
Garrett P. Lent

glent@postschell.com
717-612-6032 Direct
717-731-1985 Direct Fax
File #: 200842

November 17, 2025

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Matthew L. Homsher, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor North
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

**Re: Monroe Energy, LLC, et al. v. Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P.
Docket Nos. C-2025-3053018**

Dear Secretary Homsher:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P. is the Answer to the Motion to Strike of Monroe Energy, LLC, Lucknow-Highspire Terminals LLC, Sheetz Inc., and PBF Holding Company LLC, collectively the (“Complainants”), in the above-referenced proceeding.

Copies will be provided as indicated on the Certificate of Service.

Respectfully submitted,


Garrett P. Lent

GPL/dmc
Attachment

cc: The Honorable Eranda Vero (*via email; w/attachment*)
Certificate of Service

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served upon the following persons, in the manner indicated, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant).

VIA E-MAIL ONLY

Todd S. Stewart
HMS Legal LLP
501 Corporate Circle, Suite 302
Harrisburg, PA 17110
Email: tsstewart@hmslegal.com
Counsel for Monroe Energy, LLC

Robert A. Weishaar, Jr.
Adeolu A. Bakare
Rebecca Kimmel
McNees Wallace & Nurick, LLC
100 Pine Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
Email: bweishaar@mcneeslaw.com
abakare@mcneeslaw.com
rkimmel@mcneeslaw.com
*Counsel for Lucknow Highspire Terminals,
LLC and Sheetz, Inc.*

Randall S. Rich
Pierce Atwood LLP
1875 K Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Email: rrich@pierceatwood.com
*Attorneys for PBF Holding Company LLC
Pro hac vice*

Date: November 17, 2025



Garrett P. Lent

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Monroe Energy, LLC, Lucknow-Highspire	:	
Terminals, LLC, Sheetz, Inc. and PBF	:	
Holding Company, LLC,	:	Docket No. C-2025-3053018
	:	
Complainants,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P.	:	
	:	
Respondent.	:	
	:	

**ANSWER OF LAUREL PIPE LINE COMPANY, L.P.
TO THE MOTION TO STRIKE OF COMPLAINANTS**

Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P. (“Laurel” or the “Company”), hereby files this Answer to the Motion to Strike of the Complainants¹, pursuant to Section 5.103 of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission’s (“Commission”) regulations, 52 Pa. Code § 5.103. The Complainants request that all references to JEFFREY M. WOOLDRIDGE, INTRODUCTORY ECONOMICS: A MODERN APPROACH 88 (5th ed. 2012) (“Wooldridge”) be struck from Laurel’s Reply Brief.² If such relief is not granted, the Complainants request that an Affidavit of Witness Dr. Morris (“Morris Affidavit”) responding to Laurel’s arguments regarding Wooldridge be added to the record.³ None of the Complainants’ requested relief should be granted. Contrary to the Complainants’ insinuations, Laurel did not cite Wooldridge as additional evidence in this matter;

¹ Monroe Energy, LLC (“Monroe”), Lucknow-Highspire Terminals, LLC (“LHT”), Sheetz, Inc. (“Sheetz”), and PBF Holding Company, LLC (“PBF”), collectively, the “Complainants.”

² Motion to Strike at 3-6, ¶6-12.

³ Motion to Strike at 6-7. ¶13-15.

Wooldridge was referenced as a secondary authority for purposes of argument. The Complainants' Motion is little more than an attempt to distract from the fact that they improperly raised new theories for relief and/or causes of action for the first time in their Main Brief,⁴ and introduce further evidence (i.e., the Morris Affidavit) at a time when Laurel is deprived of an opportunity to respond to the same. For these reasons and as more fully explained below, this Motion should be disregarded and denied by the Commission.

In support thereof, Laurel states as follows:

I. BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. This proceeding was initiated on January 21, 2025, when the Complainants filed the above-captioned Formal Complaint. The Formal Complaint was filed shortly after Laurel's affiliate, Buckeye Pipe Line Company, L.P. ("Buckeye") proposed to initiate interstate service over the existing segments of the Laurel pipeline system located between Eldorado (near Altoona) and Sinking Spring (near Reading), in Pennsylvania, where Laurel's existing intrastate service would be maintained. This proposal is known as the "Bi-directional Service Extension." The Formal Complaint advanced two counts and alleged that, as a result of the bi-directional operations on its system, Laurel: (1) is providing or will provide the Complainants with unreasonable service in violation of 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501 and its Commission-approved tariff; and (2) is circumventing or will circumvent Commission jurisdiction in violation of 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 1102 and 1302.

