

DEP Permit # E15-862 & E23-524
DEP Permit HDD Reference # PA-CH-0421.0000-RD
DEP HDD # S3-0541
Township – Westtown & Edgemont
County – Chester & Delaware
HDD Site Name – Arch Bishop / South Chester Road Crossing

1st Public Comment Period

Commentator ID #	Name and Address	Affiliation
1	Margaret Quinn 503 Carmarthen Drive Exton, PA 19341	
2	Susan Mangigian	
3	Jim Deorio	
4	Cheryl Kaufman 27 Carriage Drive Media, PA 19063	
5	Lynn Strauss	
6	Jill Bogle Exton, PA	
7	Shelly Durbanis	
8	Joan Herman	
9	Sari Steuber 45 Paper Mill Rd Springfield, PA 19064	
10	Jen Anderson	
11	Valerie Peterson Baker Circle Exton, PA	
12	Andrea Hunt	
13	Lora Snyder Edgemont, PA	
14	Marion Yaglinski	
15	Steadman Andrews 1005 South Chester Road West Chester, PA 19382	
16	Jill Ripkin Solar Andover, Glen Mills	
17	Debra Jones West Chester, PA	
18	Michael D. Walsh 12 Hadley Lane Glen Mills, PA 19342	

19	R. Lerario Aston, PA	
20	Dennis Charko	
21	Becky Corbin 52A East Wing Harrisburg, PA 17120	PA Representative
22	Stephen and Jennifer Degnan 9 Hadley Lane Glen Mills, PA 19342	
23	Melinda Welsh 8 Fallbrook Lane Glen Mills, PA 19342	
24	Alexa and Kevin Manning 805 Graystone Lane Downingtown, PA 19335	
25	Bernard Greenberg West Chester, PA	
26	Kevin Grubb	
27	Ken Hemphill Delaware County, PA	
28	Michael J. Ciocco 520 W. Macdade Boulevard Milmont Park, PA 19033	Catania Engineering Associates, Inc.
29	Melissa Marshall, Esq. P.O. Box 408 1414-B Indian Creek Valley Road Melcroft, PA 15462	Mountain Watershed Association
30	Aaron J. Stemplewicz, Esq. 925 Canal Street 7 th Floor, Suite 3 Bristol, PA 19007	Delaware Riverkeeper Network
31	Joseph Otis Minott, Esq. 135 South 19 th Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
32	Alexander G. Bomstein, Esq. 135 South 19 th Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
33	Kathryn L. Urbanowicz, Esq. 135 South 19 th Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
34	Nancy Harkins	
35	Edward Cavey	
36	Eric Friedman	
37	Jennifer Berlinger 9 Fallbrook Lane Glen Mills	

38	[REDACTED]	
----	------------	--

1. Comment:

I am against any kind of drilling in this area. In regards to HDD, there is an excessive length of time proposed for drilling. It is too much time for people to put up with this noise and air pollution. There will be unnecessary risks to the foundation of homes lining this route from being exposed to prolonged vibration. the violation of peace due to the sound of the drill in action six days a week is completely unreasonable. We have had issues already with HDD in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes. Also this Pipeline is not safe for highly populated area. No Risk Assessment has been done for this area. (1)

2. Comment

I am against any kind of drilling in this area. In regards to HDD, there is an excessive length of time proposed for drilling. It is too much time for people to put up with this noise and air pollution. There will be unnecessary risks to the foundation of homes and in ground pools lining this route from being exposed to prolonged vibration. the violation of peace due to the sound of the drill in action six days a week is completely unreasonable. We have had issues already with HDD in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes. Also this pipeline is not safe for highly populated area. No Risk Assessment has been done for this area.

Sunoco just leaked 1500 gallons of material on Boot Road by the Giant!

It's a travesty that this has been allowed to happen in this beautiful residential area.
(2)

3. Comment

I am a parent of a child that attends SS Simon and Jude, I am against any kind of drilling in this area. In regards to HDD, there is an excessive length of time proposed for drilling (444 days!!). It is too much time for people to put up with this noise and air pollution. Especially for the children that attend this school. 444 days of constant noise and air pollution 100 yards away from the school. How can this be acceptable for our children?? How will they be able to concentrate and focus on their work? This is completely unacceptable and someone needs to stand up for the students. There will also be unnecessary risks to the foundation of homes lining this route from being exposed to prolonged vibration. the violation of peace due to the sound of the drill in action six days a week is completely unreasonable. We have had issues already with HDD in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes. Also this pipeline is not safe for a highly populated area. No Risk Assessment has been done for this area. To allow this to move forward under the current parameters is extremely irresponsible and a crime against our children!! (3)

4. Comment

I am against any kind of drilling in this area. In regards to HDD, there is the 444 days proposed for drilling is too much time for people to put up with this noise and air pollution. There will be unnecessary risks to the foundation of homes lining this route from being exposed to prolonged vibration. The violation of peace due to the sound of the drill in action six days a week is completely unreasonable. We have had issues already with HDD in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes.

