

APRIL 2018
VOL. 18-4

PRATT'S

ENERGY LAW

REPORT



EDITOR'S NOTE: LOOKING BACK, AND AHEAD

Victoria Prussen Spears

ENERGY REGULATORY UPDATE: 2017 YEAR IN REVIEW

Jay T. Ryan, Gregory S. Wagner, Brooksany Barrowes, and Thomas Holmberg

FERC'S 2017 REPORT ON ENFORCEMENT UNDERSCORES AGENCY'S GROWING SURVEILLANCE AND IMPORTANCE OF ROBUST COMPLIANCE MEASURES

Charles R. Mills, Daniel A. Mullen, Shaun Boedicker, Natty Brower, and Karen Bruni

FERC EXTENDS SUPREME COURT'S *EPSA* DECISION BEYOND DEMAND RESPONSE TO ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Norman C. Bay, Sohair A. Aguirre, and Thomas R. Millar

INCREASED RISK OF STATE PROSECUTION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CRIMES

Michael J. Engle and Andrew S. Levine

KENTUCKY'S LIMITED ENERGY RENEWABLE INCENTIVES

Mark D. Lansing

Pratt's Energy Law Report

VOLUME 18

NUMBER 4

APRIL 2018

Editor's Note: Looking Back, and Ahead

Victoria Prussen Spears 109

Energy Regulatory Update: 2017 Year in Review

Jay T. Ryan, Gregory S. Wagner, Brooksany Barrowes,
and Thomas Holmberg 111

**FERC's 2017 Report on Enforcement Underscores Agency's Growing
Surveillance and Importance of Robust Compliance Measures**

Charles R. Mills, Daniel A. Mullen, Shaun Boedicker,
Natty Brower, and Karen Bruni 124

**FERC Extends Supreme Court's *EPSA* Decision Beyond
Demand Response to Energy Efficiency**

Norman C. Bay, Sohair A. Aguirre, and Thomas R. Millar 130

Increased Risk of State Prosecution for Environmental Crimes

Michael J. Engle and Andrew S. Levine 134

Kentucky's Limited Energy Renewable Incentives

Mark D. Lansing 139

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please email:

Jacqueline M. Morris at (908) 673-1528
Email: jacqueline.m.morris@lexisnexis.com
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385
Fax Number (800) 828-8341
Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0836-3 (print)
ISBN: 978-1-6328-0837-0 (ebook)
ISSN: 2374-3395 (print)
ISSN: 2374-3409 (online)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT'S ENERGY LAW REPORT [page number]
(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Ian Coles, *Rare Earth Elements: Deep Sea Mining and the Law of the Sea*, 14 PRATT'S ENERGY
LAW REPORT 4 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Matthew Bender and the Matthew Bender Flame Design are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2018 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

SAMUEL B. BOXERMAN

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

ANDREW CALDER

Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP

M. SETH GINTHER

Partner, Hirschler Fleischer, P.C.

R. TODD JOHNSON

Partner, Jones Day

BARCLAY NICHOLSON

Partner, Norton Rose Fulbright

BRADLEY A. WALKER

Counsel, Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC

ELAINE M. WALSH

Partner, Baker Botts L.L.P.

SEAN T. WHEELER

Partner, Latham & Watkins LLP

WANDA B. WHIGHAM

Senior Counsel, Holland & Knight LLP

Hydraulic Fracturing Developments

ERIC ROTHENBERG

Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP

Pratt's Energy Law Report is published 10 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2018 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 718.224.2258. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house energy counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in energy-related environmental preservation, the laws governing cutting-edge alternative energy technologies, and legal developments affecting traditional and new energy providers. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Pratt's Energy Law Report, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 121 Chanlon Road, North Building, New Providence, NJ 07974.

Increased Risk of State Prosecution for Environmental Crimes

*By Michael J. Engle and Andrew S. Levine**

This article explores two distinct areas of criminal exposure for environmental crimes at the state level to determine if there are factors that favor criminal rather than civil enforcement of a violation: construction activities within exceptionally valued waterways and upon or near the habitats of endangered species.

Typically, new presidential administrations make loud proclamations about new environmental enforcement initiatives, including a focus on certain environmental crimes. While their vigor in environmental enforcement has differed, no team in recent memory has taken over at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) with so little information about prosecutorial priorities. Frankly, the Trump team has been more invested in rolling back regulatory initiatives of prior administrations and restoring the illusion of a robust coal economy, than it has been about forewarning regulated parties about new avenues of investigation. Prosecutions continue to be sure, as documented on Department of Justice (“DOJ”) website,¹ with the typical focus on improper waste disposal, chemical sampling and endangered species trading.

