

Rebecca Britton
211 Andover Dr.
Exton PA 19341

April 7, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

April 7, 2019

Re: Rebecca Britton v. Sunoco Pipeline L.P.; Docket No. C-2019-3006898

Meghan Flynn. et al. v. Sunoco Pipeline L.P.; Docket Nos. C-2018-3006116 and
P-2018-3006117;

Melissa DiBernardino v. Sunoco Pipeline L.P.; Docket No. C-2018-3005025;

Laura Obenski v. Sunoco Pipeline L.P.; Docket No. C-2019-3006905

**REBECCA BRITTON'S ANSWER TO SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.'S MOTION TO
CONSOLIDATE**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission is Rebecca Britton's
Answer to Sunoco Pipeline L.P.'s Motion to Consolidate in the above-referenced proceedings.

If you have any questions regarding these filings please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very Truly Yours,



Rebecca Britton
Pro se
April 7, 2019

April 7, 2019

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

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Rebecca Britton	:	
211 Andover Dr.	:	
Exton, PA 19341	:	Docket No. C-2019-3006898
Complainant	:	
 	:	
v.	:	
 	:	
SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.,	:	
Respondent.	:	
 	:	
MEGAN FLYNN <i>et al</i>	:	Docket Nos. C-2018-3006116
v.	:	P-2018-3006117
SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.,	:	
 	:	
MELISSA DIBERNARDINO,	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2018-3005025
SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.,	:	
 	:	
LAURA OBENSKI	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2019-3006905
SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.,	:	

ANSWER OF REBECCA BRITTON TO SPLP's MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE

On March 18, 2019 SPLP moved for the consolidation of the Flynn *et al* complaint (Docket Nos. C-20 18-3006116 and P 2018-3006117), with the DiBernardino complaint (Docket No. C-2018-3005025), the Britton complaint (Docket No. C-2019-3006898), and the Obenski complaint (Docket No. C-2019- 3006905), and responds to the Obenski Motion to Consolidate.

In response to this consolidation request I am filing this response in accordance with pa 52 code 5.61.

1. No response required. I cannot admit or deny the statements and concerns of other complainants.
2. Denied. On March 30th Mrs. DiBernardino filed answer to motion to consolidate that stated the issues raised in her complaint.
3. Denied. Respondent fails to acknowledge issues averred as filed in my *pro se* formal complaint with the Commission. While it is true that I averred concern about ME1, ME2, ME2X and the 12-inch pipelines and that they are unsafe to operate in Uwchlan Township and in areas of Chester County that relate to my water supply; Respondent fails to recognize 8 inch Twin Oaks to Icedale line of which I express same overall safety concerns. I also raise adequacy of statewide hazard insurance. I aver that SPLP's public awareness programs are inadequate and have created a situation where public protections, as guaranteed, under Title 35 are not being met. I aver concerns regarding SPLP's integrity management program, including avertments of inadequate leak detection protocols. I do aver that the locations of valve stations are unsafe, and that the use of horizontal directional drilling to construct ME2 and ME2X has the potential to impact natural resources. SPLP may not seek to limit the scope of my complaint or requested

relief with this consolidation attempt.

4. No response required. I cannot admit or deny the statements and concerns of other complainants.

5. Denied as stated. While the four complaints share *some* common questions of law, this does not necessarily determine that consolidation of the matters are appropriate.

6. Admitted.

7. Denied as stated. Respondents characterization of my complaint fails to acknowledge issues raised in my complaint. It is not clear to me at this time, whether or not, this consolidation will create judicial efficiencincy; or if, I will suffer prejudice from consolidation. I oppose this consolidation until it is clear that consolidation does not prejudice my substantial rights of due process. I oppose this consolidation until it is clear that consolidation does not limit my ability to represent myself; and all of my prosecutorial rights are retained. I oppose this consolidation until it is made clear my original complaint will be heard in its entirety. I oppose this consolidation until it is made clear that I will have ample time for my case to be fully heard before the court. I oppose this consolidation until, such a time, that I am ensured that my requested relief will not be limited by other parties. I oppose this consolidation until I am sure my consolidation does not prejudice any other party, or intervenor, filed to the Flynn *et al* docket.

8. Denied. I respectfully submit to, *Your Honor*, while consolidation might reduce costs and efficiencies for the Public Utility Commission and Respondent it seems it would create a costly and inefficient process for myself. I am a stay at home mother and our family relies on a single income. Traveling to and from Harrisburg, daily, for an elongated trial would be a financial burden both in travel expenses and childcare costs. Not being privy to testimony in consolidated cases and missing days of evidence and testimony could also negatively prejudice me. I oppose this consolidation until I understand what kind of prejudice this consolidation

would create for my case to move forward. I oppose this consolidation until the cost reduction and efficiency this consolidation is intended to create for me; are clear to me. I oppose this consolidation until I am sure this proposal is something that fits into my family's budgeted financial wellbeing. I am opposed to this consolidation until I am sure the proceedings do not interfere with my primary duty, caretaker, to my children while my husband is at work.