As far as the pipeline in general, this pipeline is not safe for highly populated area. No Risk Assessment has been done for this area. This pipeline was pushed through with no thought and no holding Sunoco responsible for behaving in a just way. It is a disgrace that this is being allowed to continue. (4)

5. Comment

I am against any kind of drilling in this area. In regards to HDD, there is an excessive length of time proposed for drilling. It is too much time for people to put up with this noise and air pollution. There will be unnecessary risks to the foundation of homes lining this route from being exposed to prolonged vibration. the violation of peace due to the sound of the drill in action six days a week is completely unreasonable. We have had issues already with HDD in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes. Also this pipeline is not safe for highly populated area. No Risk Assessment has been done for this area. (5)

6. Comment

I am against any kind of drilling in this area. In regards to HDD, the length of time is excessive for people to put up with the noise and air pollution. Not to mention, there will be unnecessary risks to the foundations of homes in the area, particularly older homes, from being exposed to prolonged vibration. We have had issues already with HDD in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes. This pipeline is not safe for a highly populated area. To my knowledge, no Risk Assessment has been done for this area, which is unacceptable.

Please take the interests of citizens of this community seriously and put a stop to drilling near our homes. (6)

7. Comment

I am against any kind of drilling in this area. In regards to HDD, there is an excessive length of time proposed for it's drilling. It is way too much time for people to put up with the amount of noise and air pollution that will result from HDD. There will be unnecessary risks to the foundation of homes lining this route from being exposed to prolonged vibration. the violation of peace due to the sound of the drill in action six days a week is completely unreasonable. We have had issues already with HDD in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes. Not to mention the pipeline is not safe for such a highly populated area. No Risk Assessment has been done for this area. (7)

8. Comment

Please be accountable and hold SuNOco to the rules they should be following. Who do they think they are coming here, thinking they can do what they want and when they want. for what?? They have destroyed our trees, our land. They are polluting our wells, all these spills are not right!! The latest at the Boot Road site that wasn't even reported by them, is wrong!! I have a well and I am worried about my water. Why won't you stand up for us and stop this madness. I don't care they are a big corporation! Someone has to stop them. Money is what is important to them and all the stockholders and getting this product overseas. Forgot about our environment. This is all wrong. (8)

9. Comment

I am against any kind of drilling in this area or even having a pipeline of this type go through these areas. In regards to HDD, there is an excessive length of time proposed for drilling. It is too much time for people to put up with this noise and air pollution. There will be unnecessary risks to the foundation of homes lining this route from being exposed to prolonged vibration. the violation of peace due to the sound of the drill in action six days a week is completely unreasonable. We have had issues already with HDD in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes. Also this pipeline is not safe for highly populated area. No Risk Assessment has been done for this area. Please do not allow these projects to go forward. (9)

10. Comment

I am against any kind of drilling in this area. In regards to HDD, there is an excessive length of time proposed for drilling. It is too much time for people to put up with this noise and air pollution. There will be unnecessary risks to the foundation of homes lining this route from being exposed to prolonged vibration. the violation of peace due to the sound of the drill in action six days a week is completely unreasonable. We have had issues already with HDD in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes. Also this pipeline is not safe for highly populated area. No Risk Assessment has been done for this area. (10)

11. Comment

I am against any kind of drilling in this area. This coming on the heels of a spill today at the site located at Crump and Whitford Roads in Exton, Uwchlan Township. There is an excessive length of time proposed for drilling. It is too much time for people to put up with this noise and air pollution. There will be unnecessary risks to the foundation of homes lining this route from being exposed to prolonged vibration not only the violation of peace due to the sound of the drill in action six days a week is completely unreasonable. We have had issues in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes. Also this pipeline is not safe for highly populated area. No Risk Assessment has been done for this area.

