



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

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

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

---

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

April 16, 2018

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

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

Re: Petition of the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission for the Issuance of an Ex Parte Emergency Order; Docket No. P-2018-3000281; **SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.'S ANSWER OPPOSING INTERVENTION OF PIPELINE SAFETY COALITION**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission is Sunoco Pipeline L.P.'s Answer Opposing Intervention of Pipeline Safety Coalition in the above-referenced matter. Copies of this document have been served in accordance with the attached Certificate of Service.

If you have any questions regarding this filing, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

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

TJS/WES/das

Enclosures

cc: Per Certificate of Service

BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Petition of the Bureau of Investigation and :  
Enforcement of the Pennsylvania Public :     Docket No. P-2018-3000281  
Utility Commission for the Issuance of an :  
Ex Parte Emergency Order :

---

**SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.'S ANSWER OPPOSING  
INTERVENTION OF PIPELINE SAFETY COALITION**

---

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.66,<sup>1</sup> Sunoco Pipeline L.P. (“SPLP”), by and through its attorneys, Hawke McKeon & Sniscak LLP, submits this Answer in Opposition to the Petition to Intervene of Pipeline Safety Coalition served on March 26, 2018 seeking intervention in the Commission’s March 7, 2018 *Ex Parte* Emergency Order (“Emergency Order”).

**SUMMARY**

The Petition should be denied because Pipeline Safety Coalition does not have any requisite direct interest sufficient to grant standing, any alleged interest is already adequately represented by BI&E and its Pipeline Safety Division in this proceeding, and allowing intervention will unnecessarily broaden the narrow issues involved in this proceeding, cause unnecessary time and expense, invites delay, is contrary to the interest of SPLP’s shipper customers whose service has

---

<sup>1</sup> SPLP notes that it is not required to specifically answer the allegations within a petition to intervene, and any such allegations are not deemed admitted by SPLP’s non-response. *Compare* 52 Pa. Code § 5.66 (“party may file an answer to a petition to intervene within 20 days of service, and in default thereof, may be deemed to have waived objection to the granting of the petition. Answers shall be served upon all other parties.”) *with* § 5.61(b)(3) (as to form of answers to complaints, answers must “Admit or deny specifically all material allegations of the complaint”). Given the lack of standing of the party discussed herein, the lack of technical basis or explanation or verifiable expert support for the allegations contained in the Petition, and SPLP’s ongoing cooperation with the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement and Pipeline Safety and their experts in this matter, SPLP will not respond to unsupported and incorrect assertions and allegations of the Petition. For example, Petitioner makes various assertions as to geology and the integrity of the ME1 line, which are highly technical issues, yet the Petition is verified solely by Lynda K. Farrell, Founder and Executive Director, and provides no information that she is qualified to provide verification for such allegations.

been interrupted, and will prolong an injunction that is necessarily limited to the circumstances of the Emergency Order. The Pipeline Safety Coalition alleges no facts sufficient to grant it standing as an organization and improperly attempts to expand the scope of this proceeding.

This proceeding is limited by the geography of the emergency conditions in the Lisa Drive Area of West Whiteland Township, and in the context of an *ex parte* Emergency Order proceeding that granted an injunction, that cannot be extended to other geographical regions, especially where, as here, there are no emergency circumstances beyond the Lisa Drive Area. This proceeding is not and procedurally cannot be transformed by a petition to intervene into a general safety investigation of the entire ME1 line or right-of-way with an injunction preventing operation of the line and requiring testing and remediation because there is no allegation, indication, or evidence of any conditions that could satisfy the “emergency” standard outside of the Lisa Drive Area in West Whiteland Township. *See* 52 Pa. Code § 3.2 (requiring, inter alia clear right to relief and immediate need for relief). A party seeking intervention must take the proceeding as it currently stands and cannot broaden the scope of what is at issue in the proceeding<sup>2</sup> and this principle is crucial here, in the context of an *ex parte* Emergency Order proceeding involving an injunction, because injunctive relief must be narrowly tailored to the emergency circumstance because such relief is ordered without hearing.<sup>3</sup>

Petitioner here is Pipeline Safety Coalition, which is a non-profit 501(c)(3) located in Downingtown, PA, which is outside the area at issue in this proceeding, and fails to allege the location of any of its members, and thus cannot meet the Commission’s intervention standard. In

---

<sup>2</sup> *See Com., et al. v. Energy Services Providers, Inc. d/b/a PaG&E*, Order Granting Petition to Intervene, Docket No. C-2014-2427656, 2015 WL 1957859 (Order entered Apr. 23, 2015) (Cheskis, J.) (“In granting intervention, however, Mr. Sobiech will be required to take the case as it currently stands. PaG&E is correct that intervenors generally take the record as they find it at the time of intervention.”)