9. I oppose this consolidation until such a time that I can make a reasonable judgement regarding the 8 criteria are met by me, personally, the pro se complainant.

10. Admitted in part. Denied in part. Admitted there are *some* overlapping issues. Denied that each of the 8 criteria as established by the Commission in *City of Lancaster Sewer Fund* is already met in regards to my consolidation. Specifically.

- 1) It is unclear if additional issues raised by consolidation will cloud a determination of common issues.
- 2) It is unclear if consolidation will only increase costs to me, a party in the proceeding. I am unclear if consolidation will reduce the necessity of decision making by me, a party in the proceeding.
- 3) It is unclear of how this consolidation will not protract the hearing. I am unclear as to how the hearing will result in an orderly and manageable record.
- 4) The proposed schedule does not have a decision granted until Winter 2019. Considering my complaint averments, proximity to my family to this hazard, with exposure virtually 24 hrs a day and lack of hazard planning; I certainly feel as though this is an undue delay.

11. Denied. The central issues Respondent identifies must not limit the scope or relief my complaint seeks.

12. Denied. There is no reason to suggest that my questioning of some witnesses will be repetitive. There is no reason to suggest my witnesses will be the same as other parties

witnesses. There is no reason to suggest that Judge Barnes cannot provide consistent rulings. I oppose this consolidation until I am guaranteed that all of my witnesses and subsequent testimony would be heard.

14. Denied. I have the burden of proof and will decide what is the “subordinate” issues. Respondent does not have the discretion to, “treat or regard” which issues have critical importance to me, the *pro se* complainant. I must retain full prosecutorial powers.

15. Admitted.

16. No further response needed.

17. Denied. SPLP has not demonstrated how consolidation will not prejudice me. The Commission has not demonstrated how judicial efficiency will be gained by granting my *pro se* complaint consolidation. Alternatively, my consolidation in this matter might create a burden to the Commission after hearing my concerns as listed above.

Wherefore, I respectfully request the right to understand how I will not be prejudiced. I reserve the right to have full party status should consolidation occur. I reserve the right to prosecute my own complaint should consolidation occur. I do not forfeit any of my rights, or relief requested, should consolidation occur.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rebecca Britton". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Rebecca Britton

April 7, 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 via electronic filing:

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
efiling system

Thomas J. Sniscak, Esq
tjsniscak@hmslegal.com

Kevin J. McKeon
kjmckeon@hmslegal.com

Whitney E. Snyder
@hmslegal.com

Robert D. Fox, Esq.
Neil S. Witkes, Esp.
Diana A. Silva, Esq.
rfox@mankogold.com
nwitkes@mankogold.com
dsilva@mankogold.com

Michael Bomstein

mbomstein@gmail.com

Anthony D. Kanagy, Esquire
Garrett P. Lent, Esquire
akanazy@postschell.com
glent@postschell.com

Rich Raiders, Esq.
rich@raiderslaw.com

Vince M. Pompo, Esq.
Guy. A. Donatelli, Esq
Alex J. Baumler, Esq.
vpompo@lambmcerlane.com
Gdonatelli@lambmcerlane.com
abaumler@lambmcerlane.com

Margaret A. Morris, Esq.
mmorris@regerlaw.com

Leah Rotenberg, Esq.
rotenberg@mcr-attorneys.com

Mark L. Freed
mlf@curtinheefner.com

James R. Flandreau
jflandreau@pfblaw.com

David J. Brooman
Richard Sokorai
Mark R. Fischer
dbrooman@highswartz.com
rsokorai@highswartz.com
mfischer@highswartz.com

Thomas Casey
tcaseylegal@gmail.com

Josh Maxwell

jmaxwell@downingtowntown.org

Laura Obenski
ljobenski@gmail.com

Stephanie M. Wimer
stwimer@pa.gov

Michael Maddren, Esq.
Patricia Sons Biswanger, Esq.
maddrenM@co.delaware.pa.us
patbiswanger@gmail.com

James C. Dalton, Esq.
jdalton@utbf.com

Melissa DiBernardino
lissdibernardino@gmail.com

Virginia Marcille-Kerslake
vkerslake@gmail.com

James J. Byrne, Esq.
Kelly S. Sullivan, Esq.
jjbyrne@mbmlawoffice.com
ksullivan@mbmlawoffice.com

Honorable Elizabeth Barnes
ebarnes@pa.gov



Rebecca Britton
Pro se
April 7, 2019

VERIFICATION

I, Rebecca Britton, hereby state that the facts above set forth are true and correct (or are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief) and that I expect to be able to prove the same at a hearing held in this matter. I understand that the statements herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities).

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rebecca Britton".

Rebecca Britton
Pro se
April 7, 2019