Please stop this NOW! (11)

12. Comment

I am writing regarding the planned horizontal directional drilling (HDD) for the Mariner East 2 Pipeline scheduled to take place between PA Routes 3 to 926 in the near future. I am against any kind of drilling in this area. In regards to HDD, there is an excessive length of time proposed for drilling. It is too much time for people to put up with this noise and air pollution. There will be unnecessary risks to the foundation of homes lining this route from being exposed to prolonged vibration. The violation of peace due to the sound of the drill in action six days a week is completely unreasonable. We have had issues already with HDD in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes. Also, since there has been no Risk Assessment regarding the pipeline in this area, it is impossible to address safety concerns raised by residents and others like myself who frequently travel these roads through the area. I am deeply disturbed by the frequent spills of drilling fluid in East Whiteland Township over the past several months (I work in this township at Immaculata University) and the lack of action by government agencies in overseeing unlawful drilling activity by ETP. While ETP insists the spills are non-toxic, the presence of such clay in our streams and rivers still poses hazards to the flora and fauna in those waterways. Thus the need for DEP and other agencies to strictly oversee any waterway crossing. Thank you for your consideration. (12)

13. Comment

Hello. I am writing to voice my sincere concern over the proposed HDD drilling site in Edgmont PA number E15-862, E23-524. PA-CH-0421.0000-RD S3-0541. This area has large majority of private wells which were not in disclosed in permits. This area is extremely sensitive to water well contamination from the HDD drilling. Sunoco has had over 100 frac outs or IR s since beginning of construction of the mariner east 2 project. The geology in this area lends itself to high risk area for frac outs. We cannot take this risk!!! The permits approved by DEP did not account for any wells present in this area. This needs to be re-evaluated with the private wells accounted for. Thank you for understanding! (13)

14. Comment

Regarding Sunoco's Mariner East pipelines: These pipelines ARE NOT SAFE for highly populated areas. The greatest threat to residents is the large number of deaths that would occur in the event of a leak/explosion. By the way, Sunoco has the WORST safety record in the industry.

Other issues that are completely unreasonable for PA residents:

- HDD drilling that causes leaking of drilling fluids, sink holes, contaminated wells, aquifers and streams.
- Excessive length of drilling time that produces noise and air pollution.
- Damage to foundations of homes near the pipelines from exposure to prolonged vibration.
- Drilling noise six days a week is completely unreasonable.
- Devalued property

- Homeowners insurance companies refusing to insure homes close to the ME2 pipelines.
- Multiple violations by Sunoco that have NOT been addressed.
- Damage to wetlands and the environment.

These pipelines have made residents' lives a living hell. It is unconsonable to put Sunoco's profit above citizens' safety and quality of life. (14)

15. Comment

Regarding Sunoco Pipeline's Mariner East 2 Project. I received Sunoco Pipeline's letter and HDD Reevaluation Report on December 4, 2017, from Mark McConnell, and I have significant concerns about Sunoco boring two pipelines under the road, in front of my home, and only a couple hundred feet from my well.

There is at least one likely discrepancy in this HDD Reevaluation Report dealing with well flow (gpm). Sunoco had performed a test of my well (which is likely included in this report as a statistic) that does not accurately represent the flow of my well, but rather the flow of my well through a run of ½ inch copper tubing with multiple 90 degree fittings, a Hose Bibb and a length of garden hose into a 5 gallon pail. One might then ask if any or all the other tests of residents wells was done in a similar way which could entirely discredit their flow statistic.

Further... Both of the recent Sunoco Pipeline mailings that I received were each followed with a Certified Mailing and all were improperly addressed to Zip Cope 19380 when we are Zip Code 19382. If they can't even get this correct, what else have they gotten wrong.

My concerns are amplified by the facts that I am 75 years old and in poor health. Among other things, I have severe COPD, I'm on oxygen 24/7 from a Stationary Oxygen Concentrator and Tanks when I venture out to keep a doctor's appointment. Even on oxygen, I can't go up or down steps, with my Walker, or walk more than thirty or so feet without my blood oxygen dropping and my pulse rising to where I am in distress until I sit and rest for a few minutes. My sole caregiver is my wife who is 79 years old and struggling with her own health issues. Any occurrence that disrupts our regimented routines negatively impacts our health and our ability to live any kind of meaningful life.

Sunoco Pipeline, in a letter dated October 30, 2017, offered to test our water during and after their construction if we called them. I called upon receiving that letter on November 1, 2017 and spoke with Amy Johnson who told me she would call me, during the drilling, to schedule a water test. My questioning how I'd know if my water became polluted before the test or while waiting for the test results went unanswered as did my questioning whether there would be another flow test.

Mark Davis, representing Sunoco Pipeline, called on November 17, 2017 and followed up with an email to confirm... "Per our conversation today I am writing to

confirm that a temporary water system will be installed on the property. The current water source will not be disconnected unless there is an issue. The temporary water supply will be maintained by us at all times. A sub contractor will schedule a date for a property visit and then for installation. I will reach out when I have the date the sub contractor will be out there. Below is a list of numbers you can call should you notice any issues with your water during construction.”

