



Thomas J. Sniscak  
(717) 703-0800  
[tjsniscak@hmslegal.com](mailto:tjsniscak@hmslegal.com)

Whitney E. Snyder  
(717) 703-0807  
[wesnyder@hmslegal.com](mailto:wesnyder@hmslegal.com)

Kevin J. McKeon  
(717) 703-0801  
[kjmckeon@hmslegal.com](mailto:kjmckeon@hmslegal.com)

Bryce R. Beard  
(717) 703-0808  
[brbeard@hmslegal.com](mailto:brbeard@hmslegal.com)

100 North Tenth Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 Phone: 717.236.1300 Fax: 717.236.4841 [www.hmslegal.com](http://www.hmslegal.com)

March 1, 2021

**Via Electronic Filing**

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street – Second Floor North  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

RE: Glen Riddle Station, L.P. v. Sunoco Pipeline L.P.; Docket No. C-2020-3023129;  
**SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.’S MOTION TO COMPEL**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission is Sunoco Pipeline L.P.’s Motion to Compel Responses to Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents, Set I, in the above-referenced proceeding. Copies have been served in accordance with the attached Certificate of Service.

This notice is served electronically pursuant to the COVID-19 Suspension Emergency Order dated March 20, 2020 and ratified March 26, 2020.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Thomas J. Sniscak*

Thomas J. Sniscak  
Whitney E. Snyder  
Kevin J. McKeon  
Bryce R. Beard

*Counsel for Sunoco Pipeline L.P.*

BRB/das

Enclosures

cc: Honorable Joel Cheskis (via email [jcheskis@pa.gov](mailto:jcheskis@pa.gov))  
Ashley L. Beach (via email [abeach@foxrothschild.com](mailto:abeach@foxrothschild.com))

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

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

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL ONLY**

Samuel W. Cortes, Esquire  
Fox Rothschild LLP  
747 Constitution Drive, Suite 100  
Exton, PA 19341  
(610) 458-7500  
[scortes@foxrothschild.com](mailto:scortes@foxrothschild.com)

*/s/ Thomas J. Sniscak* \_\_\_\_\_

Thomas J. Sniscak, Esq.  
Whitney E. Snyder, Esq.  
Kevin J. McKeon, Esq.  
Bryce R. Beard, Esq.

Dated: March 1, 2021

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

|                           |   |            |                |
|---------------------------|---|------------|----------------|
| GLEN RIDDLE STATION, L.P. | : |            |                |
|                           | : | Docket No. | C-2020-3023129 |
| v.                        | : |            |                |
|                           | : |            |                |
| SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.      | : |            |                |

---

**NOTICE TO PLEAD**

---

YOU ARE HEREBY ADVISED THAT, PURSUANT TO 52 PA. CODE § 5.342(g)(1), YOU MAY FILE A REPLY TO THE ENCLOSED MOTION TO COMPEL WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF SERVICE. YOUR REPLY SHOULD BE FILED WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION, P.O. BOX 3265, HARRISBURG, PA 17105-3265. A COPY OF YOUR REPLY SHOULD ALSO BE SERVED ON THE UNDERSIGNED COUNSEL.

Thomas J. Sniscak, Esq. (PA ID No. 33891)  
Whitney E. Snyder, Esq. (PA ID No. 316625)  
Kevin J. McKeon, Esq. (PA ID No. 30428)  
Bryce R. Beard, Esq. (PA ID No. 325837)  
Hawke, McKeon & Sniscak LLP  
100 North Tenth Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
Tel: (717) 236-1300  
tjsniscak@hmslegal.com  
wesnyder@hmslegal.com  
kjmckeon@hmslegal.com  
brbeard@hmslegal.com

*Counsel for Sunoco Pipeline L.P.*

Dated: March 1, 2021

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

|                           |   |            |                |
|---------------------------|---|------------|----------------|
| GLEN RIDDLE STATION, L.P. | : |            |                |
|                           | : | Docket No. | C-2020-3023129 |
| v.                        | : |            |                |
|                           | : |            |                |
| SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.      | : |            |                |