However, in the absence of enforcement activity at the federal level, which seems likely, Pennsylvania Attorney General Josh Shapiro has made it clear that his office will react. In particular, Shapiro’s office intends to pursue a heightened review of companies and practices related to the unconventional extraction of natural gas,² which involves not only new well pad sites, but also substantial, related pipeline developments. As a consequence, we believe it is worth exploring two distinct areas of criminal exposure to determine if there are factors that favor of criminal rather than civil enforcement of a violation: construction activities within exceptionally valued waterways (including wetlands) and upon or near the habitats of endangered species.

* Michael J. Engle is chair of Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP’s, White-Collar Defense, Internal Investigations & Corporate Compliance group. Andrew S. Levine is co-chair of the firm’s Environmental practice group. The authors may be contacted at mengle@stradley.com and alevine@stradley.com, respectively.

¹ <https://www.justice.gov/enrd/selected-publications/environmental-crimes-monthly-bulletins-2015-2006>.

² <https://www.joshshapiro.org/agenda/getting-tough-on-frackers/>.

VALUED WATERWAYS

Construction of fracking wells for the extraction of natural gas and pipeline networks often put workers into remote areas. Surprisingly, a state-by-state analysis³ determined that Pennsylvania has the highest stream density in the country with a relatively low incidence of stream proximity. This implies that many important waterways in isolated areas with valuable wildlife habitat for endangered species may be located in proximity to fracking wells and pipelines.

Environmental criminal cases brought exclusively within Pennsylvania have been infrequent as compared to cooperative prosecutions with federal authorities. Federal efforts, with which the Commonwealth routinely cooperates, have predominated. For example, in 2017 a wastewater trucking driver who caused significant environmental harm by dumping surfactant-laden wastewater into Ohio rivers was sentenced to prison for several Clean Water Act felonies. A significant fine and lengthy probation were also imposed upon a wastewater sampler that manipulated data to conceal analytical exceedances. And in 2016, another wastewater operator was sentenced to more than two years' incarceration for illegally discharging fracking water. The Trump administration has not prioritized such prosecutions, paving the way for more aggressive state-based actions and raising the question as to whether existing statutes, such as the Clean Streams Law ("CSL"), are adequate.

In the highest profile environmental criminal case recently brought by a Pennsylvania attorney general, XTO Energy allegedly dumped toxic wastewater from a Marcellus Shale well site. The state filed criminal charges against XTO under the CSL and the Solid Waste Management Act. This case was one of the first instances in which a shale company was charged with criminal offenses. Although this case came on like a lion, it was resolved using the state's accelerated rehabilitative disposition program ("ARD")—a process generally applied to drunk drivers with no prior record who are seeking to avoid trial. Nevertheless, industry executives expressed concern over the prosecution since the company had previously settled with the EPA and Justice Department over the same incident. Further, substantial criticism was leveled against then-Attorney General Kane for bringing criminal charges because there did not appear to be specific intent to circumvent the law or to cause egregious harm to the environment.

However, criminal conduct under the CSL has no intent requirement or any need for a prosecutor to demonstrate egregious harm—it is a strict liability standard under 35 P.S. § 691.602(a). The Superior Court made it clear that

³ <http://klabergroup.com/insights/?Considering-Water-A-state-by-state-analysis-of-our-relationship-with-waterways-2>.

specific intent was not a required criminal element in *Commonwealth v. Sonneborn*. In this 1949 Superior Court case, the defendants filled two lagoons on their property with acidic sludge that they drained into Bear Creek. The concept of intent was addressed again in *Commonwealth v. Peggs Run Coal Co.*, in which the Commonwealth charged the defendant with discharging debris- and silt-laden water from its impounding lagoons into Peggs Run in violation of its mining permit. The court held the defendant violated the CSL, despite the defendant's contention that it had no intent to discharge the material.

Although the CSL dictates strict liability for a violating individual or entity, courts do require proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the individual or entity is responsible for the violation before the Commonwealth can impose criminal liability. For example, in *Commonwealth v. Baumgardner Oil Co.*, the trial court dismissed a case against an oil company because the Commonwealth did not present sufficient evidence to link a discharge of oil to the defendant. However, as long as the Commonwealth can provide the requisite evidence of causation, criminal liability can be in the offing.