When I ask Mr. Davis if this would be potable water, he suggested that we use bottled water for drinking and would not say whether the water they would provide was drinkable. He ignored my telling him that I and my wife were incapable of carrying cases of bottled water around and he would not say who would pay for it, let alone deliver it. Nor would he say how long it would take to hook up to this temporary water supply or how he would keep it from freezing in the winter. However, when I ask what happens if the well becomes polluted, his reply was that they would either drill us a new well or hook us up to public water. There was nothing forthcoming from him about what we would do while all this was going on or where they planned on drilling a new well if the aquifer was polluted, or where he planned on hooking up to public water when the public water main doesn't come as far as our house.

I would suggest that Sunoco Pipeline has not adequately planned for the impact they may have on residents along their proposed Horizontal Directional Drilling and until they do; and until they establish satisfactory plans and methods that will prevent disruption to those residents, they should be denied the permits necessary for them to proceed. (15)

16. Comment

The fundamental flaw: lack of alternative route analysis. One of the important requirements placed on Sunoco in submitting this plan, like others required by the August 9 settlement agreement, is the discussion of alternative routes. Just as with the Exton plan, submitted a few weeks ago, Sunoco has failed to properly examine alternatives.

The key problem with this new plan is that Sunoco has used the wrong priorities in its analysis. The first priority should have been avoiding populated areas. Instead, Sunoco has prioritized following existing pipeline easements. This simplifies the considerations for Sunoco, but it puts lives at risk needlessly.

Sunoco claims that “safety is our #1 priority”, but its actions—and this plan—show that's not true. This was obvious in the Exton plan as well.

There is an opportunity to route this pipeline through a far less settled area a little to the southwest, just as there were far less populated routes available near Exton. Sunoco has ignored those possibilities, despite the fact that the settlement agreement requires their consideration.

Not only would a route that runs near fewer houses drastically reduce the risk in case of a leak, it would also reduce the number of private wells that might possibly be affected by drilling.

Sunoco's willful rejection of alternative routes is explicit in this report. "Any alternate route considered to the southwest would require the clearing of a new 'greenfield' corridor through existing woodlands and croplands, increase the number of stream crossings, and possibly encroach on additional private residences before it could rejoin the current route," according to the report. But that is being disingenuous. No new "clearing of a corridor" would be required. HDD can be used to go under woodlands and croplands, just as it is being proposed to go under homes, schools, and roads. Sunoco just isn't willing to consider it, presumably because they would have to go to the trouble of obtaining new easements. (1)

17. Comment

I am against any kind of drilling in this area. In regards to HDD, there is an excessive length of time proposed for drilling. It is too much time for people to put up with this noise and air pollution. There will be unnecessary risks to the foundation of homes lining this route from being exposed to prolonged vibration. the violation of peace due to the sound of the drill in action six days a week is completely unreasonable. We have had issues already with HDD in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes. Also this pipeline is not safe for highly populated area. No Risk Assessment has been done for this area. (16)

18. Comment

Demand that Sunoco re-evaluate the populated area they are putting these pipelines in. The most populated parts of Philly suburbs! Demand they follow the law! They are getting away with everything. This pipeline is next to homes (literally) schools (literally) and major roads and senior centers!!! All the worst places ever! (17)

19. Comment

First and foremost, the route by which Sunoco would like to take for the above permit is ILLEGAL in the state of the Pennsylvania. Please see Section 1511(b) of the PA Business Corporation Law which states:

"1511. Additional powers of certain public utility corporations.

(a) General rule. --A public utility corporation shall, in addition to any other power of eminent domain conferred by any other statute, have the right to take, occupy and condemn property for one or more of the following principal purposes and ancillary purposes reasonably necessary or appropriate for the accomplishment of the principal purposes:

(1) The transportation of passengers or property or both as a common carrier by means of elevated street railway, ferry, inclined plane railway, railroad, street railway or underground street railway, trackless-trolley omnibus or by any combination of such means.