---

**SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P. MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSES TO  
INTERROGATORIES AND REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS SET 1  
DIRECTED AT GLEN RIDDLE STATION L.P.**

---

Pursuant to Section 5.342(g) of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission’s (“PUC” or “Commission”) regulations, 52 Pa. Code § 5.342(g), Sunoco Pipeline L.P. (“SPLP”) files this Motion To Compel Responses To Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents Set 1 (“Set 1”) To Glen Riddle Station L.P. (“GRS”) (“Motion”). In support of this Motion, SPLP respectfully asserts as follows:

**INTRODUCTION**

1. On February 9, 2021, SPLP served on GRS Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents Set 1.
2. On February 19, 2021, GRS interposed the attached Objections to Set I Nos. 1, 4, 5, 9-12, 14-16 and RFP Nos. 1, 3, 4, 10, 11-17. See Attachment A.
3. SPLP is moving to compel responses to Set I.<sup>1</sup> In Set I, SPLP sought discoverable and relevant information regarding GRS’ actions involving its residents, measures GRS has taken, information regarding the alleged impact of SPLP’s construction on GRS and its tenants, and various events related to SPLP’s construction at the property as well as relevant documents to this

---

<sup>1</sup> Counsel for SPLP and Counsel for GRS are attempting to resolve this discovery dispute on Wednesday, March 3, 2021. Should that discussion prove productive, SPLP will withdraw or amend certain portions of this Motion to Compel. Because of the pending discussion, SPLP will not object to GRS filing an Answer to this Motion under the Commission’s normal response deadlines under 52 Pa Code 5.342.

proceeding. As discussed below, SPLP requests that Your Honor dismiss GRS's objections and compel answers to SPLP's Set I.

## **ARGUMENT**

### **I. SPLP Set I No. 4**

4. SPLP Set I No. 4 requests information regarding a "letter to the editor" which was published in the DELCO Times on February 4, 2021, and authored by Stephen Iacobucci.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Iacobucci was identified as a witness of GRS in this proceeding pertaining to the factual information of the Complaint, including the history of the dispute.<sup>3</sup> The Letter at issue goes on at length, making false, sensationalized and misleading allegations about SPLP's construction at the property that is directly relevant to this complaint proceeding, including but not limited to the truth and veracity of the underlying allegations of the complaint itself and the identified witness's credibility.

5. GRS objected to SPLP Set I No. 4 on the basis that the request "would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond," and that the request was irrelevant and unlikely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. See attachment A. On its face, the objections are factually deficient and should be dismissed.

6. Contrary to GRS' objections, the information is relevant. As the Commission's regulations outline and as the Commission has repeatedly affirmed, a party seeking to withhold discovery on grounds of relevancy must meet a high burden showing the requested information to be wholly irrelevant to the applicable subject matter. Under the Commission's regulations:

---

<sup>2</sup> See [https://www.delcotimes.com/opinion/letter-to-the-editor-why-is-middletown-siding-with-the-pipeline/article\\_363e0310-6751-11eb-aa38-cb46ab3f935e.html](https://www.delcotimes.com/opinion/letter-to-the-editor-why-is-middletown-siding-with-the-pipeline/article_363e0310-6751-11eb-aa38-cb46ab3f935e.html)

<sup>3</sup> See GRS Prehearing Memo identifying Mr. Iacobucci, filed February 24, 2021.

