



Thomas J. Sniscak  
(717) 703-0800  
tjsniscak@hmslegal.com

Kevin J. McKeon  
(717) 703-0801  
kjmckeon@hmslegal.com

Whitney E. Snyder  
(717) 703-0807  
wesnyder@hmslegal.com

100 North Tenth Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 Phone: 717.236.1300 Fax: 717.236.4841 www.hmslegal.com

March 25, 2019

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, Filing Room  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: Meghan Flynn, et al. v. Sunoco Pipeline L.P.; Docket Nos. C-2018-3006116 and P-2018-3006117; **SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.'S ANSWER OPPOSING PETITION TO INTERVENE OF WEST CHESTER AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Attached for electronic filing with the Commission is Sunoco Pipeline L.P.'s Answer Opposing Petition to Intervene of West Chester Area School District in the above-referenced proceeding.

If you have any questions regarding this filing, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

Thomas J. Sniscak  
Kevin J. McKeon  
Whitney E. Snyder  
*Counsel for Sunoco Pipeline L.P.*

WES/das  
Enclosure

cc: Per Certificate of Service  
James J. Byrne, Esquire ([jjbyrne@mbmlawoffice.com](mailto:jjbyrne@mbmlawoffice.com))  
Kelly S. Sullivan, Esquire ([ksullivan@mbmlawoffice.com](mailto:ksullivan@mbmlawoffice.com))  
Michael P. Pierce, Esquire ([mppierce@piercelandhughes.com](mailto:mppierce@piercelandhughes.com))

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

MEGHAN FLYNN	:		
ROSEMARY FULLER	:		
MICHAEL WALSH	:		
NANCY HARKINS	:		
GERALD MCMULLEN	:		
CAROLINE HUGHES and	:		
MELISSA HAINES	:		
	:	Docket Nos.	C-2018-3006116
Complainants,	:		P-2018-3006117
	:		
v.	:		
	:		
SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.,	:		
	:		
Respondent.	:		

---

**SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.’S ANSWER  
OPPOSING PETITION TO INTERVENE  
OF WEST CHESTER AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT**

---

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.66,<sup>1</sup> Sunoco Pipeline L.P. (SPLP) submits this Answer Opposing West Chester Area School District’s (Petitioner) March 4, 2019 Petition to Intervene in this proceeding because the Petition is untimely, Petitioner seeks to intervene on issues outside the scope of the Complaint and seeks relief that the law does not allow. Moreover, to the extent the Petition to Intervene raises issues covered by the Amended Complaint, Petitioner has not shown

---

<sup>1</sup> SPLP notes that it is not required to specifically answer the allegations within a petition to intervene, and any such allegations are not deemed admitted by SPLP’s non-response. Compare 52 Pa. Code § 5.66 (“party may file an answer to a petition to intervene within 20 days of service, and in default thereof, may be deemed to have waived objection to the granting of the petition. Answers shall be served upon all other parties.”) with § 5.61(b)(3) (as to form of answers to complaints, answers must “Admit or deny specifically all material allegations of the complaint”).

the necessary requirement of intervention under the Commission's regulation at 52 Pa. Code § 5.72, that its interests are not adequately represented by a party already litigating these issues.

The Petition was filed on March 4, 2019, 105 days after the Complaint was filed in this case. 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.74 and 5.53 require a Petition to Intervene in a proceeding be filed within 60 days of the initiating pleading in a proceeding, absent "good cause shown." Here, Petitioner has not alleged its Petition is timely, nor has it alleged "good cause" for this late filing in the alternative. Therefore, petition should be denied.

