siting of Valve 344 or the meaning of the Settlement Agreement. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321 (c). Without waiver of these objections and the General Objections enumerated above, SPLP will provide a response to this interrogatory with respect to the siting of Valve 344.

# SPLP Objects to Interrogatory 14 because it implicates other portions of the Mariner East Pipeline that are unrelated to the Valve or Settlement Agreement at issue. SPLP argues that the request pertains to the entire pipeline corridor in West Goshen Township, and is not limited to the areas relevant to this dispute, namely the SPLP Use Area and the Janiec 2 tract. Thus, it is a fishing expedition into SPLP’s other legal proceedings in the Township and is unrelated to the Settlement Agreement and Valve at issue here. Without waiving its objections, SPLP nevertheless stated it would respond to this Interrogatory with respect to the siting of Valve 344. In its October 2 Response, SPLP responded as follows: “The only tract that SPLP considered for purchase regarding the siting of the Valve is the Janiec 2 Tract.” Additionally, SPLP referred the Township to SPLP’s document production at SPLP000001-SPLP00727 which are documents pertaining to the real estate transactions concerning Valve 344.

# I agree with the Township that the Interrogatory is narrowly tailored, in that it seeks information regarding property transactions only within the Township relating to the Mariner East Project, which has been ongoing for several years. This information is reasonably calculated to identify the locations through which SPLP sought to run the Mariner East pipelines and is therefore relevant to whether SPLP attempted to site Valve 344 on the SPLP Use Area as agreed in the Settlement Agreement. Therefore, the requested information falls within the scope of permissible discovery under 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c). SPLP shall be compelled to respond to Interrogatory No. 14 within twenty days.

# Township Interrogatory 19

Interrogatory 19: Identify SPLP’s emergency response plan regarding the portion of the Mariner East Project running through the Township and produce a copy of any documents relating thereto.

SPLP Objection: SPLP objects to WGT 19 on the ground that is seeks information that is not relevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence insofar as it seeks information unrelated to the siting of Valve 344 or the meaning of Settlement Agreement. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321 (c).

# SPLP Objects to Interrogatory 19 arguing that is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence because it implicates other portions of the Mariner East project that are not unrelated to the Valve or Settlement Agreement at issue here. The request pertains to the entire pipeline corridor in West Goshen Township, and is not limited to the areas relevant to this dispute, namely the SPLP Use Area and the Janiec 2 tract. Additionally, SPLP’s emergency response plans contain sensitive and confidential security information. Safeguarding detailed emergency response information is critically important to protecting against security breaches that could threaten the Mariner East Pipeline and the health and safety of the community.

# I agree with the Township that the Interrogatory is narrowly tailored, in that the purpose of the Settlement Agreement, and SPLP’s agreement therein to site Valve 344 on the SPLP Use Area, was to address the Township’s safety concerns pertaining to the Mariner East Project. The Township anticipates that SPLP’s emergency response plan will include information addressing how Valve 344 at its proposed location on the Janiec 2 Tract factors into SPLP’s emergency response plan, and whether the safety concerns raised by the Township and its citizens prior to the Settlement Agreement have been properly addressed by SPLP. Therefore, this information is relevant and reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of other admissible evidence, thereby falling within the scope of permissible discovery under 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c). Additionally, there is a Protective Order in place to protect confidential information in this litigated proceeding.

# Township Interrogatory 20

Interrogatory 20: Identify all traffic studies performed by or on behalf of SPLP regarding the portion of the Mariner East Project within the Township or within townships adjacent to the Township, and produce a copy of any reports and other documents relating to said studies.

SPLP Objection: SPLP objects to WGT 20 on the ground that it seeks information that is not relevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence insofar as it seeks information regarding traffic studies in adjacent townships, which is unrelated to the siting of Valve 344 or the meaning of the Settlement Agreement. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321 (c). Without waiver of these objections and the General Objections enumerated above, SPLP will provide a response to this interrogatory in relation to Valve 344.

# SPLP Objects to Interrogatory 20 insofar as traffic studies in other township have no bearing on the narrow issues before the Commission in this proceeding. Any such studies are not relevant to the placement of the Valve at the SPLP Use Area or the Janiec 2 Tract, or the underlying Settlement Agreement. Without waiving its objections, SPLP nevertheless stated it would respond to this Interrogatory with respect to the siting of Valve 344. In its October 2 Response, SPLP responded that it has not undertaken any traffic studies in West Goshen Township.