<sup>3</sup> *See Woodward Twp. v. Zerbe*, 6 A.3d 651, 658 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2010) (“Even where the essential prerequisites of an injunction are satisfied, *the court must narrowly tailor its remedy to abate the injury.*”) (emphasis added).

particular, Pipeline Safety Coalition does not have a sufficient interest to have standing, any interest it alleges is more than adequately represented by BI&E and its Pipeline Safety division, and Pipeline Safety Coalition will neither be the subject of nor bound by the Commission's decision in this proceeding.

Moreover, given the lack of interest and that any alleged interests are already sufficiently represented in this proceeding, allowing Pipeline Safety Coalition and the multiple other petitioners to intervene will unnecessarily prolong the injunction beyond what is required to address circumstances the Emergency Order raised, thereby harming SPLP's shippers, their customers, and SPLP, which is a public utility providing a service in the public interest. Accordingly, the Petition to Intervene should be denied.

## **ARGUMENT**

### **A. Legal Standard**

Standing to intervene is governed under 52 Pa. Code § 5.72(a) and "pertinent case law discussing the types of interests sufficient for purposes of intervention." *Joint Application of Commonwealth Telephone Company, CTSI, LLC and CTE Telecom, LLC d/b/a Commonwealth Long Distance Company For All Approvals Under the Public Utility Code for the Acquisition By Citizens Communications Company of All Stock of the Joint Applicants' Corporate Parent, Commonwealth Telephone Enterprises, Inc.*, Docket No. A-310800F0010, Order Granting Exceptions (entered Feb. 8, 2007) ("*Commonwealth Telephone*").

52 Pa. Code § 5.72 states:

§ 5.72. Eligibility to intervene.

(a) Persons. A petition to intervene may be filed by a person claiming a right to intervene or an interest of such nature that intervention is necessary or appropriate to the administration of the

statute under which the proceeding is brought. The right or interest may be one of the following:

...  
(2) An interest which may be directly affected and which is not adequately represented by existing participants, and as to which the petitioner may be bound by the action of the Commission in the proceeding.

(3) Another interest of such nature that participation of the petitioner may be in the public interest.

Pertinent case law provides that:

one who seeks to challenge governmental action must show a direct and substantial interest and, in addition, must show a sufficiently close causal connection between the challenged action and the asserted injury to qualify the interest as “immediate” rather than “remote.” Consequently, in order to have standing, a person must be “aggrieved” or adversely affected by the matter he seeks to challenge. [A] party must have an interest in the controversy that is distinguishable from the interest shared by other citizens. To surpass that interest, the interest must be substantial, direct, and immediate.

*Commonwealth Telephone* (citing and quoting *William Penn Parking Garage v. City of Pittsburgh*, 464 Pa. 168, 202, 346 A.2d 269, 286 (1975); *Parents United for Better Schools, et al., v. School District of Phila., et al.*, 684 A.2d 689 (Pa. Commw. 1994); *Sierra Club v. Hartman*, 529 Pa. 454, 605 A.2d 309 (1992)).

Regarding organizations, the Commonwealth Court has explained that:

Dismissal for lack of standing is proper where the plaintiff organization neither identifies its affected members nor pleads sufficient facts to permit a court to determine that they have a substantial, direct and immediate interest. *Lincoln Party by Robinson v. General Assembly*, 682 A.2d 1326, 1330 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1996) (plaintiff organization failed to show that it had standing where it did not “set forth the nature of its membership or the names of any of its members” and “neglect[ed] to identify any of its members”) (emphasis in original); *Eastern Pennsylvania Citizens Against Gambling v. Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board*, (Pa. Cmwlth., No. 1912 C.D. 2013, filed Nov. 10, 2014), slip op. at 10, 2014 WL 10298868 at \*5 (community organization lacked standing where its filings “do not identify any member ... or set forth any

individualized interest of its members”).<sup>3</sup> Standing may be shown without \*535 identification of individual members, but only where the complaint's description of the organization's members is sufficient to show that they are aggrieved. *See North-Central Pennsylvania Trial Lawyers Association*, 827 A.2d at 555 (association alleged that its membership included Pennsylvania medical malpractice attorneys and challenged statute directly affected Pennsylvania medical malpractice attorneys); *Narcotics Agents Regional Committee v. American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees*, 780 A.2d 863, 870 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2001) (association represented all employees who were affected by defendant's actions); *Pennsylvania Social Services Union, Local 668*, 699 A.2d at 810 (union alleged that it represented claims investigation agents and claims investigation agent supervisors, including members of that group who were affected by the challenged removal from civil service protection); *Parents United for Better Schools, Inc.*, 646 A.2d at 692 (nonprofit corporation alleged that its members included parents of students in high schools where the challenged policy had been implemented).