Also, the Petition alleges intervention is proper based on Petitioner's proximity to the Mariner East pipelines and its duty to assure proper disaster response. The Petition impermissibly requests relief and raises issues well beyond the scope of the Amended Complaint. The Petition also requests relief outside of what the law and applicable PHMSA regulations require of SPLP, including:

- a. That the Commission order Sunoco to *perform continued and ongoing line inspection and geophysical testing and analysis in the areas of School District's schools where the ME Pipelines are operating and/or are in the process of construction;*
- b. That the Commission order Sunoco to *provide to the School District on a timely basis the results of that continued and ongoing line inspection and geophysical testing;*
- c. That the Commission order that *in the absence of either the above testing or inspection, or the delivery of the result of same, or in the absence of testing or inspection results that establish that the ME Pipelines or the valve station are determined by the Bureau of Inspection and Enforcement ("BI&E") and the U.S. Department of Transportation's Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration ("PHMSA") to not pose any risk to the School District's properties, that the ME Pipelines shall immediately cease operations until such time as Sunoco performs all necessary corrective actions and acquires approval of BI&E and PHMSA prior to receiving Commission approval to resume operation and/or construction;*
- d. That the Commission order Sunoco to develop and submit *testing and inspection protocols appropriate to ensure the safe operation and maintenance of ME Pipelines in close proximity to School*

*District's schools, to be approved by BI&E and PHMSA on a regular basis;*

e. That the Commission order Sunoco to develop and install a *mass early warning notification system* at all potentially affected School District Schools which would provide immediately notice of a leak, potential explosion or another failure in the pipeline system;

f. That the Commission order Sunoco provide a School District-specific public education or awareness plan designed to inform and education the students, families and School District Staff on proper and effective disaster prevention and response

g. Such further relief as may become available during the proceedings on this Application.

(emphasis added).

In contrast, the Amended Complaint in this proceeding raises issues regarding SPLP's public awareness program, emergency response program, and attempts to raise an issue regarding SPLP's integrity management program. The Amended Complaint does not raise issues of geology. The Petition seeks relief that would require consideration of issues *well-beyond the scope* of the Amended Complaint. That is not a proper basis for intervention. *See* 52 Pa. Code § 5.72(a)(2) (requiring an interest that may be directly affected by the proceeding). In the event, the petitioner is granted intervention (which it should not be granted) its participation should be limited to existing issues and its attempt to inject new issues late in the process should be rejected under the clear Commission regulation and caselaw on this point.

The Petition also seeks relief improperly outside of the Pennsylvania rulemaking process (The Commonwealth Documents Law and the Regulatory Review Act) and essentially would re-write federal regulations and establish new standards. The additional or new relief Petitioner seeks to inject into this proceeding<sup>2</sup> is far afield of what federal regulation require of SPLP and is simply

---

<sup>2</sup> Examples include a regulatory requirement to install an alarm system and shutting down the Mariner East pipelines unless it can be shown a zero risk to Petitioner. Neither of these are required by governing PHMSA regulations nor has the standard for any public utility operation been a "zero risk" to which little if anything in our society is, including riding in a school bus.

relief that the Commission cannot order,<sup>3</sup> and pursuit of such issue is a waste of the money and time of the School District, SPLP and the Commission's resources. Intervention is not proper to seek relief that is beyond the power of the Commission to order or to illegally attempt to adopt standards that should only be set by a rulemaking process and conformance to federal law. If allowed to intervene, these new issues raised by the Petitioner should not be permitted under the above-cited Commission regulation and caselaw.

The rest of the issues the Petition raises are duplicative of the Complaint and Petitioner has not shown that those interests are not already adequately represented by existing parties, and under the cases cited below, intervention should be denied.

A. Legal Standard

Standing to intervene is governed under 52 Pa. Code § 5.72(a) and "pertinent case law discussing the types of interests sufficient for purposes of intervention." *Joint Application of Commonwealth Telephone Company, CTSI, LLC and CTE Telecom, LLC d/b/a Commonwealth Long Distance Company for All Approvals Under the Public Utility Code for the Acquisition By Citizens Communications Company of All Stock of the Joint Applicants' Corporate Parent, Commonwealth Telephone Enterprises, Inc.*, Docket No. A-310800F0010, Order Granting Exceptions (entered Feb. 8, 2007).

52 Pa. Code § 5.72 states:

§ 5.72. Eligibility to intervene.