2. Laurel makes references to and incorporates the procedural history of this matter, as set forth in Section II of its Main Brief, as if the same were fully set forth herein.

⁴ See Laurel RB, Section G. Indeed, the Motion to Strike plainly endeavors to distinguish the Complainants' efforts to introduce new theories and demands for relief from Laurel's citation to a textbook as secondary authority to support argument on brief. See Motion to Strike at 4-5, ¶10 (attempting to claim the Complainants are "drawing on evidence to fashion legal arguments in a main brief").

3. On October 3, 2025, Laurel and the Complainants filed Main Briefs addressing the issues being litigated in this proceeding.

4. On October 17, 2025, Laurel and the Complainants filed Reply Briefs.

5. Also on October 31, 2025, Complainants filed the instant Motion.

6. Pursuant to Section 5.103 of the Commission's regulations, 52 Pa. Code § 5.103, Laurel hereby submits its Answer to the Motion.

II. ANSWER TO THE MOTION TO STRIKE

7. The Complainants, in their Motion to Strike, request that all references to Wooldridge be stricken.⁵ If such relief is not granted, the Complainants request that an Affidavit of Witness Dr. Morris responding to Laurel's arguments regarding Introductory Econometrics be added to the record.⁶ None of the Complainants' requested relief should be granted.

8. First, the references to Wooldridge do not introduce new evidence to the record, but merely use a secondary authority to elucidate a general, widely-accepted statistical principle. Such citation is analogous to citations to other secondary materials on brief, such as citations to dictionaries regarding generally-accepted definitions,⁷ governmental reports,⁸ or governmental websites.⁹ Clearly, such citations by the parties do not constitute evidence, but are instead argument based upon secondary authorities.

9. Second, regardless of the merit of the Complainants' request to strike portions of Laurel's Reply Brief (and there is no merit to this request), the Complainants' request to enter the Morris Affidavit into the record is improper. Critically, despite the Complainants' contentions

⁵ Motion to Strike at 3-6, ¶¶6-12.

⁶ Motion to Strike at 6-7, ¶¶13-15.

⁷ Laurel RB at 50, n. 249 (citing Black's Law Dictionary and the Cambridge Dictionary).

⁸ Complainants RB at 7, n. 13 (citing and quoting "Keystone XL Pipeline Project: Key Issues", Congressional Research Service, 7-5700, R41668, at 5 (Dec. 12, 2011) (available at https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20111212_R41668_fbd5079ade99e949e57ccb3758184c3aa72c9fee.pdf).

⁹ Complainants RB at 7, n. 15 (citing generally www.ferc.gov/oil).

to the contrary, Laurel witness Dr. Webb's rebuttal testimony explained how his statistical analysis is consistent with generally-accepted standards and techniques.¹⁰ Dr. Webb also explained how Dr. Morris had not conducted any such similar analysis.¹¹ However, Dr. Morris at no point in his rejoinder testimony or exhibits actually states that he conducted a statistically rigorous or valid analysis.¹² Moreover, Dr. Morris admitted to the very principles discussed in Wooldridge, which the Complainants seek to strike.¹³ The Morris Affidavit does not actually attempt to contradict or contextualize the cited passages of Wooldridge as the Complainants purport. Instead, the Morris Affidavit is a latent attempt to rehabilitate and further bolster Dr. Morris's rejoinder testimony and exhibits, by attempting to inject additional discussion of statistical principles which their witness failed to address in both direct and rejoinder testimony, long after the record has closed.

10. Third, even if the Complainants' Motion to Strike had any merit (and it does not), the Complainants cast an overbroad net in the Motion. They request, for example, that this section be stricken:

The fact that Dr. Webb's discussion is consistent with basic statistical practice is also broadly supported by reviewing undergraduate textbooks. In other words, a standard econometrics text identifies precisely the issue that Dr. Webb discussed in his testimony, and to which Dr. Morris provided no effective response.¹⁴

The reference to Dr. Webb's discussion being consistent with basic statistical practice is, in fact, a reference to Dr. Webb's undisputed testimony of record. Moreover, Dr. Morris at no point in his direct or rejoinder provided an effective response to this testimony.¹⁵

¹⁰ Laurel St. No. 3-R at 94-101 and Appendix A.