- (2) The transportation of artificial or natural gas, electricity, petroleum or petroleum products or water or any combination of such substances for the public.
 - (3) The production, generation, manufacture, transmission, storage, distribution or furnishing of natural or artificial gas, electricity, steam, air conditioning or refrigerating service or any combination thereof to or for the public.
 - (4) The diverting, developing, pumping, impounding, distributing or furnishing of water from either surface or subsurface sources to or for the public.
 - (5) The collection, treatment or disposal of sewage for the public.
 - (6) The conveyance or transmission of messages or communications by telephone or telegraph for the public.
 - (7) The diverting, pumping or impounding of water for the development or furnishing of hydroelectric power to or for the public.
 - (8) The transportation of oxygen or nitrogen, or both, by pipeline or conduit for the public.
- (b) Restrictions. --The powers conferred by subsection (a) shall not be exercised:
- (1) To condemn for the purpose of constructing any street railway, trackless-trolley omnibus, petroleum or petroleum products transportation or aerial electric transmission, aerial telephone or aerial telegraph lines:
 - (i) Any dwelling house or, except in the case of any condemnation for petroleum or petroleum products transportation lines, any part of the reasonable curtilage of a dwelling house within 100 meters therefrom and not within the limits of any street, highway, water or other public way or place."

There are numerous homes along this HDD route that violates the above restriction. Therefore, Sunoco's eminent domain use has violated the state's statute.

In addition to the above, a critical part of Sunoco's August agreement with the Clean Air Council is their recognition and realization of an alternative route analysis. A route that would disrupt and endanger far fewer lives, homes, schools, businesses etc. In Sunoco's reevaluation report, their re-route analysis" is fatally flawed and their priorities in examining an alternate route are mis-guided. The key problem with this new plan is that Sunoco has used the wrong priorities in its analysis. The first priority should have been avoiding populated areas. Instead, Sunoco has prioritized following existing pipeline easements. This simplifies the considerations for Sunoco, but it puts lives at risk needlessly. For a company that claims that safety is their #1 priority, their re-route analysis goes completely against this claim. For this type of HVL pipeline to be as safe as possible, it would be routed through as rural an area as possible and not run within 100 feet of homes, school, elderly care facilities, day cares, churches etc. There are far less populated routes that this pipeline can take from western PA to Marcus Hook that are southwest of the current route. Sunoco has ignored these possibilities despite the fact that their agreement with Clean Air Council requires their consideration. Simply put, because those routes would be more expensive for Sunoco than the current route, they are being disregarded and Sunoco is sacrificing the greater good and safety of the public as a result of that. Not only would a route that runs in a much more rural area where there are fewer homes drastically reduce the risk in the

case of a leak or explosion, it would also reduce the number of private wells and water sources that might possibly be affected by their drilling.

Sunoco's willful rejection of alternative routes is explicit in this report. "Any alternate route considered to the southwest would require the clearing of a new 'greenfield' corridor through existing woodlands and croplands, increase the number of stream crossings, and possibly encroach on additional private residences before it could rejoin the current route," according to the report. But that is being disingenuous. No new "clearing of a corridor" would be required. HDD can be used to go under woodlands and croplands, just as it is being proposed to go under homes, schools, and roads. Sunoco just isn't willing to consider it, presumably because they would have to go to the trouble of obtaining new easements.

A very real and perhaps independent analysis of alternative routes should be a requirement of the DEP and the state of PA.

In addition to the above, Sunoco's track record in installing these pipelines is awful. As attested by the > 100 violations the DEP has administered to them. I have no expectation for this to change. In the location of this HDD site, if and when there are inadvertent returns, they are going to be in private residents yards, under their homes, across public road ways. Sunoco's track records in PA assures us these frac outs and inadvertent returns will happen. Along this HDD route, they are going to be happening on residents personal private property and if anything like what occurs in West Whiteland happens again, sink holes may form further endangering people and their homes.

Lastly, this pipeline route will FOREVER endanger children. This route is within 200 feet of Saint Simon and Jude elementary and middle schools and within 2000 feet of Penn Wood Elementary School. Far too close to children 5 days a week, 40 weeks a year. If there was a pipeline leak, how can 500-750 children be expected to correctly evacuate on foot, upwind and uphill for up to 1/2 half mile to escape the potential blast radius. THAT IS NOT REALISTIC. Even worse, if there was a pipeline explosion, how many children's lives does it take for the state to realize the risk of this project? One life is too many. Please shut down this project. (18)

20. Comment

Sunoco must consider alternative routes. That is what they agreed to do in the August 9 settlement agreement, but they are not doing it. Not only do they need to do it for this particular drill site, they need to do it for every plan they submit, including ones they've already filed. (19)

21. Comment

I am against any kind of drilling in this area. In regards to HDD, there is an excessive length of time proposed for drilling. It is too much time for people to put up with this noise and air pollution. There will be unnecessary risks to the foundation of homes lining this route from being exposed to prolonged vibration. the violation of peace

due to the sound of the drill in action six days a week is completely unreasonable. We have had issues already with HDD in our area with inadvertent returns as well as sink holes. Also this pipeline is not safe for highly populated area. No Risk Assessment has been done for this area.