(a) *Persons*. A petition to intervene may be filed by a person claiming a right to intervene or an interest of such nature that intervention is necessary or appropriate to the administration of the

---

<sup>3</sup> The Commission may adopt additional or more stringent pipeline safety regulations than 49 C.F.R. Part 195 regulations "only if those standards are compatible with minimum standards." 49 U.S.C.A. § 60104(c). The Commission has not established any relevant regulations and after-the-fact subjective interpretation of 49 C.F.R. Part 195 is therefore inconsistent with the Pipeline Safety Act and should be preempted. In addition, finding a violation based on an after-the-fact subjective interpretation instead of the plain terms of the regulations violates SPLP's due process rights.

statute under which the proceeding is brought. The right or interest may be one of the following:

...

(2) An interest which may be directly affected, and which is not adequately represented by existing participants, and as to which the petitioner may be bound by the action of the Commission in the proceeding.

Accordingly, to have standing to intervene, Petitioner must show *all of the following*: (1) a direct, substantial, and immediate interest in the challenged action, (2) that is not adequately represented by existing participants, and (3) that the petitioner may be bound by the action of the Commission in the proceedings. Petitioner here meets none of these three standards.

Further, it is well-established that a Petition to Intervene cannot expand the scope of the issues in the underlying proceedings. *See Com., et al. v. Energy Services Providers, Inc. d/b/a PaG&E, Order Granting Petition to Intervene*, Docket No. C-2014-2427656, 2015 WL 1957859 (Order entered Apr. 23, 2015) (Cheskis, J.) (“In granting intervention, however, Mr. Sobiech will be required to take the case as it currently stands. PaG&E is correct that intervenors generally take the record as they find it at the time of intervention.”).

## B. Argument

### 1. The Petition is Untimely under 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.74 and 5.53

The Petition is untimely and should be denied. The Complaint was filed on November 19, 2018<sup>4</sup>. The Petition to Intervene was filed on March 4, 2019, 105 days after the Complaint was

---

<sup>4</sup> On December 20, 2018, the Complainants filed an amended complaint. The December 20, 2018 amendments to the Complaint did not extend the time for interventions. Even if there was a Commission regulation that extended the time for intervention based on an amendment to a pleading, which there is not, SPLP notes that this Petition to Intervene would still be untimely, as it was filed 74 days after the Amended Complaint was filed. There is no Commission regulation that extends the time for intervention when an amendment to a pleading is filed. A Petition to Intervene is due 60 days from an initiating complaint. 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.74 and 5.53. In contrast, the Commission’s regulations expressly extend the answering time period when an amended pleading is filed to require an answer within 20 days of the amended pleading. 52 Pa. Code § 5.65(a). The presence of a specific Commission regulation that extends the time for an answer in the event of an amended pleading coupled with the absence of any Commission regulation regarding intervention and amended pleadings means that the Commission has not changed the time period for intervention in the event of an amended pleading. See, e.g., *Popowsky v. Pennsylvania Public Utility Com'n*, 869 A.2d 1144, 1159 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2005) (the inclusion of a specific matter in a statute implies the exclusion of other matters).

filed. A Petition to Intervene is due 60 days from an initiating complaint. See 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.74 and 5.53. However, an untimely intervention can be allowed when the Petition to Intervene shows “good cause”. 52 Pa. Code § 5.74. Here, Petitioners fail to allege good cause for allowing it to intervene out of time in this proceeding. Therefore, the Petition should be denied because it is untimely and failed to allege good cause to allow late intervention.

2. Petitioner’s Intervention is Based on Issues that Would Improperly Broaden this Proceeding and Cannot be the Basis for Intervention

The Amended Complaint alleges the following issues:

Count I: Violation of 49 CFR § 195.440 (Alleging deficiencies in the SPLP’s public awareness program);

Count II: Violation of 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501 and 52 Pa. Code § 59.33 (Alleging SPLP’s failure to properly warn and protect the public);

Count III: Failure to Consider the Value of Lost Human Life (Alleging SPLP failed to consider the economic value of life);

Count IV: Failure of Integrity Management Program (Alleging SPLP Integrity Management Plan deficiencies).