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). The Commonwealth Court has further reinforced the broad scope of discoverable information, stating that “relevancy should be interpreted broadly and liberally, and any doubts regarding the relevancy of subject matter should be resolved in favor of relevancy.” *Koken v. One Beacon Ins. Co.*, 911 A.2d 1021, 1025 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2006). As emphasized by the Commonwealth Court, the party contending discovery is not relevant has the burden of proving irrelevancy. *Id.*

7. Discovery intended to obtain evidence which is relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to relevant evidence<sup>4</sup> has always been permitted. SPLP’s narrowly tailored discovery request regarding GRS’ witness Mr. Iacobucci’s Letter to the Editor is reasonably calculated to lead to relevant and admissible evidence. The caselaw could not be clearer that this type of evidence is relevant. *See Application of Scranton Transportation, LLC, for the Right to Begin to Transp., As A Common Carrier, by Motor Vehicle, Persons in Call or Demand Serv., to &/or from Points Within Lackawanna Cty., Pennsylvania*, No. A-2012-2303837, 2014 WL 2876689, at \*6

---

<sup>4</sup> 52 Pa. Code Section 5.321(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.***” (emphasis added).

(Pa. PUC 2014) (“The credibility of witnesses, their manner of testifying, their apparent candor, intelligence, personal intent and bias, or lack thereof, are all considered in determining what weight should be given to their testimony.”) (quoting *Application of Jet Sedan Services*, Docket No. A-2009-2120781 (Order entered August 18, 2010)) (citing *Danovitz v. Portnoy*, 399 Pa. 599, 161 A.2d 146 (Pa. 1960)); *see also, e.g., Com. v. Ellis*, 700 A.2d 948, 957 (Pa. Super. 1997) (evidence of bias, interest, or corruption is always relevant evidence).

8. Further, Set 1 No. 4 is narrowly tailored to seek admissible evidence and is not overly broad or unduly burdensome. No. 4 (a) seeks the simple answer of when the Letter to the Editor authored by Mr. Iacobucci was submitted to the DELCO Times. The answer requires a response that, by definition, is not burdensome – the identification of a single date in time. In addition, No. 4 (b) seeks relevant information based on the allegations set forth in the letter and seeks any supporting documents supporting the letters allegations, including copies and logs of communications regarding the noise allegations Mr. Iacobucci makes. This request is not burdensome, and Your Honor should compel GRS’ response to this relevant interrogatory.

## **II. SPLP Set I No. 9 and RFP 12**

9. SPLP Set I No. 9 and RFP 12 requests information regarding any communications and coordination efforts that GRS has had with various anti-pipeline activists, some of whom have been physically present at the property in an attempt to interrupt or halt SPLP’s public utility construction activities. In particular, members of the “Mama Bear Brigade” and other members of the public staged and supported an organized protest on January 30, 2021.<sup>5</sup> Upon information and belief, as a result of this protest, multiple members of the protest were charged with the summary offense of defiant trespass. GRS’s Mr. Iacobucci openly supported the interruption efforts, stating

---

<sup>5</sup> See [https://www.delcotimes.com/news/pipeline-foes-stage-protest-at-glen-riddle/article\\_a40a336a-6313-11eb-a4f4-8f51c9cbe8df.html](https://www.delcotimes.com/news/pipeline-foes-stage-protest-at-glen-riddle/article_a40a336a-6313-11eb-a4f4-8f51c9cbe8df.html)

to the DELCO Times “We really appreciate everyone being here today to just bring awareness to the problem that exists here today.”<sup>6</sup>

10. GRS objected to this request on the basis of unreasonable burden and relevance, both of which should be dismissed. See Attachment A. Given Mr. Iacobucci’s support for the interruption of public utility construction by certain individuals, SPLP seeks in No. 9 and RFP 12 narrowly tailored information which is not burdensome and is relevant to this proceeding which will lead to the discovery of admissible evidence as to whether Complainant and its representative actively coordinated with individuals of the public to interrupt SPLP’s approved construction at the property. *Supra* paragraph 6-9.

**III. SPLP Set I No. 10-11.**

11. SPLP Set I Nos. 10-11 requests information regarding various relevant aspects of GRS’ operations, including any rent abatement programs, the identity of the property’s manager and leasing agents. GRS objects based on undue burden, that the request is irrelevant, and that the discovery appears to be related to a different proceeding. See attachment A.