I believe it is irresponsible and unnecessary to expose so many people to a huge and catastrophic blast area. Thank you for considering (20)

22. Comment

I am writing to express my concern regarding the Mariner East 2 Pipeline construction project permit modification for open trench construction in the Exton (Chester County) business area.

This type of construction involves potential public safety and environmental impacts not associated with the horizontal directional drill (HDD) method. Businesses and the public library in the Exton area are frequented by many residents including the elderly and young children from the neighboring community so special consideration, specifically with respect to fall hazards and operation of heavy equipment, is warranted.

On behalf of the residents of my legislative district, I urge the PA Department of Environmental Protection to thoroughly review this permit modification request to consider all potential public safety and environmental impacts. Many sensitive environmental features cannot be replaced if they are lost. This application should not be approved unless the safety and environmental concerns are satisfactorily addressed. (21)

Letter – [Representative Corbin – 11-27-17 – Arch Bishop / South Chester Road Crossing](#)

23. Comment

In regards to the above, we cannot express how vehemently opposed to these HDD locations we are.

First and foremost, the route by which Sunoco would like to take for the above permit is ILLEGAL in the state of Pennsylvania. Please, see Section 1511(b) of the PA Business Corporation Law which states:

"1511. Additional powers of certain public utility corporations.

(a) General rule.--A public utility corporation shall, in addition to any other power of eminent domain conferred by any other statute, have the right to take, occupy and condemn property for one or more of the following principal purposes and ancillary purposes reasonably necessary or appropriate for the accomplishment of the principal purposes:

(1) The transportation of passengers or property or both as a common carrier by means of elevated street railway, ferry, inclined plane railway, railroad, street railway

or underground street railway, trackless-trolley omnibus or by any combination of such means.

(2) The transportation of artificial or natural gas, electricity, petroleum or petroleum products or water or any combination of such substances for the public.

(3) The production, generation, manufacture, transmission, storage, distribution or furnishing of natural or artificial gas, electricity, steam, air conditioning or refrigerating service or any combination thereof to or for the public.

(4) The diverting, developing, pumping, impounding, distributing or furnishing of water from either surface or subsurface sources to or for the public.

(5) The collection, treatment or disposal of sewage for the public.

(6) The conveyance or transmission of messages or communications by telephone or telegraph for the public.

(7) The diverting, pumping or impounding of water for the development or furnishing of hydroelectric power to or for the public.

(8) The transportation of oxygen or nitrogen, or both, by pipeline or conduit for the public.

(b) Restrictions --The powers conferred by subsection (a) shall not be exercised:

(1) To condemn for the purpose of constructing any street railway, trackless-trolley omnibus, petroleum or petroleum products transportation or aerial electric transmission, aerial telephone or aerial telegraph lines:

(i) Any dwelling house or, except in the case of any condemnation for petroleum or petroleum products transportation lines, any part of the reasonable curtilage of a dwelling house within 100 meters therefrom and not within the limits of any street, highway, water or other public way or place."

There are numerous family homes, private businesses, restaurants, heavily traveled roadways all along this HDD route that violates the above restriction. Therefore, Sunoco's eminent domain use has violated the state's statute.

In addition to the above, a critical part of Sunoco's August agreement with the Clean Air Council is their recognition and realization of an alternative route analysis. A route that would disrupt and endanger far fewer lives, homes, schools, businesses etc. In Sunoco's reevaluation report, their re-route analysis" is fatally flawed and their priorities in examining an alternate route are mis-guided. The key problem with this new plan is that Sunoco has used the wrong priorities in its analysis. The first priority should have been avoiding populated areas. Instead, Sunoco has prioritized following existing pipeline easements. This simplifies the considerations for Sunoco, but it puts lives at risk needlessly. For a company that claims that safety is their #1 priority, their re-route analysis goes completely against this claim. For this type of HVL pipeline to be as safe as possible, it would be routed through as rural an area as possible and not run within 100 feet of homes, school, elderly care facilities, day cares, churches etc. There are far less populated routes that this pipeline can take from western PA to Marcus Hook that are southwest of the current route. Sunoco has ignored these possibilities despite the fact that their agreement with Clean Air Council requires their consideration. Simply put, because those routes would be more expensive for Sunoco than the current route, they are being disregarded and Sunoco is sacrificing the greater

good and safety of the public as a result of that. Not only would a route that runs in a much more rural area where there are fewer homes drastically reduce the risk in the case of a leak or explosion, it would also reduce the number of private wells and water sources that might possibly be affected by their drilling.