# I agree with the Township that the Interrogatory is narrowly tailored to seek information aimed at assessing the credibility of testimony given by SPLP representative, Matthew Gordon, at the July 18, 2017 hearing on the Township’s Petition for Interim Emergency Order. *See, e.g.,* Hearing Transcript at pp. 189-190 (Gordon testified that it would be highly unlikely for PennDOT to permit open- cut installation on Boot Road). Given Mr. Gordon’s testimony regarding the permissible curvature of the Mariner East pipelines, and how this impacts SPLP’s ability to run the pipeline through the SPLP Use Area, the traffic study information for adjacent townships may have impacted SPLP’s decisions regarding the location of Valve 344. This information is relevant to the Township’s claims in this case regarding SPLP’s attempts to locate Valve 344 on the SPLP Use Area and therefore falls within the scope of permissible discovery under 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c). *See* 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c), *supra*.

# Township Interrogatory 21

Interrogatory 21: Identify the results of all soil borings and other geological testing performed by or on behalf of SPLP for the portion of the Mariner East Project within Chester County, Pennsylvania and Delaware County, Pennsylvania, and produce a copy of any results, logs, reports and other documents relating to said borings and testing.

SPLP Objection: SPLP objects to WGT 21 on the ground that it seeks information that is not relevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence insofar as it seeks information unrelated to the siting of Valve 344 or the meaning of the Settlement Agreement. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321 (c). SPLP further objects to WGT 21 on the grounds that identifying "all" soil boring and geological testing in Chester and Delaware Counties and "all" related documents is unreasonable, oppressive, burdensome, and expensive, 52 Pa. Code § 5.361 (a), and would require SPLP to make an unreasonable investigation, 52 Pa. Code § 5.361 (a)(4). Without waiver of these objections and the General Objections enumerated above, SPLP will provide a response to this interrogatory in relation to Valve 344.

# SPLP Objects to Interrogatory 21 arguing that soil borings and geological testing in areas outside West Goshen Township have no bearing on the narrow issues before the Commission in this proceeding. SPLP contends that any such results are not relevant to the placement of the Valve at the SPLP Use Area or the Janiec 2 Tract, or the underlying Settlement Agreement. Without waiving its objections, SPLP nevertheless stated it would respond to this Interrogatory with respect to the siting of Valve 344. In its October 2 Response, SPLP responded by referring the Township to SPLP’s document production at SPLP003470-SPLP003791 and SPLP003893-SPLP003903. These documents contain information related to geotechnical boring locations, HDD profiles with geotechnical information, test boring logs, geotechnical laboratory testing results, and field description and logging systems for soil exploration in Chester and Delaware Counties.

# I agree with the Township that the Interrogatory is narrowly tailored to the Counties in which the Township sits and the County directly adjacent thereto, and seeks information aimed at assessing the credibility of Matthew Gordon’s testimony at the July 18, 2017 hearing. Specifically, Mr. Gordon testified that SPLP’s decision regarding the location of Valve 344 was impacted by the presence of fractured rock under Route 202 near the SPLP Use Area. *See, e.g.,* Hearing Transcript at p. 232. The Interrogatory seeks information from other locations around the Township at which SPLP may have drilled through similar soils despite the concerns raised by Mr. Gordon. This information is relevant to the Township’s claims in this case regarding SPLP’s attempts to locate Valve 344 on the SPLP Use Area and therefore falls within the scope of permissible discovery under 52 Pa. Code § 5.321. *See*, 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c), *supra*.

# Township Interrogatory 22

Interrogatory 22: Identify all locations along the Mariner East Project in the last three years at which SPLP performed HDD through rock identified as "SM" (described by Matthew Gordon at pp. 192-193 of the Hearing Transcript as a type of unconsolidated sandstone), and produce all documents related to the decision to directionally drill through the identified locations rather than drill through another location or open cut.