*Americans for Fair Treatment, Inc. v. Philadelphia Fed'n of Teachers*, 150 A.3d 528, 534–35 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2016), *reargument denied* (Jan. 17, 2017).

Accordingly, to have standing to intervene, petitioner must show that at least one of its members has (1) a direct, substantial, and immediate interest meeting the legal standards discussed above, (2) that is not adequately represented by existing participants, and (3) that the petitioner may be bound by the action of the Commission in the proceeding. Petitioner here meets none of those three standards as it totally fails to allege any facts regarding its members. Likewise, Petitioner's intervention is not public interest.

**B. Petitioner's interest is not direct, immediate, or substantial**

Petitioner cannot show, as it is required to, a direct, immediate and substantial interest because Petitioner is not within the geographic region to which this limited *ex parte* Emergency Order proceeding pertains and fails to allege that any of its members are within that geographical location, and thus cannot show any aggrievement to Petitioner that bears a close causal connection

to this proceeding and is distinguishable from the interest of the general public in compliance with the law. “[T]he requirement that an interest be ‘direct’ means that a person claiming to be aggrieved must show causation of the harm by the matter of which he or she complains.” *In Re Peco Energy Co.*, A-110550F0160, 2005 WL 1959191, at \*2–6 (July 18, 2005). “An ‘immediate’ interest involves the nature of the causal connection between the action complained of and the injury to the party challenging it and is shown where the interest the party seeks to protect is within the zone of interests sought to be protected by the statute or the constitutional guarantee in question. Both the immediacy and directness requirements primarily depend upon the causal relationship between the claimed injury and the action in question.” *George v. Pennsylvania Pub. Util. Comm’n*, 735 A.2d 1282, 1286–87 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1999) (citing *Wm. Penn Parking Garage, Inc. v. City of Pittsburgh*, 464 Pa. 168, 346 A.2d 269 (1975)). “The requirement of a ‘substantial’ interest means there must be some discernible adverse effect to some interest other than the general interest in having others comply with the law.” *See William Penn Parking Garage*, 464 Pa. at 195, 346 A.2d at 282; *see also Friends of the AtGlen-Susquehanna Trail, Inc. v. PA. PUC*, 717 A. 2d 581 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1998), *appeal denied* 559 Pa. 695 (1999).

First, Petitioner essentially admits that its interests are neither direct or immediate because *it totally fails to allege a direct or substantial interest*. Petition at P 16. There is no causal connection between what was ordered to occur in this proceeding, solely in West Whiteland Township, and any alleged harm to Pipeline Safety Coalition. Instead, the Petition attempts to improperly expand the proceeding to include Pipeline Safety Coalition (Thornbury Township) to create an interest. This it cannot do.

This proceeding is limited by the geography of the emergency conditions, and in the context of an *ex parte* Emergency Order proceeding that granted an injunction, cannot be extended

to other geographical regions, especially where, as here, there are no emergency circumstances beyond the Lisa Drive Area. This case is an *ex parte* Emergency Order proceeding specific to addressing concerns of geological and pipeline conditions in the Lisa Drive area of West Whiteland Township, Pennsylvania. See Emergency Order at Ordering Paragraph 1. This proceeding is not and procedurally cannot be transformed by a petition to intervene into a general safety investigation of the entire ME1 line or right-of-way with an injunction preventing operation of the line and requiring testing and remediation because there is no allegation, indication, or evidence of any conditions that could satisfy the “emergency” standard outside of the Lisa Drive Area in West Whiteland Township. See 52 Pa. Code § 3.2 (requiring, *inter alia* clear right to relief and immediate need for relief). The bases for BI&E’s Petition are the subsidence issues near Lisa Drive and how they may effect the ME1 line in that area. See *e.g.*, BI&E Petition at PP 1, 4, 5-11, 26.

A party seeking intervention must take the proceeding as it currently stands and cannot broaden the scope of what as is at issue in the proceeding, especially here, where in BI&E’s Petition and in the Commission’s March 7, 2018 Order, there is no indication of emergency circumstances at issue outside of the Lisa Drive area of West Whiteland Township. See *Com., et al. v. Energy Services Providers, Inc. d/b/a PaG&E*, Order Granting Petition to Intervene, Docket No. C-2014-2427656, 2015 WL 1957859 (Order entered Apr. 23, 2015) (Cheskis, J.) (“In granting intervention, however, Mr. Sobiech will be required to take the case as it currently stands. PaG&E is correct that intervenors generally take the record as they find it at the time of intervention.”).

This principle is especially important in the context of an Emergency Order proceeding involving an injunction because injunctive relief must be narrowly tailored to the emergency circumstance because such relief is ordered without hearing. *Pye v. Com., Ins. Dep’t*, 372 A.2d



33,35 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1977) (“An injunction is an extraordinary remedy to be granted only with extreme caution”); *Woodward Twp. v. Zerbe*, 6 A.3d 651, 658 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2010) (“Even where the essential prerequisites of an injunction are satisfied, *the court must narrowly tailor its remedy* to abate the injury.”) (emphasis added).