12. These requests seek relevant information which will lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this proceeding. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321; see also *Supra* paragraph 6-9. These interrogatories seek to explore the underlying accusations regarding the impact GRS claims on its residents at the core of this proceeding and what programs, offerings, and accommodations GRS and its property managers have made for residents which goes directly to the veracity of their complaint. Your Honor should compel GRS’ responses to this relevant and narrowly tailored interrogatory.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*



**IV. SPLP Set I No. 12, 14, and 15**

13. SPLP Set I Nos. 12, 14, and 15 seeks to explore the extent of GRS' alleged impact to residents, and the veracity thereof, as a result of construction at the property. These requests seek information on how many tenants vacated Glen Riddle Apartments in the last six months, the vacancy rate or number of units vacant since September 1, 2020, and whether tenants have relocated to other buildings at the property and from which buildings they left. GRS objects to these requests as burdensome and irrelevant, as well as that they are related to other proceedings. See attachment A.

14. These requests seek relevant information which will lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this proceeding. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321; see also *Supra* paragraph 6-9. In the Complaint, GRS makes multiple allegations regarding the impacts of SPLP's construction at the property and on its residents. Nos. 12, 14, and 15 explore the veracity and truthfulness of those allegations and whether or not those impacts are able to be substantiated through data regarding GRS' tenancy and any change thereof at the property. Your Honor should compel GRS' responses to these relevant and narrowly tailored interrogatories.

**V. SPLP Set I RFP 1**

15. SPLP Set I RFP 1 seeks all documents and communications identified in, used to respond to, referenced by or related to GRS' answers to Set I Interrogatories. GRS objected to RFP 1 on the basis that it is burdensome and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. See attachment A.

16. SPLP's Set I RFP 1 is both relevant and not burdensome, and GRS' objections are meritless. RFP 1 requests that GRS produce the documents and communications it relied upon or used regarding its response to interrogatories, which is relevant and not burdensome. 52 Pa. Code

§ 5.321; see also *Supra* paragraph 6-9. Your Honor should compel Complainant to respond fully to RFP No. 1.

**VI. SPLP Set I RFP 10**

17. SPLP Set I RFP 10 seeks all communications between GRS and the township regarding the property or any payments made to the township. GRS objects on the same basis as above, that the request is burdensome and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. See attachment A.

18. SPLP's Set I RFP 10 is both relevant and not burdensome. This matter involves allegations regarding SPLP's construction practices, many of which require Township permitting and approval. If GRS communicated with the Township regarding SPLP's work at the property or corresponded regarding any payments made to the township, those facts and communications are relevant evidence to this proceeding to fully understand the veracity of GRS' allegations. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321; see also *Supra* paragraph 6-9. Your Honor should compel Complainant to respond fully to RFP No. 10.

**VII. SPLP Set I RFP 11**

19. SPLP Set I RFP 11 seeks all complaints filed and submissions made through GRS' website regarding SPLP's construction at the property through their web portal <https://www.glenriddleapartments.com/pipeline-report>. Complainant objected on the same basis as above, that the request is burdensome, irrelevant, and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. See attachment A.

20. GRS repeatedly has stated that its formal complaint pending before the Commission and its Emergency Order requests are on behalf of not only GRS' property interests, but for its

residents or tenants safety concerns.<sup>7</sup> Complaints made by GRS residents directly to GRS management regarding SPLP's construction activities are acutely relevant to this proceeding and the allegations raised in the Complaint including but not limited to GRS' belief that the work site is "unsafe" or presents hazards to Glen Riddle Residents. Production of complaints residents have filed with management for GRS regarding SPLP's construction at the web portal, if any, is not burdensome and would be easily accessible by GRS management. Your Honor should compel Complaint to respond fully to RFP No. 11.

#### **VIII. SPLP Set I RFP 13**

21. SPLP Set I RFP 13 seeks all communications by and between Glen Riddle and Delaware County, including the District Attorney's Office. Complainant objected on the same basis as above, that the request is burdensome, irrelevant, and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. See attachment A.