SPLP Objection: SPLP objects to WGT 22 on the grounds that identifying "all" locations along the Mariner East Project in the last three years where HDD through SM was performed, and producing "all" related documents is unreasonable, oppressive, burdensome, and expensive, 52 Pa Code § 5.361 (a), and would require SPLP to make an unreasonable investigation, 52 Pa. Code § 5.361 (a)(4). Without waiver of these objections and the General Objections enumerated above, SPLP will provide a response to this interrogatory.

# SPLP Objects to Interrogatory 22 as it is unreasonable and unduly burdensome because it requires SPLP to conduct a time consuming and expensive search of all areas along the entire Mariner East Project corridor where SPLP may have drilled through unconsolidated sandstone. Without waiving its objections, SPLP nevertheless stated it would respond to this Interrogatory. In its October 2 Response, SPLP responded by explaining as follows:

## SPLP has performed HDD through SM material along the Mariner East Project when conditions permit. For example, SPLP003904 depicts an HDD through SM material from station 0+00 to approximately 10+00. Here, however, SPLP and its consultants concluded that, based on surface and subsurface conditions, an HDD entering at the SPLP Use Area, then proceeding underneath Route 202, and exiting on the Janiec 2 Tract, would have been imprudent and unsafe. Specifically, such an HDD profile would require a minimum drill depth of approximately 20-25 feet. Additionally, the soils under and near Route 202 in that area, in addition to containing unconsolidated sandstone, or SM, consist of highly fractured fill material, likely from the construction of Route 202. The combination of a shallow drilling depth and highly fractured and unconsolidated fill material and sandstone increases the risk of an inadvertent return in that area. Route 202 is a busy highway that serves approximately 70,000 cars each day. The subsurface and surface conditions factored into SPLP’s conclusion that an HDD from the SPLP Use Area to the Janiec 2 site would not be prudent. SPLP continues to review documents potentially responsive to this request. SPLP will supplement this response if necessary in a timely manner after it has completed its review.

# I agree with the Township that this response is incomplete, the Interrogatory is narrowly tailored to a specific type of rock allegedly encountered by SPLP on the Mariner East Project, and it seeks information aimed at assessing the credibility of Matthew Gordon’s testimony at the July 18, 2017 hearing. *See, e.g.,* Hearing Transcript at p. 192-193, 232. The Interrogatory seeks information from other locations along the Mariner East Project to determine whether SPLP drilled through similar soils despite the concerns raised by Mr. Gordon. This information is relevant to the Township’s claims in this case regarding SPLP’s attempts to locate Valve 344 on the SPLP Use Area and therefore falls within the scope of permissible discovery under 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c). *See*, 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c), *supra*. Therefore, SPLP shall be compelled to answer Interrogatory No. 22 completely within twenty days.

# Township Interrogatory 23

# On October 30, 2017, counsel for West Goshen Township indicated that adequate or full responses to Requests No. 1 had been provided by Sunoco, and therefore the motion shall be denied as moot with respect to Interrogatory 1.

Conclusion

For these reasons, SPLP’s objections to Interrogatories 6, 10, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21 and 22 are overruled. SPLP shall be compelled to respond completely to Interrogatories 6, 10, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, and 22 within twenty (20) days from the date of entry of this order. The Motion to Compel regarding Interrogatories 1 and 23 shall be denied as moot.

ORDER

 THEREFORE,

 IT IS ORDERED:

 1. That West Goshen Township’s Motion to Dismiss Objections and Compel Responses to Interrogatories of Sunoco Pipeline, L.P. is granted in part and denied in part.

2. That West Goshen Township’s Motion to Dismiss Objections and Compel Responses to Interrogatories 1 and 23 is denied as moot.

3. That West Goshen Township’s Motion to Dismiss Objections and Compel Responses to Interrogatories 6, 10, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, and 23 is granted.

4. That Sunoco Pipeline L.P. is compelled to provide complete answers to Interrogatories 6, 10, 13, 14, 19, 20, and 21 within twenty (20) days of the date of entry of this Order.

5. That the Objections of Sunoco Pipeline L.P. to West Goshen Township’s Interrogatories 6, 10, 13, 14, 19, 20, and 21 are overruled, except that Sunoco Pipeline, L.P. may withhold privileged communications with Sunoco Pipeline L.P.’s attorneys.

Date: November 1, 2017

 Elizabeth Barnes

 Administrative Law Judge
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