

Morgan Lewis

Mark A. Lazaroff
Partner
+1.215.963.4603
mark.lazaroff@morganlewis.com

August 22, 2025

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Matthew L. Homsher, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

**Re: Petition of the Borough of Royersford, Pennsylvania for Emergency Order
Docket No. P-2025-3056530**

Dear Secretary Homsher:

Enclosed please find a **Motion for Protective Order** (the “Motion”) for filing in the above-referenced docket.

Copies of the Motion have been served in accordance with the enclosed Certificate of Service.

If you have any questions regarding this filing, please contact me directly at 215.963.4603.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,



Mark A. Lazaroff
MAL/ap

c: Per Certificate of Service

DB1/ 161755678.1

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

PETITION OF THE BOROUGH OF :
ROYERSFORD, PENNSYLVANIA FOR : **DOCKET NO. P-2025-3056530**
EMERGENCY ORDER :

MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

TO DEPUTY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE CHRISTOPHER P. PELL AND
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE F. JOSEPH BRADY:

PECO Energy Company (“PECO”) hereby requests that the Honorable Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge Christopher P. Pell and Administrative Law Judge F. Joseph Brady (the “ALJs”) enter a Protective Order in this proceeding pursuant to the provisions of 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.362(a)(7) and 5.365(a). In support of this Motion, the Company represents as follows:

1. On July 28, 2025, the Borough of Royersford (“Borough”) filed its Petition for Emergency Order (“Petition”) in the above-captioned proceeding seeking the issuance of an *ex parte* emergency order from the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“PUC” or “Commission”) pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 3.1 et. seq to address conditions at two railroad crossings in the Borough (the “Crossings”).

2. On August 1, 2025, Chairman Stephen M. DeFrank issued an Ex Parte Emergency Order which: (1) granted in part, and denied in part, the Petition; (2) directed the Commission’s Bureau of Technical Utility Services (“TUS”) to meet and confer with all interested parties within 20 days to consider options for immediate remediation of the dangerous conditions at the Crossings; and (3) referred the Petition to the Office of Administrative Law Judge for adjudication as a formal complaint, on an expedited basis.

3. On August 4, 2025, the Commission issued an Initial Telephonic Prehearing Conference Notice scheduling a prehearing conference with the ALJs. Also on August 4, 2025, the ALJs issued their Prehearing Conference Order.

4. On August 7, 2025, the ALJs granted a request made by PECO, with the support of Norfolk Southern Corporation (“NS”) and the Borough, to modify the procedural schedule, extending the due date for Prehearing Memoranda to August 15, 2025 at noon and rescheduling the initial prehearing conference to August 19, 2025.

5. On August 15, 2025, PECO submitted a Prehearing Conference Memorandum that included a proposed Protective Order and further explained that the Protective Order was circulated to all parties for consideration and no party expressed objections to the Protective Order.

6. On August 19, 2025, the ALJs convened a Prehearing Conference. During the Prehearing Conference, the Borough and the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement requested additional time to review the Protective Order proposed by the Company. The ALJs requested that the parties confer and that PECO submit a motion for the entry of its proposed Protective Order no later than August 22, 2025.

7. Subsequent to the Prehearing Conference, the parties agreed to limited modifications to the proposed Protective Order that was appended to PECO’s Prehearing Conference Memorandum.

8. It is possible that, in the course of this proceeding, proprietary information within the definition of 52 Pa. Code § 5.365 may be presented or requested that justifies the issuance of a protective order. Some of that information may be of a highly confidential nature. Treatment

of such information as set forth in the proposed Protective Order, attached as Exhibit A, is justified because unrestricted disclosure of such information would not be in the public interest. These considerations constitute cause for the restrictions specified in 52 Pa. Code § 5.365 and in Administrative Law Judge or Commission Orders granting relief pursuant to said regulation.

9. Under 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.362(a)(7) and 5.365, the Office of Administrative Law Judge or the Commission may issue a Protective Order to limit or prohibit disclosure of confidential information where the potential harm to a participant would be substantial and outweighs the public's interest in having access to the confidential information. In applying this standard, relevant factors to be considered include the extent to which disclosure would cause unfair economic or competitive damage; the extent to which the information may already be known by others and used in similar activities; and the potential value of such information to the party and the party's competitors. 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.365(a)(1)-(3).