Sunoco's willful rejection of alternative routes is explicit in this report. "Any alternate route considered to the southwest would require the clearing of a new 'greenfield' corridor through existing woodlands and croplands, increase the number of stream crossings, and possibly encroach on additional private residences before it could rejoin the current route," according to the report. But that is being disingenuous. No new "clearing of a corridor" would be required. HDD can be used to go under woodlands and croplands, just as it is being proposed to go under homes, schools, and roads. Sunoco just isn't willing to consider it, presumably because they would have to go to the trouble of obtaining new easements.

A webpage at OSHA.gov clearly details the inherent risks of short term and long term exposure to diesel exhaust from heavy equipment at construction work sites. Please see, https://www.osha.gov/dts/hazardalerts/diesel_exhaust_hazard_alert.html.

The existing drill sight at Slitting Mill Rd. and Rt. 352, behind the Duffers' establishment, has a generator running 24 hours a day 7 days week to prevent damage from lower temperatures. The resulting fumes, the noises, the vibrations are very real, very invasive, and very disturbing. Frequently, almost daily, the surrounding properties are subjected to fumes, the likes of which one would experience on the tarmac at the Philadelphia Airport. The stench of the diesel permeates the air in our yard and precludes any house windows from being opened.

How many of these significant questions were posed by the DEP to the ETP and Sunoco petitioners of these various permits? The nature of these permits clearly was not just business as usual. Evidently, these requests have been treated thus. The PA DEP, the state and the local officials clearly were lacking in their preparation for a proper and thorough evaluation of these proposals, the details, the impacts on PA residents, the implications of the transporting a highly volatile and unstable products within close proximity to populations. It has been a proven travesty that the people elected and selected to safe guard the interests and the safety of the population of PA have failed in their mission and mandates.

A very credible and perhaps independent analysis of alternative routes should be a minimum requirement of the DEP, Delaware County, and Chester County, and the state of PA, prior to permits being validated.

Entire quality of life is adversely being impacted by the greed of a few out of state executives and their share holders. Not one dollar of profit from the sale of the raw material overseas will be realized here in the state that it is harvested in.

How can the PUC and PA DEP officials look the PA public in the eye with a straight face and tell us this project is for the greater good of the individuals of PA, who will see and realize lower energy costs?

In addition to the above, Sunoco's track record in installing these pipelines is awful. As attested by the > 100 violations the DEP has administered to them. I have no expectation for this to change. In the location of this HDD site, when there are inadvertent returns, they are going to be into and onto private residents' yards, under their homes, across public road ways.

Sunoco's track records in PA assures us these frac outs and inadvertent returns will happen. Along this suggested HDD route, the risk of sink holes alone should be enough for the PA DEP to be compelled to not authorize these permits. The potential sink hole risk alone under or near State roads and Routes would do untold harm and damage to the public.

Lastly, this pipeline route will FOREVER endanger residents and school children. This route is within 200 feet of Saint Simon and Jude elementary and middle schools and within 2000 feet of Penn Wood Elementary School. Far too close to children 5 days a week, 40 weeks a year. If there was a pipeline leak, how can 500-750 children be expected to correctly evacuate on foot, upwind and uphill for up to 1/2 half mile to escape the potential blast radius. THAT IS NOT REALISTIC. Even worse, if there was a pipeline explosion, how many children's lives does it take for the state to realize the risk of this project? One life is too many. Please shut down this project.
(22)

24. Comment

In addition to the below, I do not read one word in Sunoco's reevaluation report in regards to the risk presented to the neighboring houses.

Where is Sunoco's risk assessment in regards to the home that will be less than 250 feet behind the drill at the corner of route 926 and route 352? My home is currently about 300 yards from a drill and the ground vibrates outside my front door. What is the drilling going to do to a home that is 250 feet from the drill?

Is there a risk assessment for what is going to happen to the roadway of route 352 that is less than 100 feet from the drilling rig closest to route 352 and West Chester Pike?

Is there an independent risk assessment of the ME 2 Pipeline in general? Where is it?
(18)

25. Comment

This note is in response to the Horizontal Drill Analysis for Arch Bishop/South Chester Road and Sunoco's Reevaluation submission to the DEP for the 352/926 drilling sites.

My name is Melinda Welsh, and I live at 8 Fallbrook Lane on Glen Mills (Andover development). This property backs up to the corner of 325 and 926.