¹¹ Laurel St. No. 3-R at 77.

¹² See Tr. 425-430.

¹³ Tr. 435 (Dr. Morris admitting that the omission of variables can bias the results of a statistical analysis).

¹⁴ Motion to Strike at 5, ¶12.

¹⁵ The Complainants appear to have now recognized this evidentiary gap, and have attempted to supply the Morris Affidavit to close it.

11. As a further example, the Complainants identify the following passage to be stricken:

Again, Dr. Webb's conclusion is consistent with standard statistical texts. In other words, consistent with Dr. Webb's testimony, adding irrelevant variables will not generate inaccurate results as long as the appropriate control variables are included. As such, Dr. Morris's suggestion that Dr. Webb's analysis contains too many variables is unsupported by statistical practice and completely unsupported by any evidence.¹⁶

12. The Complainants appear to intentionally omit the preceding sentences of the reference paragraph in Laurel's Reply Brief that cites the Statistical Appendix that was included with Dr. Webb's rebuttal testimony and forms the evidentiary basis for the argument presented by the remainder of this paragraph.¹⁷ The Complainants' request that such portions of the Reply Brief be stricken is not an attempt to strike record evidence; it is an attempt to rewrite arguments presented in Laurel's Reply Brief that are based on undisputed evidence presented by Laurel, and a lack of evidence presented by Complainants, which the Complainants failed to rebut.

13. Finally, Complainants' Motion to Strike is little more than an attempt to distract from the fact that they improperly raised new theories for relief and/or causes of action for the first time in their Main Brief. Indeed, Section V.G. of Laurel's Reply Brief explained that the Complainants' Main Brief contains fatal variances between the allegations in the Formal Complaint, and the evidence and arguments they presented at hearing. Unable to actually demonstrate that they have not run afoul of Pennsylvania law that prohibits a party from introducing theories for relief and/or causes of action not raised in a complaint at (or after) a

¹⁶ Motion to Strike at 6, ¶12.

¹⁷ Laurel RB at 25 (citing and quoting Paragraph 8 of the Statistical Appendix to Laurel St. No. 3-R).

hearing, the Complainants appear to be utilizing the Motion to Strike as a procedurally improper vehicle to respond to Laurel's Reply Brief.¹⁸ The ALJ should not fall for this distraction.

14. Finally, the relief the Complainants request in the alternative, the admission of the affidavit of Witness Dr. Morris, is wholly inappropriate. Such request is made in the alternative, if it is determined that the requested portions of Laurel's Reply Brief are not struck. However, if the identified portions of the Reply Brief are not struck, it is because the ALJ correctly determined that the identified portions of the Reply Brief are not extra-record evidence. If they are not extra-record evidence, then no remedy is necessary, and an affidavit would be wholly inappropriate at this stage of the proceeding. If such portions of the brief are struck, the argument is moot.

¹⁸ Motion to Strike at 4-5. Paragraph 10 of the Motion plainly attempts to rehabilitate the Complainants' misconduct, by erroneously accusing Laurel of procedural impropriety and attempting to distinguish the Complainants' conduct.

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P., respectfully requests that the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission deny the Motion to Strike of the Complainants.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Barr, Esquire (DC ID #375372)
Post & Schell, P.C.
607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005-2000
Phone: (202) 347-1000
Fax: (202) 661-6970
E-mail: cbarr@postschell.com

Admitted Pro Hac Vice

David B. MacGregor, Esquire (PA ID #28804)
Anthony D. Kanagy, Esquire (PA ID #85522)
Garrett P. Lent, Esquire (PA ID #321566)
Alice A. Wade, Esquire (ID # 335228)
Erin R. Kawa, Esquire (PA ID #308302)
Post & Schell, P.C.
17 North Second Street, 12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601
Phone: (717) 731-1970
Fax: (717) 731-1985
E-mail: dmacgregor@postschell.com
E-mail: akanagy@postschell.com
E-mail: glent@postschell.com
E-mail: alice.wade@postschell.com
E-mail: EKawa@PostSchell.com

Date: November 17, 2025

Counsel for Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P