

APRIL 2020

VOL. 20-4

PRATT'S

# ENERGY LAW

## REPORT



LexisNexis

**EDITOR'S NOTE: IN THE STATES**

Victoria Prussen Spears

**PROTECTING MUTUAL INDEMNITY PROVISIONS FROM THE NEW MEXICO OILFIELD ANTI-INDEMNITY ACT**

Tom Donaho

**CALIFORNIA TAKES ACTION TO AVOID ELECTRICITY SHORTAGES AND RELIABILITY CHALLENGES**

Monica A. Schwabs, Neeraj Arora, F. Jackson Stoddard, and Levi McAllister

**SITTING STILL (OR HOW STATE ANTI-IDLING LAWS ARE LANDING TRANSIT AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANIES IN FEDERAL COURT)**

Aaron M. Flynn, Christopher J. Cunio, Michael J. Altieri, and Lauren Bachtel

**TEXAS SUPREME COURT REJECTS "ACCIDENTAL PARTNERSHIPS" AND AFFIRMS REVERSAL OF \$535 MILLION PIPELINE JUDGMENT**

Timothy S. Durst, Louis Layrisson, Liam O'Rourke, and Shayna M. Goldblatt

**CUTTING CARBON, SAVING DOLLARS? PHILADELPHIA ADOPTS BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY TUNEUP REQUIREMENT**

Brad A. Molotsky and David Amerikaner

# Pratt's Energy Law Report

---

VOLUME 20

NUMBER 4

April 2020

---

**Editor's Note: In the States**

Victoria Prussen Spears

109

**Protecting Mutual Indemnity Provisions from the New Mexico Oilfield Anti-Indemnity Act**

Tom Donaho

111

**California Takes Action to Avoid Electricity Shortages and Reliability Challenges**

Monica A. Schwebs, Neeraj Arora, F. Jackson Stoddard, and Levi McAllister

120

**Sitting Still (or How State Anti-Idling Laws Are Landing Transit and Transportation Companies in Federal Court)**

Aaron M. Flynn, Christopher J. Cunio, Michael J. Altieri, and Lauren Bachtel

127

**Texas Supreme Court Rejects "Accidental Partnerships" and Affirms Reversal of \$535 Million Pipeline Judgment**

Timothy S. Durst, Louis Layrisson, Liam O'Rourke, and Shayna M. Goldblatt

132

**Cutting Carbon, Saving Dollars? Philadelphia Adopts Building Energy Efficiency Tuneup Requirement**

Brad A. Molotsky and David Amerikaner

136

**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 RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc. Copyright © 2020 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](http://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.*

**STEPHEN J. HUMES**

*Partner, Holland & Knight LLP*

**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*

---

## **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 2020 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](mailto:Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com). Direct any editorial inquiries 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](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 646.539.8300. 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.

# Sitting Still (or How State Anti-Idling Laws Are Landing Transit and Transportation Companies in Federal Court)

*By Aaron M. Flynn, Christopher J. Cunio, Michael J. Altieri, and Lauren Bachtel\**

*Across the Northeast and elsewhere, unnecessary vehicle idling is, subject to certain nuances and exceptions, generally prohibited. Recently, violators have come under attack by non-governmental organizations. State penalties vary, but the potential exposure can be severe, especially when the statutory maximum available penalties are calculated pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act and compounded on a per-violation/per-day basis. In this article, the authors discuss the anti-idling laws and advise owners of all forms of trucking and transit companies to take proactive measures to educate operators on these requirements.*

How can sitting still in the Northeast potentially land you in a world of trouble under the federal Clean Air Act (“CAA”) and corresponding state laws? Quite easily, if you happen to be in or leave a vehicle with its engine on and the vehicle itself is not in motion for more than a few minutes. That is the definition of “unnecessary vehicle idling” in many jurisdictions.

Across the Northeast and elsewhere, unnecessary vehicle idling is, subject to certain nuances and exceptions, generally prohibited.

Recently, violators have come under attack by non-governmental organizations. State penalties vary, but the potential exposure can be severe, especially when the statutory maximum available penalties are calculated pursuant to the federal CAA and compounded on a per-violation/per-day basis.