10. The attached proposed Protective Order defines two categories of protected information. The first is "CONFIDENTIAL" protected material, which is defined in Paragraph 3 of Exhibit A as "those materials which customarily are treated by that party as sensitive or proprietary, which are not available to the public, and which, if disclosed freely, would subject that party or its clients to risk of competitive disadvantage or other business injury." The second is "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" protected material, which is also defined in Paragraph 3 of Exhibit A as "those materials that are of such a commercially sensitive nature relative to the business interests of a Party or of such a private, personal nature that a Party is able to justify a heightened level of confidential protection with respect to those materials."

11. Paragraph 16 of the proposed Protective Order protects against overly broad designations of protected information by giving all parties the right to question or challenge the

confidential or proprietary nature of the information deemed “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” protected material.

12. Limitation on the disclosure of information deemed CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” protected material will not prejudice the rights of the parties, nor will such limitation frustrate the prompt and fair resolution of this proceeding. The proposed Protective Order balances the interests of the parties, the public, and the Commission.

13. The attached Protected Order sought by PECO will protect the proprietary nature of competitively valuable information while allowing the parties to use such information for purposes of the instant litigation. The proposed Protective Order applies the least restrictive means of limitation that will provide the necessary protections from disclosure.

14. The attached Protective Order also reflects the limited modifications requested by the Bureau of Investigation & Enforcement after the Prehearing Conference to allow the Bureau of Technical Utility Services and Safety Division to use protected information for purposes of investigation and enforcement of the Public Utility Code and the Commission’s regulations in this proceeding. PECO has consulted with all other parties to this proceeding regarding these limited modifications and no party expressed opposition to entry of the proposed Protective Order.

WHEREFORE, for all of the foregoing reasons, PECO Energy Company respectfully requests that Your Honors grant this Motion and issue a Protective Order in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony E. Gay (Pa. No. 74624)
Jack R. Garfinkle (Pa. No. 81892)
PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone: 267.533.1999
anthony.gay@exeloncorp.com
jack.garfinkle@exeloncorp.com

Kenneth M. Kulak (Pa. No. 75509)
Mark A. Lazaroff (Pa. No. 315407)
Catherine G. Vasudevan (Pa. No. 210254)
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
2222 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2921
Phone: 215.963.5384
Fax: 215.963.5001
ken.kulak@morganlewis.com
mark.lazaroff@morganlewis.com
catherine.vasudevan@morganlewis.com

Dated: August 22, 2025

Counsel for PECO Energy Company

EXHIBIT A

FORM OF PROTECTIVE ORDER

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

PETITION OF THE BOROUGH OF :
ROYERSFORD, PENNSYLVANIA FOR : **DOCKET NO. P-2025-3056530**
EMERGENCY ORDER :

PROTECTIVE ORDER

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. This Protective Order is hereby GRANTED and shall establish procedures for the protection of all materials and information identified in Paragraphs 2 and 3 below, which are or will be filed with the Commission, produced in discovery, or otherwise presented during the above-captioned proceeding and all proceedings consolidated with it. All persons now or hereafter granted access to the materials and information identified in Paragraph 2 of this Protective Order shall use and disclose such information only in accordance with this Order.

2. The information subject to this Protective Order is all correspondence, documents, data, information, studies, methodologies and other materials, whether produced or reproduced or stored on paper, cards, tape, disk, film, electronic facsimile, magnetic or optical memory, computer storage devices or any other devices or media, including, but not limited to, electronic mail (e-mail), furnished in this proceeding that the producing party believes to be of a proprietary or confidential nature and are so designated by being stamped “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” protected material. Such materials are referred to in this Order as “Proprietary Information.” When a statement or exhibit is identified for the record, the portions thereof that constitute Proprietary Information shall be designated as such for the record.

3. For purposes of this Protective Order there are two categories of Proprietary Information: “CONFIDENTIAL” and “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” protected material. A producing party may designate as “CONFIDENTIAL” those materials that are customarily treated by that party as sensitive or proprietary, that are not available to the public, and that, if generally disclosed, would subject that party or its clients to the risk of competitive disadvantage or other business injury. A producing party may designate as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” those materials that are of such a commercially sensitive nature, relative to the business interests of parties to this proceeding, or of such a private or personal nature, that the producing party determined that a heightened level of confidential protection with respect to those materials is appropriate. The parties shall endeavor to limit the information designated as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” protected material.

