



Thomas J. Sniscak
(717) 703-0800
tjsniscak@hmslegal.com

Kevin J. McKeon
(717) 703-0801
kjmckeon@hmslegal.com

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

100 North Tenth Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 Phone: 717.236.1300 Fax: 717.236.4841 www.hmslegal.com

March 19, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

Re: Docket No. C-2017-2589346; Sunoco Pipeline LP Reply to West Goshen Township Reply to New Matter

Dear Secretary Chiavetta,

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.63, Sunoco Pipeline LP (SPLP) submits this letter reply to West Goshen Township's February 26, 2018 Reply to New Matter Raised in Sunoco Pipeline LP's Answer in Opposition to West Goshen Township's (WGT) Petition for Reconsideration, or in the alternative, amendment of the Commission's Order Entered January 9, 2018 (Reply).

On March 15, 2018, the Commission denied WGT's Petition, and noted that while WGT had filed the Reply, it was not necessary to address the reply because many of WGT's "responses are not responses to new material facts, but are, instead, responses to Sunoco's arguments that the Township disagrees with. Our Regulations do not provide the opportunity for a Party to file a response to arguments in an Answer to a Petition for Reconsideration." March 15, 2018 Order at n. 5.

SPLP had previously advised the Commission that it would respond to the Reply consistent with the Commission's regulations, on March 19, 2018. Since the Commission has already decided this matter, it appears SPLP's Reply is moot. However, SPLP provides this Letter Reply to ensure that the allegations contained in WGT's Reply are not deemed admitted. Accordingly, SPLP submits the following reply:

As to each “New Matter Allegation” contained in WGT’s Reply, SPLP denies the characterization of SPLP’s Answer to the Petition. SPLP’s Answer speaks for itself. As the Commission noted, most of what WGT characterized as “New Matter Allegations” are actually arguments, not a reply to new material facts. As to the factual averments contained in WGT’s “Township Reply to New Matter” paragraphs, SPLP responds as follows:

1. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 1.** Denied.
2. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 2.** SPLP denies that “drilling at Janiec 2, rather than on the SPLP Use Area, is consistent with putting the Valve on Janiec 2.” Drilling at Janiec 2 is also consistent with putting the valve on the SPLP Use Area or placing no valve in the Township at all.
3. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 3.** SPLP denies that these documents were “buried.” WGT’s lack of diligence is no excuse, where, as here, WGT made an overbroad request, SPLP informed WGT that its request was overbroad, yet WGT sought to compel SPLP to produce this burdensome amount of information, and, as ALJ Barnes ordered, SPLP produced the requested documents on November 21, 2017, the day on which they were due. *See West Goshen Township v. Sunoco Pipeline, L.P.*, Docket No. C-2017-2589346, Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Motion to Compel Responses at Ordering Paragraph 4 (Order entered November 1, 2017) (“That Sunoco Pipeline L.P. is compelled to provide complete answers to Interrogatories 6, 10, 13, 14, 19, 20, and 21 within twenty (20) days of the date of entry of this Order.”).
4. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 4.** SPLP denies that “There was no allegation by the Township that SPLP’s Petition was not properly verified.” WGT’s argument continues to be meritless and its new allegation completely ignores the fact that a verification pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 1.36 has the same effect as a sworn, notarized

statement under 57 Pa. C.S. § 316. By submitting an accompanying verification, under the Commission's rules, SPLP's Petition in effect was sworn. 52 Pa. Code § 1.36 ("Verification means a signed written statement of fact supported by oath or affirmation or made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities). . . . When verification is permitted, notarization is not necessary.").

5. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 5.** Denied.
6. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 6.** Denied.
7. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 7.** Denied.
8. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 8.** Denied.
9. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 9.** Denied.
10. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 10.** Denied to the extent WGT alleges WGT has participated in good faith to attempt to settle this matter.
11. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 11.** Denied.
12. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 12.** Denied.
13. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 13.** Denied.
14. **Reply to Township Reply to New Matter Allegation 14.** SPLP denies WGT's characterization of any of the documents that WGT discusses.

Very truly yours,



Thomas J. Sniscak
Kevin J. McKeon
Whitney E. Snyder
Counsel for Sunoco Pipeline, L.P.

TJS/WES/das

cc: Per Certificate of Service

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 electronically on the Commission's electronic filing system.

VIA EMAIL AND FIRST-CLASS MAIL

David J. Brooman, Esquire
Richard Sokorai, Esquire
Mark R. Fischer, Jr., Esquire
High Swartz LLP
40 East Airy Street
Norristown, PA 19404
dbrooman@highswartz.com
rsokorai@highswartz.com
mfischer@highswartz.com

Counsel for West Goshen Township

Douglas Wayne, Esquire
High Swartz LLP
116 East Court Street
Doylestown, PA 18901
dwayne@highswartz.com

Counsel for West Goshen Township



Thomas J. Sniscak
Kevin J. McKeon
Whitney E. Snyder

DATED: March 19, 2018