Thus, the scope of the underlying issues in the Complaint case are SPLP’s public awareness and emergency response programs, general allegations of risk, and allegations concerning SPLP’s integrity management plan, which specifically focus on corrosion control and cathodic protection.

In contrast, this Petition seeks relief for topics, specific to the School District’s grounds along the Mariner East right of way, unrelated to the scope of the issues the Amended Complaint raises, including new issues regarding geology. Thus, Petitioner’s pursuit of its requested relief would without question improperly expand the scope of the issues in this proceeding. That is not a proper basis for intervention, and the Petition should be denied. See *Com., et al. v. Energy Services Providers, Inc. d/b/a PaG&E, Order Granting Petition to Intervene*, Docket No. C-2014-2427656, 2015 WL 1957859 (Order entered Apr. 23, 2015) (Cheskis, J.) (“In granting intervention,

however, Mr. Sobiech will be required to take the case as it currently stands. PaG&E is correct that intervenors generally take the record as they find it at the time of intervention.”).

3. Interests the Petition Properly Raises are Already Adequately Represented

Complainants adequately represent Petitioner’s interests concerning issues already raised within the Amended Complaint. Complainants already allege inadequacies in SPLP’s public awareness program and emergency preparedness program. In the Petition for Interim Emergency Relief Hearing, Complainants called a Downingtown Area School District witness to support these claims, and Complainants can do the same for West Chester Area School District in the ongoing Complaint proceeding. The Complainants already adequately represent Petitioner’s interests in issues raised in the Amended Complaint and the Petition should be denied.

4. Even if Granted Intervenor Status, Petitioner Cannot Expand the Scope of the Proceeding

SPLP notes that if Petitioner is nonetheless granted intervenor status, late filed intervenors must take the case as it is and cannot expand the scope of the proceeding. *See Com., et al. v. Energy Services Providers, Inc. d/b/a PaG&E, Order Granting Petition to Intervene*, Docket No. C-2014-2427656, 2015 WL 1957859 (Order entered Apr. 23, 2015) (Cheskis, J.) (“In granting intervention, however, Mr. Sobiech will be required to take the case as it currently stands. PaG&E is correct that intervenors generally take the record as they find it at the time of intervention.”). Even if intervention is allowed, Petitioner cannot pursue issues beyond the scope of the Amended Complaint.

**WHEREFORE**, Sunoco Pipeline L.P. requests West Chester Area School District's  
Petition to Intervene be denied.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Sniscak, Esq. (PA ID No. 33891)  
Kevin J. McKeon, Esq. (PA ID No. 30428)  
Whitney E. Snyder, Esq. (PA ID No. 316625)  
Hawke, McKeon & Sniscak LLP  
100 North Tenth Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
Tel: (717) 236-1300  
[tjsniscak@hmslegal.com](mailto:tjsniscak@hmslegal.com)  
[kjmckeon@hmslegal.com](mailto:kjmckeon@hmslegal.com)  
[wesnyder@hmslegal.com](mailto:wesnyder@hmslegal.com)

Robert D. Fox, Esq. (PA ID No. 44322)  
Neil S. Witkes, Esq. (PA ID No. 37653)  
Diana A. Silva, Esq. (PA ID No. 311083)  
MANKO, GOLD, KATCHER & FOX, LLP  
401 City Avenue, Suite 901  
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004  
Tel: (484) 430-5700  
[rfox@mankogold.com](mailto:rfox@mankogold.com)  
[nwitkes@mankogold.com](mailto:nwitkes@mankogold.com)  
[dsilva@mankogold.com](mailto:dsilva@mankogold.com)

*Attorneys for Respondent Sunoco Pipeline L.P.*

Dated: March 25, 2019

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the foregoing document upon the parties, listed below, in accordance with the requirements of § 1.54 (relating to service by a party). This document has been filed electronically on the Commission's electronic filing system and served on the following:

### VIA ELECTRONIC AND FIRST CLASS

Michael S. Bomstein, Esquire  
Pinnola & Bomstein  
Suite 2126 Land Title Building  
100 South Broad Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19110  
[mbomstein@gmail.com](mailto:mbomstein@gmail.com)

*Counsel for Complainants*

Anthony D. Kanagy, Esquire  
Garrett P. Lent, Esquire  
Post & Schell PC  
17 North Second Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
[akanagy@postschell.com](mailto:akanagy@postschell.com)  
[glent@postschell.com](mailto:glent@postschell.com)

*Counsel for Range Resources – Appalachia LLC*

Guy A. Donatelli, Esquire  
Lamb McErlane, PC  
24 East Market St., Box 565  
West Chester, PA 19382-0565  
[gdonatelli@lambmcerlane.com](mailto:gdonatelli@lambmcerlane.com)

*Counsel for Downingtown Area School District, Chester County, Pennsylvania and Rose Tree Media School District, Delaware County, Pennsylvania*

Rich Raiders, Esquire  
Raiders Law  
321 East Main Street  
Annville, PA 17003  
[rich@raiderslaw.com](mailto:rich@raiderslaw.com)

*Counsel for Andover Homeowner's Association, Inc.*

Margaret A. Morris, Esquire  
Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP  
Cira Centre, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor  
2929 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19104  
[mmorris@regerlaw.com](mailto:mmorris@regerlaw.com)

*Counsel for East Goshen Township*

Leah Rotenberg, Esquire  
Mays, Connard & Rotenberg LLP  
1235 Penn Avenue, Suite 202  
Wyomissing, PA 19610  
[rotenberg@mcr-attorneys.com](mailto:rotenberg@mcr-attorneys.com)

*Counsel for Twin Valley School District, Berks County, Pennsylvania*

Vincent M. Pompo, Esquire  
Lamb McErlane, PC  
24 East Market St., Box 565  
West Chester, PA 19382-0565  
[vpompo@lambmcerlane.com](mailto:vpompo@lambmcerlane.com)

*Counsel for West Whiteland Township, Chester County, Pennsylvania*

Alex J. Baumler, Esquire  
Lamb McErlane, PC  
24 East Market St., Box 565  
West Chester, PA 19382-0565  
[abaumler@lambmcerlane.com](mailto:abaumler@lambmcerlane.com)

*Counsel for Downingtown Area School District, Chester County, Pennsylvania, Rose Tree Media School District, Delaware County, Pennsylvania, and West Whiteland Township*

Mark L. Freed  
Curtin & Heefner LP  
2005 S. Easton Road, Suite 100  
Doylestown, PA 18901  
[mlf@curtinheefner.com](mailto:mlf@curtinheefner.com)

*Counsel for Uwchlan Township*

James R. Flandreau, Esquire  
Paul, Flandreau & Berger, LLP  
320 W. Front Street  
Media, PA 19063  
[jflandreau@pfblaw.com](mailto:jflandreau@pfblaw.com)

*Counsel for Middletown Township*

Michael Maddren, Esquire  
Patricia Sons Biswanger, Esquire  
Office of the Solicitor  
County of Delaware  
Government Center Building  
201 West Front Street  
Media, PA 19063  
[MaddrenM@co.delaware.pa.us](mailto:MaddrenM@co.delaware.pa.us)  
[patbiswanger@gmail.com](mailto:patbiswanger@gmail.com)

*Counsel for County of Delaware*

James C. Dalton, Esquire  
Unruh Turner Burke & Frees  
P.O. Box 515  
West Chester, PA 19381-0515  
[jdalton@utbf.com](mailto:jdalton@utbf.com)

*Counsel for West Chester Area School District, Chester County, Pennsylvania*



Thomas J. Sniscak, Esquire  
Whitney E. Snyder, Esquire

Dated: March 25, 2019