22. In the spirit of compromise, SPLP is willing to modify the original question to seek the following:

"All communications by and between Glen Riddle and Delaware County relative to SPLP's construction and occupation or use of the site at the Property."

23. With this amended request, SPLP seeks relevant and not burdensome discovery focused primarily on the property at issue. Communications between Glen Riddle and Delaware County regarding SPLP's construction and occupation or use of the site is relevant to the allegations of the complaint.

---

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. Complaint Paragraphs 41, 44-47, 61; Petition for Interim Emergency Relief *in passim*.

**IX. SPLP Set I RFP 14-17**

24. SPLP Set I RFP 14-17 seeks information regarding information supplied to tenants via leases, applications, rules, regulations, or requirements, as well as marketing brochures. Complainant objected to these RFPs on the same basis as above, that the request is burdensome, irrelevant, and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence or that the request is related to another proceeding. See attachment A. These objections are meritless and should be dismissed.

25. Complainant's objection to the production based on their undue burden is devoid of fact and logic - the leases they currently use, an application for tenancy, the rules which apply to tenants and GRS' marketing are factually not supportable, and each of these items are something GRS must have in its possession to carry out its leasing and daily apartment operations at the property. Moreover, GSA has alleged that SPLP's actions have interfered with tenancy, uses, obligations and rights of tenants under the leases. Information regarding that is clearly relevant or likely to result in relevant evidence regarding the matters, rights and obligations alleged to be interfered. The production of such materials requires no more effort that GRS does for any new tenancy applicant interested in leasing at the property. Further, these materials are relevant to the allegations in the Complaint regarding the temporary construction activities at the site and what notice or rules thereof apply to tenants. This project and the work in the area has been widely publicized for years, and whether and how Glen Riddle has advised prospective tenants of that fact is highly relevant to the issues of credibility of the present complaints about SPLP's activities at the property. Such rules and regulations may also include specific guidance, if any, from GRS to tenants on safe procedures for construction at the property, including but not limited to paving, sidewalk repairs, other utility repairs, etc., that may impact residents in a similar manner as SPLP's

approved construction activities. Your Honor should compel Complainant to fully respond to SPLP Set I RFP 14-17 and dismiss the meritless objections.

**CONCLUSION**

WHEREFORE, Sunoco Pipeline L.P. respectfully requests that Your Honor reject Complainant Glen Riddle Station L.P.'s Objections to SPLP's Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents Set 1 and grant this Motion to Compel.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Thomas J. Sniscak

Thomas J. Sniscak, Esq. (PA ID No. 33891)  
Whitney E. Snyder, Esq. (PA ID No. 316625)  
Kevin J. McKeon, Esq. (PA ID No. 30428)  
Bryce R. Beard, Esq. (PA ID No. 325837)  
Hawke, McKeon & Sniscak LLP  
100 North Tenth Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
Tel: (717) 236-1300  
tjsniscak@hmslegal.com  
wesnyder@hmslegal.com  
kjmckeon@hmslegal.com  
brbeard@hmslegal.com

Date: March 1, 2021

# **ATTACHMENT A**



Eagleview Corporate Center  
747 Constitution Drive  
Suite 100  
Exton, PA 19341-0673  
Tel (610) 458-7500 Fax (610) 458-7337  
www.foxrothschild.com

SAMUEL W. CORTES  
Direct No: 610.458.4966  
Email: SCortes@FoxRothschild.com

February 19, 2021

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

**Re: Glen Riddle Station, L.P. v. Sunoco Pipeline L.P.; Docket No. C-2020-3023129**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for electronic filing is the Certificate of Service regarding Glen Riddle Station, L.P.'s Objections to Certain Sunoco Pipeline L.P.'s Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents upon Glen Riddle Station, L.P. – Set I, in the above-referenced matter. If you have any questions with regard to this filing, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Samuel W. Cortes', written over a light blue horizontal line.

