

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**  
**Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120**

**Sunoco Pipeline, L.P.**

**Public Meeting – December 8, 2022**  
**3023129-TUS**  
**Docket No. C-2020-3023129**

**STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN GLADYS BROWN DUTRIEUILLE**

On December 2, 2020, Glen Riddle Station, L.P. (Glen Riddle) filed a formal Complaint alleging that Sunoco Pipeline L.P.'s (Sunoco) construction of the Mariner East 2 and Mariner East 2x pipelines across and adjacent to its buildings, which house 124 residential apartments, caused severe disruption to its residents sufficient to constitute unreasonable service by the utility. Glen Riddle claimed that Sunoco's actions adversely affected property parking and traffic safety, created an unsafe construction work site, shirked government-mandated pandemic safety protocols, caused a water line break depriving residents of water service, raised structural and storm drainage concerns, and that the utility failed to communicate regarding a potentially hazardous leak.

At the June 16, 2022 Public Meeting, the Commission denied Sunoco's Exceptions to the Initial Decision and sustained the ALJ's determination that Sunoco provided unreasonable service as well as the recommended \$51,000 civil penalty. At the August 25, 2022 Public Meeting, the Commission granted Sunoco's Petition to Reconsider and rescinded \$48,000 of the civil penalty. I dissented on that vote because Sunoco failed to raise any new or novel arguments on reconsideration.<sup>1</sup> As a public service message, I reiterate that had proper public notice of construction activity been given to Glen Riddle as required by our regulations, an accord could have been reached between the parties regarding construction times and possible ways to minimize disruption to the community.

The Petition before us for consideration today is Sunoco's request for a refund of \$48,000 of the \$51,000 civil penalty paid. Although I dissented on the decision to lower the civil penalty, I agree that consistent with the majority's decision to lower the penalty, the instant Petition requesting the refund should be granted.

**December 8, 2022**  
**Date**



---

**Gladys Brown Dutrieuille, Chairman**

---

<sup>1</sup> *Duick v. Pa. Gas & Water Co.*, 56 Pa. PUC 553, 558-559 (1983); 51 PUR4th 284, 288-289 (1983).