Accordingly, owners and operators of all forms of trucking and transit companies should not sit still and should take proactive measures to educate or reeducate vehicle schedulers and operators alike on these anti-idling requirements.

---

\* Aaron M. Flynn (aflynn@huntonak.com) is a partner at Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP representing companies in major environmental litigation and regulatory matters across the country. Christopher J. Cunio (ccunio@huntonak.com) is a partner at the firm handling complex commercial litigation, government investigations, and business disputes of all sizes and varieties. Michael J. Altieri (maltieri@huntonak.com) is a senior attorney assisting clients with permitting, compliance, and enforcement issues relating to air, water, and waste. Lauren Bachtel (lbachtel@huntonak.com) is an environmental senior attorney at the firm.

## BACKGROUND

Anti-idling campaigns by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) and state environmental regulators are nothing new.<sup>1</sup> Developments in vehicle technology, idling reduction technology installed at fixed locations, and the fuel and other cost savings realized have also worked to make unnecessary idling less likely and less harmful in the intervening years.<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless, non-governmental organizations (“NGO”) are taking up the charge anew and are literally “making a federal case” out of the matter, ensnaring owners and operators of vehicles that were allegedly left idling for too long.<sup>3</sup>

This most recent crop of federal cases in Massachusetts all target bus company entities, with a trend that seems to be spreading into Connecticut.<sup>4</sup>

To date, the NGOs’ strategy appears to target transit and trucking companies with:

- (a) Advertised and fixed routes;
- (b) Known locations for people and cargo transfer; and
- (c) Fixed overnight vehicle parking areas.

This approach may provide certain investigative efficiencies for environmental regulators and NGO plaintiffs alike, but it should by no means be viewed as a limitation on the types of entities that could be targeted for enforcement.

---

<sup>1</sup> See EPA, *Compilation of State, County, and Local Anti-Idling Regulations*, EPA420-B-06-004 (April 2006), <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/documents/CompilationofStateIdlingRegulations.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., DOE, *Idle Reduction*, [https://afdc.energy.gov/conserve/idle\\_reduction\\_basics.html](https://afdc.energy.gov/conserve/idle_reduction_basics.html) (last visited Jan. 23, 2020); EPA, *Learn About Idling Reduction Technologies (IRTs) for Trucks and School Buses*, <https://www.epa.gov/verified-diesel-tech/learn-about-idling-reduction-technologies-irts-trucks-and-school-buses> (last visited Jan. 23, 2020).

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., *Conservationists sue to curb Boston school bus idling*, wbur (July 11, 2019), <https://www.wbur.org/earthwhile/2019/07/10/conservation-law-foundation-transdev-air-pollution>; *Conservation Law Foundation sues Wynn Resorts over idling of shuttle buses at casino*, The Boston Globe (January 9, 2020), <https://www.bostonglobe.com/business/2020/01/09/conservation-law-foundation-sues-wynn-resorts-over-idling-shuttle-buses-casino/kjUPCM110ZnmdbZP0EsiM/story.html>.

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., *Conservation Law Found., Inc. v. Wynn Resorts, Ltd, et al.*, 20-cv-10033-DPW (D. Mass., filed Jan. 8, 2020); *Conservation Law Found., Inc. v. Academy Bus, LLC et al.*, 20-cv-10032-DPW (D. Mass., filed Jan. 8, 2020); and Press Release, Conservation Law Foundation (December 17, 2019), <https://www.clf.org/newsroom/connecticut-school-bus-provider-polluting-neighborhoods/>.

Accordingly, it is critical that transit and trucking companies, both large and small, understand how this reinvigorated form of environmental enforcement works.

Most heavily regulated industries are aware that certain federal environmental statutes like the Clean Water Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act and the CAA each include provisions for “citizen suit” enforcement.

In essence, private citizen suits are a supplement to the more traditional federal executive branch (i.e., EPA) enforcement under these federal statutes. Similar to EPA enforcement, should a private citizen substantially prevail in its environmental suit, all civil penalties are paid to the federal treasury, and the private citizen may be able to collect reasonable attorneys’ fees and other costs associated with bringing the suit to its conclusion.<sup>5</sup>

Universally, citizen suit provisions require 60-days advance notice to the alleged violator, the EPA and the applicable state regulator before a suit can be commenced in federal district court.