Since Pipeline Safety Coalition cannot show a direct or immediate interest, its interest is necessarily not substantial. A substantial interest means an interest greater than that of all citizens in compliance with the law. Since there is no causal connection between Petitioner and the Emergency Order or the alleged harm to Petitioner and the Emergency Order, Petitioner is left with solely a general interest in compliance with gas safety regulations, an interest that all citizens share. Accordingly, Petitioner has not shown an interest adequate to fulfill standing requirements to intervene.

C. BI&E Adequately Represents Petitioner’s Alleged Interest

Assuming arguendo Petitioner could show an interest, that interest is more than adequately represented by BI&E and Pipeline Safety. BI&E initiated this proceeding pursuant to its statutory and regulatory mandates to prosecute and investigate “violations of the Public Utility Code and Commission regulations.” BI&E Petition at 13. The Commission’s Pipeline Safety section likewise is responsible for enforcing safety laws and regulations and providing technical expertise in this proceeding pursuant to the Emergency Order. *See* Emergency Order at Ordering Paragraph 1. BI&E’s authority to enforce the gas safety laws on behalf of the general public takes into account the broad public interest in providing safe pipeline transportation service and adequately represents any alleged interest Petitioner may have. *See In Re Peco Energy Co.*, A-110550F0160, 2005 WL 1959191, at \*2–6 (July 18, 2005) (finding individual’s interest adequately represented by public advocates representing the public interest).

Petitioner fails to assert its interest is not adequately represented. Since Pipeline Safety Coalition has no interest greater than that of the public, and BI&E expressly represents the public interest in enforcing safety laws and regulations, BI&E adequately represents Pipeline Safety Coalition's interests.

D. Petitioner Will Not Be Bound by This Proceeding

Again, since this *ex parte* Emergency Order injunction proceeding is necessarily limited in scope to emergency conditions alleged in West Whiteland Township, there is no binding effect on Pipeline Safety Coalition. Petitioner fails to even assert it could be bound by the Commission's actions in this proceeding. As such, Petitioner likewise fails to meet this prong of the intervention standard.

E. Granting Intervention is Not in the Public Interest

Allowing intervention of entities outside the geographic region of the *ex parte* Emergency Order is not in the public interest because those parties have no direct interest and thus their intervention and the time needed for their participation will unnecessarily extend the time of the injunction beyond what is necessary to ensure the safety of the ME1 pipeline, harming SPLP's shippers, the shippers' customers, and SPLP, which is a public utility. Entities outside the geographic region at issue in regions where there is no emergency attempting to intervene and unnecessarily prolong the injunction causes harms that clearly outweigh any public interest in participation of such entities, especially where, as here, BI&E and Pipeline Safety adequately represent the public interest in compliance with pipeline safety laws and regulations.

**CONCLUSION**

WHEREFORE Sunoco Pipeline L.P. respectfully requests the Commission deny the  
Petition to Intervene.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Sniscak, Attorney I.D. # 33891  
Kevin J. McKeon, Attorney I.D. # 30428  
Whitney E. Snyder, Attorney I.D. # 316625  
Hawke McKeon & Sniscak, LLP  
100 North Tenth Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
(717) 236-1300  
[tjsniscak@hmslegal.com](mailto:tjsniscak@hmslegal.com)  
[kjmckeon@hmslegal.com](mailto:kjmckeon@hmslegal.com)  
[wesnnyder@hmslegal.com](mailto:wesnnyder@hmslegal.com)

DATED: April 16, 2018

*Attorneys for Sunoco Pipeline L.P.*

## VERIFICATION

I, Chris Lason, certify that I am Vice President - Pipeline Integrity, Corrosion Services, materials QA/QC at Energy Transfer Partners, and that in this capacity I am authorized to, and do make this Verification on behalf of Sunoco Pipeline L.P., an Energy Transfer Partnership, that the facts set forth in the foregoing document are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and that Sunoco Pipeline L.P., expects to be able to prove the same at any hearing that may be held in this matter. I understand that false statements made therein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S. § 4904, relating to unsworn falsifications to authorities.



---

Chris Lason  
Vice President - Pipeline Integrity, Corrosion  
Services, materials QA/QC  
Energy Transfer Partners  
On behalf of Sunoco Pipeline L.P.

DATED: 4/16/18

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the foregoing document upon the entities, 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 FIRST-CLASS MAIL**

Michael L. Swindler, Esquire  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement  
P.O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Lynda K. Farrell  
Pipeline Safety Coalition  
331 Norwood Road  
Downingtown, PA 19335



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

DATED: April 16, 2018