4. Subject to the terms of this Protective Order, Proprietary Information shall be provided to counsel for a party who meets the criteria of a “Reviewing Representative” as set forth below. Such counsel shall use or disclose the Proprietary Information only for purposes of preparing or presenting evidence, testimony, cross examination or argument in this proceeding. To the extent required for participation in this proceeding, such counsel may allow others to have access to Proprietary Information only in accordance with the conditions and limitations set forth in this Protective Order.

5. Information deemed “CONFIDENTIAL” shall be provided to a “Reviewing Representative.” For purposes of “CONFIDENTIAL” Proprietary Information, a “Reviewing Representative” is a person who has signed a Non-Disclosure Certificate and is:

- i. A statutory advocate, or an attorney for a statutory advocate pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 1.8 or an attorney who has formally entered an appearance in this proceeding on behalf of a party;
- ii. An attorney, paralegal, or other employee associated for purposes of this case with an attorney described in subparagraph (i) above;
- iii. An expert or an employee of an expert retained by a party for the purpose of advising that party or testifying in this proceeding on behalf of that party; or
- iv. Employees or other representatives of a party to this proceeding who have significant responsibility for developing or presenting the party's positions in this docket.

6. Information deemed "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" protected material shall be provided to a Reviewing Representative, provided, however that a Reviewing Representative, for purposes of "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" protected material, is limited to a person who has signed a Non-Disclosure Certificate and is:

- i. A statutory advocate, or an attorney for a statutory advocate, pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 1.8 or an attorney who has formally entered an appearance in this proceeding on behalf of a party;
- ii. An attorney, paralegal, or other employee associated for purposes of this case with an attorney described in subparagraph (i);
- iii. An outside expert or an employee of an outside expert retained by a party for the purposes of advising that party or testifying in this proceeding on behalf of that party; or
- iv. A person designated as a Reviewing Representative for purposes of HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL protected material pursuant to paragraph 11.

Provided, further, that in accordance with the provisions of Sections 5.362 and 5.365(e) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (52 Pa. Code §§ 5.362, 5.365(e)) any party may, by objection or motion, seek further protection with respect to HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL protected material, including, but not limited to, total prohibition of disclosure or limitation of disclosure only to particular parties.

7. For purposes of this Protective Order, a Reviewing Representative may not be a “Restricted Person” absent agreement of the party producing the Proprietary Information pursuant to Paragraph 11. A “Restricted Person” shall mean: (a) an officer, director, stockholder, partner, or owner of any competitor of the parties or an employee of such an entity if the employee’s duties involve marketing or pricing of the competitor’s products or services or advising another person who has such duties; (b) an officer, director, stockholder, partner, or owner of any affiliate of a competitor of the parties (including any association of competitors of the parties) or an employee of such an entity if the employee’s duties involve marketing or pricing of the competitor’s products or services or advising another person who has such duties; (c) an officer, director, stockholder, owner, agent (excluding any person under Paragraph 6.i or 6.ii), or employee of a competitor of a customer of the parties or of a competitor of a vendor of the parties if the Proprietary Information concerns a specific, identifiable customer or vendor of the parties; and (d) an officer, director, stockholder, owner or employee of an affiliate of a competitor of a customer of the parties if the Proprietary Information concerns a specific, identifiable customer of the parties; provided, however, that no expert shall be disqualified on account of being a stockholder, partner, or owner unless that expert’s interest in the business would provide a significant motive for violating the limitations of permissible use of the Proprietary Information. For purposes of this Protective Order, stocks, partnership or other ownership interests valued at more than \$10,000 or constituting more than a 1% interest in a business establish a significant motive for violation. A “Restricted Person” shall not include an expert for the Office of Small Business Advocate or Office of Consumer Advocate.