Under CSL § 602(b), a finding of negligence is all that is necessary to elevate the criminality from a summary offense to a second degree misdemeanor. In the 2000 case of *Westinghouse Electric Corporation v. Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection*, the Environmental Hearing Board upheld a significant penalty based on the duration and severity of the violations, which amounted to negligence, and rejected the defendant's argument that a severe penalty is only appropriate where the Commonwealth establishes intentional or reckless conduct. While not a criminal case, the opinion articulates the principle that no finding of egregious conduct is needed to aggressively prosecute a negligent violation of the CSL, whether civilly or criminally. In the event there is a finding of intent, then a third degree felony charge could result, carrying up to a seven-year prison sentence. Moreover, Pennsylvania law makes it clear that these statutory provisions apply to business entities, not only individuals, per 18 Pa.C.S. § 307.

Given the documented density of Pennsylvania's waterways—especially in undeveloped regions attractive to midstream development and gas extraction because of their distance from dense population centers that may complicate siting—the potential for a release of sediments, chemicals or fuels militates in favor of careful practices to avoid enforcement actions. More to the point, accepting the principle that statistically some excursions are likely, companies would be well advised to promptly investigate and remedy spills, and provide the requisite notice to governmental authorities quickly. While the face of the CSL provides a low threshold for criminal exposure, as a practical matter the Commonwealth tends to focus on uncooperative or clandestine conduct.

Matters such as the XTO prosecution also bring into question whether prosecutors politically benefit from taking highly aggressive stances in asserting criminal liability (even if the matter ends in a whimper). Where an ambitious state prosecutor notes a lack of federal enforcement initiative, state officials may seek to expand the parameters of their own environmental criminal statutes. The intersection of the CSL, exceptional value wetlands and waterways, and state wildlife protection acts could prove to be a strong prosecutorial cocktail.

ENDANGERED SPECIES HABITATS

As noted above, while the CSL allows for mere negligence to constitute a misdemeanor, certain additional factors may make the tilt toward criminal charges more manifest. An exceptional value wetland in Pennsylvania typically contains one or more threatened or endangered species or is closely connected to another wetland with such characteristics. A small release of fuel or contaminated sediment into, or the careless operation of a vehicle upon such a body of water could provide the components necessary for criminal prosecution. Many midstream developers seek to avoid such liability by directionally drilling beneath such sites, but that does not eliminate the potential for upwellings or inadvertent returns. Prosecution is a risk if bentonite and other sediments in the return foul or destroy endangered species habitat, or outright kill such organisms. However, unlike any number of pollution control statutes—such as the Clean Air Act, Solid Waste Management Act and the Clean Water Act—there is no specific means by which a state can demonstrate equivalency to the Endangered Species Act to undertake enforcement.

States have traditionally cooperated in federal prosecutions. However, it is unclear how states will respond if the federal government vastly reduces their commitment, or fails to undertake such initiatives. Most enforcement cases involving endangered or threatened species prosecuted under Pennsylvania law center around illegal hunting or the use of illicit hunting tactics. Most references to endangered species within the Commonwealth pertain to exclusionary criteria or permitting limitations, as recently seen in *Friends of Lackawanna v. DEP and Keystone Sanitary Landfill*. There are no recent state-only endangered species criminal enforcement matters publicly reported concerning midstream or well pad development, but Section 925 of the Commonwealth Game and Wildlife Code clearly spells out criminal offenses that carry up to three years' imprisonment. The taking of an endangered species as a result of a spill or careless construction techniques associated with pipeline or well pad development could be considered an unlicensed or permitted hunt and result in a stand-alone prosecution of the Game and Wildlife Code. In the alternative, or perhaps as an additional count, such a cull could constitute the type of conduct that exacerbates the severity of a CSL prosecution as well.

CONCLUSION

In light of the perception that the federal government is abandoning its role as guardian of the environment, regulated parties should still consider maintaining robust internal control systems to detect and remedy any environmental violations. Ambitious state attorneys general may yet step in to fill the void that may be created by the receding of federal initiatives. Parties involved in rectifying environmental violations should carefully consider the potential for criminal sanctions, and customize their approach to resolving violations by consulting with counsel well-versed in both civil and criminal liability implications.