Samuel W. Cortes

SWC:jcc  
Enclosure

cc: Per Certificate of Service

A Pennsylvania Limited Liability Partnership

California Colorado Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Illinois Minnesota  
Nevada New Jersey New York North Carolina **Pennsylvania** South Carolina Texas Washington

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

|                            |   |                       |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| GLEN RIDDLE STATION, L.P., | : | DOCKET C-2020-3023129 |
| Complainant,               | : |                       |
|                            | : |                       |
| v.                         | : |                       |
|                            | : |                       |
| SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.,      | : |                       |
| Respondent.                | : |                       |

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have, on February 19, 2021, served a true copy of Glen Riddle Station, L.P.’s Objections to Certain Sunoco Pipeline L.P.’s Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents upon Glen Riddle Station, L.P. – Set I upon the participants and by the methods set forth below, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54, as indicated below:

**Email and First Class U.S. Mail**

Thomas J. Sniscak, Esquire  
Whitney E. Snyder, Esquire  
Hawke, McKeon & Sniscak LLP  
100 North Tenth Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101



\_\_\_\_\_  
Samuel W. Cortes, Esquire





Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
**Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission**  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265  
**EFILING - FILING DETAIL**

| Date Created | Filing Number |
|--------------|---------------|
| 2/19/2021    | 2011139       |

Your filing has been electronically received. Upon review of the filing for conformity with the Commission's filing requirements, a notice will be issued acknowledging acceptance or rejection (with reason) of the filing. The matter will receive the attention of the Commission and you will be advised if any further action is required on your part.

The date filed on will be the current day if the filing occurs on a business day before or at 4:30 p.m. (EST). It will be the next business day if the filing occurs after 4:30 p.m. (EST) or on weekends or holidays.

**Docket Number:** C-2020-3023129

**Case Description:**

**Transmission Date:** 2/19/2021 1:05 PM

**Filed On:** 2/19/2021 1:05 PM

**eFiling Confirmation Number:** 2011139

| File Name   | Document Type          | Upload Date          |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|
| Filing Package - GRS COS for Objections to Discovery Requests.pdf | Certificate of Service | 2/19/2021 1:04:57 PM |

For filings exceeding 250 pages, the PUC is requiring that filers submit one paper copy to the Secretary's Bureau within three business days of submitting the electronic filing online. Please mail the paper copy along with copy of this confirmation page to Secretary, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, 400 North Street, Harrisburg PA 17120 a copy of the filing confirmation page or reference the filing confirmation number on the first page of the paper copy.

**No paper submission is necessary for filings under 250 pages.**

You can view a record of this filing and previous filings you have submitted to the PUC by using the links in the Filings menu at the top of the page. Filings that have been submitted within the last 30 days can be viewed by using the Recent Filings link. Older filings can be viewed by using the search options available in the Filing History link.

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

|                           |   |                           |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| GLEN RIDDLE STATION, L.P. | : |                           |
|                           | : |                           |
| Complainant,              | : |                           |
|                           | : |                           |
| v.                        | : |                           |
|                           | : | Docket No. C-2020-3023129 |
| SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.,     | : |                           |
|                           | : |                           |
| Respondent.               | : |                           |

**OBJECTIONS OF GLEN RIDDLE STATION, L.P., TO CERTAIN OF SUNOCO  
PIPELINE L.P.’S INTERROGATORIES AND REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF  
DOCUMENTS DIRECTED TO GLEN RIDDLE STATION L.P. – SET 1**

Pursuant to the provisions of 52 Pa. Code § 5.342 and 52 Pa. Code § 5.361, Glen Riddle Station, L.P. (“GRS”), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby objects to certain of the Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents of Sunoco Pipeline L.P. (“Sunoco”), as follows:

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

1. GRS objects to the Discovery Requests to the extent that Sunoco seeks to impose upon GRS duties and obligations beyond those set forth in the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure and the Pennsylvania Code.
2. GRS objects to producing any information in response to the Discovery Requests that is protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work-product doctrine, or any other applicable protection, restriction, or immunity from discovery.
3. GRS objects to the Discovery Requests as being overbroad and seeking voluminous information and/or documents not relevant to this matter and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

## INTERROGATORIES – SET I

1. Identify all communications between Glen Riddle and Glenn Riddle Residents regarding the Pipeline Project, Sunoco’s work on the Property, or Sunoco.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding. The interrogatory is not likely to lead to evidence relevant to the Safety Issues (as defined in paragraph 118 of the Complaint).**

**Subject to the foregoing Objection, GRS will provide a response to the Interrogatory to the extent it relates to the safety issues set forth in the Complaint.**

2. Identify all communications between Glen Riddle Residents and Glen Riddle regarding the Pipeline Project, Sunoco’s work on the Property, or Sunoco.
3. Identify all communications between Glen Riddle and the Township related to the Property.
4. Reference the “Letter to the Editor: Why is Middletown siding with the pipeline?” published in the DELCO Times on February 4, 2021.
  - a. When was this Letter to the Editor submitted to the DELCO Times?

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding. The interrogatory is not likely to lead to evidence relevant to the Safety Issues (as defined in paragraph 118 of the Complaint).**

- b. Identify all documents supporting or relating to the Letter to the Editor, including but not limited to copies or logs of all communications in support of the noise allegations in the Letter.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the**

**grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding. The interrogatory is not likely to lead to evidence relevant to the Safety Issues (as defined in paragraph 118 of the Complaint).**

5. Identify and describe all measurements of sound levels and/or vibrations from SPLP's construction at the Property.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond.**

**Subject to the foregoing Objection, GRS will provide a response to the Interrogatory with those in our possession.**

6. Identify how many parking spots were present on the Property prior to SPLP commencing work at the Property.
7. Identify the average size of each parking space on the Property.
8. Identify how many cars are listed on current leases with the Property or otherwise registered with Glen Riddle.
9. Identify all communications between Glen Riddle and:
  - a. Anyone associated with the "Mama Bear Brigade" including but not limited to Linda Emory, Abbie Wysor, Barbara Montabana, and Ann Dixon.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.**

- b. Virginia Kerslake

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.**

- c. Eric Friedman

**OBJECTION:** GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.

d. Christina DiGiulio a/k/a PK Ditty

**OBJECTION:** GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.

e. Rosemary Fuller

**OBJECTION:** GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.

10. Identify any document related to a rent abatement program for Glen Riddle Residents.

**OBJECTION:** GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.

**GRS objects to this interrogatory because this appears to be discovery related to the eminent domain proceeding, which is improper.**

11. Identify the apartment or other manager for the Property and any leasing agents.

**OBJECTION:** GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.

**GRS objects to this interrogatory because this appears to be discovery related to the eminent domain proceeding, which is improper.**

12. Identify all tenants who have vacated Glen Riddle Apartments in the last six months.

**OBJECTION:** GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the

**grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.**

**GRS objects to this interrogatory because this appears to be discovery related to the eminent domain proceeding, which is improper.**

13. Identify the total number of apartments at the Glen Riddle Apartments.
14. Identify and describe the vacancy rate or number of vacant units and their building as of September 1, 2020, October 1, 2020, November 1, 2020, December 1, 2020, January 1, 2021, and February 1, 2021.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding. The interrogatory is not likely to lead to evidence relevant to the Safety Issues (as defined in paragraph 118 of the Complaint).**

**GRS objects to this interrogatory because this appears to be discovery related to the eminent domain proceeding, which is improper.**

15. Has any tenant that relocated from one Glen Riddle Apartment building to another Glen Riddle Apartment building due to the Pipeline Project? If so:
  - a. Identify any such tenants.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.**

**GRS objects to this interrogatory because this appears to be discovery related to the eminent domain proceeding, which is improper.**

