

Rebecca Britton
211 Andover Dr.
Exton PA 19341

October 21, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

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;

**REBECCA BRITTON'S ANSWER TO SPLP'S MOTION IN LIMINE
REGARDING LAY WITNESS HEARING AND EVIDENCE**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission is Rebecca Britton's
Answer to Motion in Limine re: evidence.

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

Very Truly Yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rebecca Britton". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'R' and 'B'.

Pro se
October 21, 2019

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

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

Rebecca Britton Response to Sunoco’s Motion in Limine regarding lay witness hearing and evidence

Sunoco filed a motion in limine is too broad and at this stage is being put forth for unfounded reasons. The motion reads to me as a request to deny Her Honor from using her good judgement during the hearing to determine what is “hearsay”.

INTRODUCTION

1. Denied. I am merely presenting evidence that I had seen, heard, and learned about that caused me to file my complaint. There are legally accepted rules regarding hearsay exceptions like 803(8) public records. Public records do not constitute hearsay if: A) the record describes facts and action taken or matter observed or B) the recording of this action or matter observed was an official public duty.

I. Argument

Denied. Speaking for myself only, the evidence SPLP is contesting are merely recounting my knowledge garnered through personal experience and matters of public

record. I am not an expert and have filed with the PUC as experterts to evaluate my claims.

2. Denied. It is the direct and personal experiences and information on the public record that caused me to file my complaint. That is why I am offering the testimony and evidence.

3. Denied. Judge can use her discretion during hearing, this is to broad to decide before trial during testimony. Sunoco has not seen or heard testimony.

4. Denied. Evidence that is part of the public record can be admitted.

5. Does not pertain to my evidence and accordingly I cannot comment.

6. Denied. Evidence I submitted is matters of public record that I have seen, experienced or heard.

7. Does not pertain to my evidence and accordingly I cannot comment.

8. Does not pertain to my evidence and accordingly I cannot comment.

9. Does not pertain to my evidence and accordingly I cannot comment.

10. Denied. I am merely accounting for my direct experiences and knowledge by presenting testimony as a lay witness. I am discussing matters as I have seen or heard them that made me file my complaint and believe my needs are direct, immediate and substantial. I am not an expert and I am sure Judge Barnes will account for that when determining the weight of my evidence.

11. Denied. Matters of public record are not hearsay and SPLP is not properly objecting. The objections are too broad and over reaching. I am incorporating my entire answer to Motion in Limine filed October 17.

12. Denied. At this stage SPLP cannot come to a finding of fact to present these documents as uncorroborated. I am sure Judge Barnes can decide weight of my claims based on expert testimony in July and apply her good judgement to evaluate information.

13. Denied. SPLP has had possession of this document for many months and there is nothing in this document that should burden counsel as a surprise. I am sure the PUC is presenting relevant information to Mariner East in a brief about Mariner East. The document is a matter of public record.

14. Does not pertain to me accordingly I cannot answer.

15. Does not pertain to me accordingly I cannot answer.

16. Does not pertain to me accordingly I cannot answer.

17. Added complexity of a rapid emergency response can make the difference in an emergency. I incorporate my response from the previous motion in limine that my needs are direct immediate and substantial to include this testimony in the hearing. IF, I were not consolidated and given instructed to not repeat testimony I would have called witnesses to testify to facts I plan to provide friendly cross for.

18. Does not pertain to me accordingly I cannot answer.

II. Ruling.

Sunoco has not shown good cause or substantial reasons to propose a motion in limine for the evidence I wish to present. Three of the people whom I planned to call will no longer be testifying and Your Honor now is not hindered for time and so the argument of “36 witnesses” presenting testimony and time restraints is moot. Rulings on the day of commencement is proper.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Rebecca Britton respectfully requests:

-The Motion in Limine is denied in its entirety and my evidence is granted into the proceeding.

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

Rebecca Britton

October 21, 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@downingtown.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
October 21, 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 Britto
Pro se
October 21, 2019