8. If an expert for a party, another member of the expert’s firm or the expert’s firm generally also serves as an expert for, or as a consultant or advisor to, a Restricted Person (other than an expert or expert firm retained by the Office of Small Business Advocate or Office of Consumer Advocate), that expert must: (1) identify for the parties each Restricted Person and all

personnel in or associated with the expert's firm that work on behalf of the Restricted Person;

(2) take all reasonable steps to segregate those personnel assisting in the expert's participation in this proceeding from those personnel working on behalf of a Restricted Person; and (3) if segregation of such personnel is impractical, the expert shall give to the producing party written assurances that the lack of segregation will in no way adversely affect the interests of the parties or their customers. The parties retain the right to challenge the adequacy of the written assurances that the parties' or their customers' interests will not be adversely affected. No other persons may have access to the Proprietary Information except as authorized by order of the Commission.

9. Reviewing Representatives qualified to receive "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" protected material may discuss HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL protected material with their client or with the entity with which they are employed or associated, to the extent that the client or entity is not a "Restricted Person," but may not share with, or permit the client or entity to review or have access to, the HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL protected material.

10. Proprietary Information shall be treated by the parties and by the Reviewing Representative in accordance with the terms of this Protective Order, which are hereby expressly incorporated into the certificate that must be executed pursuant to Paragraph 12(a). Proprietary Information shall be used as necessary, for the conduct of this proceeding and for no other purpose, except that the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission's Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement, Bureau of Technical Utility Services ("TUS") and Safety Division, may use Proprietary Information for purposes of investigation and enforcement of the Public Utility Code and the Commission's regulations in this proceeding, subject to the continuing obligation to treat Proprietary Information as within the exemptions from disclosure provided in the Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Act (65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(11)) until such time as the information is found to be non-proprietary. Proprietary Information shall not be disclosed in any manner to any person

except a Reviewing Representative who is engaged in the conduct of this proceeding and who needs to know the information in order to carry out that person's responsibilities in this proceeding; provided, however, that counsel for I&E, the Office of Consumer Advocate, and Office of Small Business Advocate may share Proprietary Information with the I&E Director, and TUS and Safety Division staff for use solely in accordance with the preceding sentence of this Paragraph 10; the Consumer Advocate; and the Small Business Advocate, respectively, without obtaining a Non-Disclosure Certificate from these individuals; provided, however, that these individuals otherwise abide by the terms of the Protective Order.

11. Reviewing Representatives may not use anything contained in any Proprietary Information obtained through this proceeding to give any party or any competitor of any party a commercial advantage. In the event that a party wishes to designate as a Reviewing Representative a person not described in paragraph 6 (i) through (iii) above, the party must first seek agreement to do so from the party providing the Proprietary Information. If an agreement is reached, the designated individual shall be a Reviewing Representative pursuant to Paragraph 6 (iv) above with respect to those materials. If no agreement is reached, the party seeking to have a person designated a Reviewing Representative shall submit the disputed designation to the presiding Administrative Law Judge for resolution.

12. (a) A Reviewing Representative shall not be permitted to inspect, participate in discussions regarding, or otherwise be permitted access to Proprietary Information pursuant to this Protective Order unless that Reviewing Representative has first executed a Non-Disclosure Certificate in the form provided in Appendix A, provided, however, that if an attorney or expert qualified as a Reviewing Representative has executed such a certificate, the paralegals, secretarial and clerical personnel under his or her instruction, supervision or control need not do so. A copy of each executed Non-Disclosure Certificate shall be provided to counsel for the party asserting confidentiality prior to disclosure of any Proprietary Information to that

Reviewing Representative.

(b) Attorneys and outside experts qualified as Reviewing Representatives are responsible for ensuring that persons under their supervision or control comply with the Protective Order.

13. The parties shall designate data or documents as constituting or containing Proprietary Information by stamping the documents “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” protected material. Where only part of data compilations or multi-page documents constitutes or contains Proprietary Information, the parties, insofar as reasonably practicable within discovery and other time constraints imposed in this proceeding, shall designate only the specific data or pages of documents which constitute or contain Proprietary Information. The Commission and all parties, including the statutory advocates and any other agency or department of state government will consider and treat the Proprietary Information as within the exemptions from disclosure provided in the Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Act (65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(11)) until such time as the information is found to be non-proprietary.

14. Any public reference to Proprietary Information by a party or its Reviewing Representatives shall be to the title or exhibit reference in sufficient detail to permit persons with access to the Proprietary Information to understand fully the reference and not more. The Proprietary Information shall remain a part of the record, to the extent admitted, for all purposes of administrative or judicial review.