- b. Identify the building from which the vacated and the building into which they moved.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the**

**grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.**

**GRS objects to this interrogatory because this appears to be discovery related to the eminent domain proceeding, which is improper.**

16. Identify and describe any safety related improvements made to the Property, including but not limited to the Apartment buildings in the last five years.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this interrogatory because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.**

17. Identify how many tenants have children 18 years of age or younger.

#### **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS – SET I**

1. All documents and/or communications identified in, used to respond to, referenced by, or related to Glen Riddle's answers to the Interrogatories.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this Document Request because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this Document Request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.**

2. All documents and/or communications identified in, referenced by, or related to Glen Riddle's Complaint.
3. All documents, communications, and information relating to the safety of Sunoco's construction at the Property.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this Document Request because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this Document Request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding**

**Subject to the foregoing Objection, GRS will provide the documents to this Request to the extent it relates to the safety issues set forth in the Complaint.**

4. All documents, communications, and information submitted by Glen Riddle to the Township related to Sunoco's work at the Property.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this Document Request because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this Document Request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding. The request is not likely to lead to evidence relevant to the Safety Issues (as defined in paragraph 118 of the Complaint).**

**Subject to the foregoing Objection, GRS will provide the documents to this Request to the extent it relates to the safety issues set forth in the Complaint.**

5. All documents, communications, and information submitted by Glen Riddle to the Pennsylvania Department of Health related to Sunoco's work at the Property.
6. All documents, communications, and information submitted by Glen Riddle to the Pennsylvania State Police related to Sunoco's work at the Property.
7. All documents, communications, and information submitted by Glen Riddle to the Pennsylvania Attorney General related to Sunoco's work at the Property.
8. All documents, communications and information by and between Glen Riddle and Rosetree Media School District related to the Pipeline Project.
9. All documents, communications, and information submitted by Glen Riddle to any other state or federal agency related to Sunoco's work at the Property.
10. All communications by and between Glenn Riddle and the Township or any representatives of the Township relating to the Property or payments made to the Township.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this Document Request because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this Document Request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding**

11. All submissions made through the portal at the following link on Glen Riddle Station's website: <https://www.glenriddleapartments.com/pipeline-report>.



**OBJECTION:** GRS objects to this Document Request because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this Document Request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding. The request is not likely to lead to evidence relevant to the Safety Issues (as defined in paragraph 118 of the Complaint).

12. All documents and information related to the Mama Bear Brigade protest event staged at the Property on January 30, 2021.

**OBJECTION:** GRS objects to this Document Request because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this Document Request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.

13. All communications by and between Glen Riddle and Delaware County, including the District Attorney's Office.

**OBJECTION:** GRS objects to this Document Request because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this Document Request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.

14. A sample lease for the Glen Riddle Apartments.

**OBJECTION:** GRS objects to this Document Request because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this Document Request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.

GRS objects to this Document Request because this appears to be discovery related to the eminent domain proceeding, which is improper.

15. A sample application for tenancy at the Glen Riddle Apartments.

**OBJECTION:** GRS objects to this Document Request because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this Document Request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.

**GRS objects to this Document Request because this appears to be discovery related to the eminent domain proceeding, which is improper.**

16. Any document evidencing rules, regulations, or requirements of tenants at the Glen Riddle Apartments.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this Document Request because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this Document Request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.**

17. All marketing materials, brochures, and websites for Glen Riddle Apartments from the last two years.

**OBJECTION: GRS objects to this Document Request because it would cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden, and expense and would require an unreasonable investigation to respond. GRS also objects to this Document Request on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence relevant to the issues raised in the instant proceeding.**

**GRS objects to this Document Request because this appears to be discovery related to the eminent domain proceeding, which is improper.**

**FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP**

February 19, 2021

By:



---

Samuel W. Cortes, Esquire  
Attorney ID No. 91494  
*Attorneys for Complainant*