

DEP Permit # E07-459
DEP Permit HDD Reference # PA-BL-0122.0000-WX
DEP HDD # S2-0140
Township - Frankstown
County - Blair
HDD Site Name – Frankstown Branch Juniata River Crossing

2nd Public Comment Period

Commentator ID #	Name and Address	Affiliation
1.	Melissa Marshall, Esq. P.O. Box 408 1414-B Indian Creek Valley Road Melcroft, PA 15462	Mountain Watershed Association
2.	Aaron J. Stemplewicz, Esq. 925 Canal Street 7 th Floor, Suite 3 Bristol, PA 19007	Delaware Riverkeeper Network
3.	Joseph Otis Minott, Esq. 135 South 19 th Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
4.	Alexander G. Bomstein, Esq. 135 South 19 th Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
5.	Kathryn L. Urbanowicz, Esq. 135 South 19 th Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council

1. Comment:

On December 11, 2017, Sunoco submitted a letter and updated materials to the Department in response to the Department’s requests regarding horizontal directional drilling sites PA-BL-0122.0000-WX, and PA-BL-0122.0000-WX-16 (“Site”). Pursuant to the Corrected Stipulated Order entered on EHB Docket No. 2017-009-L on August 10, 2017 (“Order”), and on behalf of Clean Air Council, Mountain Watershed Association, Inc., and the Delaware Riverkeeper Network (“Appellants”), please accept these comments in reply.

One of the greatest concerns at this HDD site is the potential for disruption of groundwater due to the large difference in elevation between the proposed HDD entry and exit points. To help address the problem of groundwater flow back, DEP requested Sunoco provide “a plan and schedule that identifies that all necessary water collection, treatment and ancillary facilities be on site and operational prior to advancing the HDD bore to an elevation that exceeds the surface elevation of the HDD launch pad on the east side of the river.” Appellants support this request and believe it is important that Sunoco have a detailed, DEP-approved plan in place to

protect and manage groundwater at the Site. Appellants also strongly support DEP's requests for revised E&S Site Plans; without them, any protective measures Sunoco proposes will be less likely to be implemented in the field, and there will be less certainty about what Sunoco's contractors will do.

The supplemental material Sunoco has provided only partially addresses DEP's requests. What is now Attachment 3 to Sunoco's re-evaluation report for the Site includes information on a single product, Biostar-CH Flocc 500, a diagram of a hay bale flocculation structure, and a page of the E&S Site Plan. This falls short of identifying all necessary equipment and ancillary facilities Sunoco will use to collect and treat the groundwater, and nowhere has Sunoco provided the requested schedule that will ensure the equipment is timely installed.

Biostar-CH Flocc 500 is used for water filtration in conjunction with other equipment, including a pump and a water containment structure, such as a tank or sediment basin. It is unclear from the information Sunoco has provided what equipment it intends to use and where it will locate this equipment at the Site. Included in the information on Biostar-CH Flocc 500 is a diagram of a typical dewatering setup. The E&S Site Plan appears to have been revised to include a blue rectangle that is similar in dimension to a large structure depicted in typical dewatering setup, but the rectangle is unlabeled. A blue arrow has also been added to the E&S Site Plan, but it too is unlabeled. As drawn, the arrow may indicate that a structure will be installed outside the limit of disturbance. Aside from the blue rectangle and arrow, it does not appear any other changes have been made to the E&S Site Plan to address treating and managing groundwater, or to show where the treated groundwater will be discharged. No baffles, riprap, or other means of calming overflow discharge are visible around the apparent dewatering structure in the Plan. Appellants are concerned that the location where the arrow is pointing to is close to and upgradient from the crossed unnamed tributary to the Frankstown Branch of the Juniata River.

The last revision date on the E&S Plan is from August 25, 2017, when Sunoco wanted to increase its limit of disturbance. Equipment for *test* water pumping, storage, and discharge have been part of the plans since November 2016 and does not appear to be related to groundwater treatment.

Also notably missing from the information provided by Sunoco is any discussion or calculations regarding the amount or characteristics of groundwater that will be disrupted during drilling. The quantity of water that needs to be treated will influence what equipment and how much equipment is needed. As indicated in the manufacturer information, a unit of Biostar-CH Flocc 500 is only effective up to a certain quantity of water, and there is a limit on the turbidity of the water it can treat. Sunoco has not run the numbers to ensure it will have enough filtration material on site, or that it has even chosen the appropriate product. Similarly, the size of the containment and dewatering structure needed for water that has already been through the Biostar-CH Flocc 500 processes is dependent on the quantity and flow of water to be treated. The risk of overflowing the containment structure is not abstract. While

drilling for Mariner East II in Delaware County, Sunoco hit a significant groundwater supply it had not identified prior to the start of drilling, causing a large stream of water to come to the surface. Sunoco set up a hay bale containment structure there as well. Sunoco's containment attempt failed because it was not prepared to deal with the amount of water it had disrupted. *See* photos in attached Affidavit of Faith Zerbe.

Based on the forgoing, Appellants are concerned that the information Sunoco provided is indicative of an incomplete planning process that could result in significant problems with groundwater treatment and management at the Site. As DEP has requested, Sunoco should describe "all necessary equipment and ancillary facilities" that will be needed at the Site. That list must be informed by data on the quantity and characteristics of the water to be treated. Sunoco should also provide the schedule requested by DEP; having the proper equipment is of little value if it is not on hand when needed. Finally, the E&S Site Plan Sunoco has provided must be updated; the sheet Sunoco has submitted lacks even the most basic information and thus can neither be assessed nor implemented.

Thank you for considering these comments. Please keep us apprised of your next steps on the HDD Site. (1-5)

Letter – [Clean Air Council – 12-15-17 – Frankstown Branch Juniata River Crossing](#)