15. Part of any record of this proceeding containing Proprietary Information, including but not limited to all exhibits, writings, testimony, cross examination, argument, and responses to discovery, and including reference thereto as mentioned in paragraph 14 above, shall be sealed for all purposes, including administrative and judicial review, unless such Proprietary Information is released from the restrictions of this Protective Order, either through

the agreement of the parties to this proceeding or pursuant to an order of the Commission.

16. The parties shall retain the right to question or challenge the confidential or proprietary nature of Proprietary Information and to question or challenge the admissibility of Proprietary Information. If a party challenges the designation of a document or information as proprietary, the party providing the information retains the burden of demonstrating that the designation is appropriate.

17. The parties shall retain the right to object to the production of Proprietary Information on any proper ground, and to refuse to produce Proprietary Information pending the adjudication of the objection.

18. Within 30 days after a Commission final order is entered in the above-captioned proceeding, or in the event of appeals, within thirty days after appeals are finally decided, the receiving party, upon request, shall either destroy or return to the parties all copies of all documents and other materials not entered into the record, including notes, which contain any Proprietary Information. In its request, a providing party may specify whether such materials should be destroyed or returned. In the event that the materials are destroyed instead of returned, the receiving party shall certify in writing to the providing party that the Proprietary Information has been destroyed. In the event that the materials are returned instead of destroyed, the receiving party shall certify in writing to the providing party that no copies of materials containing the Proprietary Information have been retained.

Date: _____, 2025

Christopher P. Pell
Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge

F. Joseph Brady
Administrative Law Judge

APPENDIX A

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

PETITION OF THE BOROUGH OF :
ROYERSFORD, PENNSYLVANIA FOR : **DOCKET NO. P-2025-3056530**
EMERGENCY ORDER :

NON-DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The undersigned is the _____ of _____
(the receiving party).

The undersigned has read and understands the Protective Order deals with the treatment of Proprietary Information. The undersigned agrees to be bound by, and comply with, the terms and conditions of said Order, which are incorporated herein by reference.

SIGNATURE

PRINT NAME

ADDRESS

EMPLOYER

DATE: _____

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

PETITION OF THE BOROUGH OF ROYERSFORD, PENNSYLVANIA FOR EMERGENCY ORDER : **Docket No P-2025-3056530**
:

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify and affirm that I have this day served a true copy of the **Motion for Protective Order** on the following persons in the manner specified in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54:

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL or FIRST CLASS MAIL

The Honorable Christopher P. Pell
Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Philadelphia District Office
801 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107
cpell@pa.gov
Eric Ball, Administrative Assistant
erball@pa.gov

Darryl A. Lawrence
Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
Forum Place – 5th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1921
dlawrence@paoca.org

NazAarah Sabree
Office of Small Business Advocate
555 Walnut Street
Forum Place – 1st Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
ra-sba@pa.gov

The Honorable F. Joseph Brady
Administrative Law Judge
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Philadelphia District Office
801 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107
fbrady@pa.gov
Pamela McNeal, Administrative Assistant
pmcneal@pa.gov

Grant Rosul
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor West
Harrisburg, PA 17120
grosul@pa.gov

Borough of Royersford
c/o Brant & Associates, LLC
572 West Main Street
P.O. Box 26865
Trappe, PA 19426

Stephen Pemberton
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
Two Liberty Place, 22nd Floor
50 South 16th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102
spemberton@eckertseamans.com

Counsel for the Borough of Royersford

Benjamin C. Dunlap, Jr..
Cohen Seglias Pallas Greenhall & Furman PC
240 North 3rd Street, 7th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
bdunlap@cohenseglias.com

Counsel for Norfolk Southern Corporation

Dated: August 22, 2025

Carl Shultz
Renardo Hicks
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
213 Market Street, 8th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
cshultz@eckertseamans.com
rhicks@eckertseamans.com

Counsel for the Borough of Royersford
Jeffrey D. Cohen
Timothy L. Frey
Cohen & Frey P.C.
The Times Building
32 Parking Plaza, Suite 402
Ardmore, PA 19003
jcohen@freightlaw.net
tfrey@freightlaw.net

Counsel for Norfolk Southern Corporation



Mark A. Lazaroff
Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP
2222 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2921
(215) 963-4603
mark.lazaroff@morganlewis.com