#### **A RECENT EXAMPLE FOR MASSACHUSETTS**

The anti-idling statute in Massachusetts is a state prohibition (subject to exceptions) against unnecessary vehicle idling for more than five minutes, with corresponding penalties for non-compliance ranging up to \$100 for a first offence to not more than \$500 for a succeeding offence.<sup>6</sup> The same substantive anti-idling prohibition and exceptions also appear in Massachusetts’ air pollution control regulations.<sup>7</sup> The enforcement authority and fine structures at the state level differ between the anti-idling statute and the air pollution control regulation.

In *Conservation Law Found., Inc. v. Academy Bus, LLC et al.*,<sup>8</sup> the plaintiff’s 60-day notice of intent to sue and subsequent complaint seek civil penalties in amounts just shy of \$100,000 per-violation/per-day, the maximum penalty civil penalty allowed under the CAA for this category of violation.<sup>9</sup>

The intuitive question one must ask is how a potential state law violation (wherein the Massachusetts legislature found a \$100-500 penalty appropriate) has escalated to a scenario where a private plaintiff is now demanding penalties one thousand times that amount.

---

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., 42 U.S.C. § 7604(d), (g) (relevant CAA citizen suit provisions).

<sup>6</sup> M.G.L. c. 90, § 16.

<sup>7</sup> 310 CMR § 7.11(1)(b).

<sup>8</sup> 20-cv-10032-DPW (D. Mass., filed Jan. 8, 2020).

<sup>9</sup> 42 U.S.C. § 7413; 40 C.F.R. §§ 19.2 & 19.4 (civil penalties as adjusted for inflation).



According to the plaintiff's complaint, the magic lies in the CAA and, more particularly, provisions included in the Massachusetts State Implementation Plan ("SIP") approved by EPA. For this case, the plaintiff alleges that the penalty provisions of the CAA apply; it maintains that Massachusetts' EPA-approved SIP includes the State's anti-idling regulation and that, on numerous occasions, the defendants had vehicles idling for longer than five minutes.

Voilà! According to the plaintiff's logic, the defendants have violated the federal CAA each-and-every time a bus sat idling for more than five minutes.

Of course, it remains to be seen:

- (1) Whether the plaintiff's legal rationale survives scrutiny; and
- (2) Whether the fact finder will ultimately agree with the plaintiff's offered version of the facts.

As the newest round of cases are sorted, three additional points of caution should be noted in the interim:

- (1) These cases raise the specter of federal and state regulators taking a renewed interest in anti-idling efforts;
- (2) This may be just the beginning, as other non-governmental organizations may come out of the woodwork to use the CAA and state-specific idling statutes to go after a wide range of entities, such as delivery companies, ride-hailing companies, etc.; and
- (3) Class actions and similar suits could be looming on the horizon.

Transit and trucking companies looking to steer clear of enforcement should proactively take steps now to help avoid sorting these things out later in court or in the context of an enforcement action. There are a few things for companies to consider.

First, companies should be aware, educate and/or reeducate themselves on state and local vehicle anti-idling restrictions. In the Northeast, anti-idling restrictions and applicable exceptions will differ from state-to-state and even within states at the municipal level.

For example, where vehicle idling is prohibited in Massachusetts for periods in excess of five minutes, this prohibition steps down to three minutes in Connecticut, albeit with different exceptions.<sup>10</sup>

Second, most anti-idling programs in the Northeast are not new. In some instances, however, what once may have been part of extensive outreach and training programs by regulators long ago may no longer be available or difficult to find.

---

<sup>10</sup> See 310 CMR § 7.11(1)(b) compared to RCSA § 22a-174-18(b)(3).

Third, unnecessary vehicle idling wastes fuel and increases costs. Many tools, calculators and other resources are available to perform a benefit-cost analysis in order to justify a company's change in equipment and/or other operational changes to help avoid unnecessary idling.

Finally, environmental enforcement is sometimes unavoidable. Transit and trucking companies that are new to the Northeast or who have been subject to anti-idling enforcement in the past may want to develop more sophisticated complaint and enforcement response mechanisms.

In particular, companies should have set procedures in place in the event that it receives an NGO citizen suit 60-day notice-of-intent-to-sue-letter or other enforcement correspondence from the EPA or applicable state regulatory body.