I moved to this home in June of this year. I am a single mother of two children and this house was a huge investment of my resources. But, I purchased it to give the best I possibly could to my kids. When I bought the house, I had no idea how much the Sunoco pipeline work would impact us.

They have already destroyed the common area immediately behind my home, greatly affecting our privacy. And since we are so close to the construction area (about 100 feet), just clearing the site has shaken our house, causing stress to the people who live here, as well as our dogs, one of which had to be medicated. Since the drilling site is proposed to right behind my home, I am very fearful of what is about to come given how much disruption was caused just to clear the area. I am concerned about impacts to my foundation, not to mention the general lack of quality of life and anxiety that will surely come along with this work. The number of sinkholes and problems with drilling fluid from drilling further up the pipeline will surely continue to be issues since Sunoco has done nothing to mitigate them in the past.

Once the work is completed, the concern doesn't end. In fact, this is when the biggest concerns will begin. Having these dangerous materials going through a pipeline so close my home, my neighbors' homes, schools and businesses is a risk I can't believe anyone is willing to take. I do not want to be living here when this happens, but the extreme loss of property value because of Sunoco's work will make moving very difficult.

It's important to note, I have never been given any chance for a settlement or any compensation from Sunoco. But, this is about much more than money. It is about the safety and wellbeing of the citizens who live here. Please do the right thing and prevent this work from causing more harm than it already has. It is in your power to make this right for the people who live here. Thank you for your consideration. (23)

26. Comment

We are writing to you in regard to Sunoco Logistics not adequately addressing an alternate route analysis for a plan to do horizontal directional drilling at the corner of Routes 352 and 926 near Route 3 running under Route 352 in Chester and Delaware Counties. The August 9 settlement agreement discusses alternate routes when there is a densely populated area such as this near major roadways and the Andover subdivision. The pipeline route would be better if it went to the southwest in a less settled area. The concern is that the company is taking the easiest route by using existing easements that is not the best for safety of people and the environment.

We urge you to tell the company that they must consider alternate routes and all of the ramifications involving health and safety. This needs to be done for every plan they submit, including plans that have been filed.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this important issue. (24)

27. Comment

As per the recent settlement with the Environmental Hearing Board, Sunoco was to select alternate routes for ME 2 so as to avoid densely populated areas such as the junction of routes 926 and 352. I urge the DEP to enforce this provision and require Sunoco to present alternate routes so as to minimize the risks to the residents of this area. (25)

28. Comment

I would like to comment on Sunoco's plan to drill at the border of Delaware and Chester county. I believe this plan is fundamentally flawed. Sunoco has clearly not shown that they have investigated alternative paths for the pipeline. Their current plan would run the pipe through densely populated areas. There are other options, such as running it a little further southwest where there would be less people in its path.

The kind of drilling they are doing - HDD - can be done under woodlands and croplands, just as it is being done now under homes, schools, and roads (which is far more dangerous for citizens of Pennsylvania).

Sunoco must consider other options, as they agreed to in the August 9th settlement agreement. And, they should present thoroughly investigated plans and alternative plans for all the routes they have outlined. I live in an area now where they are drilling less than 50 feet from my house in Chester County. This whole project is horribly irresponsible, and the violations reported on your website clearly demonstrate this. I would prefer if the whole project was completely shut down. (26)

29. Comment

Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania.

IN RE: Condemnation by Sunoco Pipeline L.P. of Permanent and Temporary Rights of Way for the Transportation of Ethane, Propane, Liquid Petroleum Gas, and other Petroleum Products in Edgemont Township, Delaware County, Pennsylvania, over the Lands of Charles S. Katz, Jr. and Karen M. Katz Appeal of: Charles S. Katz, Jr. and Karen M. Katz

No. 1747 C.D. 2016

Decided: July 03, 2017

Please see footnote 6 - this pipeline's placement relative to this HDD site is illegal in the state of PA per the Honorable Dan Pellegrini, Senior Judge. I urge you to deny this permit. Thank you!

6. Section 1511(b) of the BCL provides that the power of eminent domain granted to public utility corporations for purposes of constructing petroleum or petroleum products transportation cannot be exercised within “any part of the reasonable curtilage of a dwelling house within 100 meters therefrom.” 15 Pa.C.S. § 1511(b). No such restriction exists on the transportation of artificial or natural gas.
<http://caselaw.findlaw.com/pa-commonwealth-court/1866877.html> (18)

30. Comment

Please require that Sunoco find alternative routes for its ME2 pipeline. Their rationale for not doing so is pure propaganda: "Any alternate route considered to the southwest would require the clearing of a new ‘greenfield’ corridor through existing woodlands and croplands, increase the number of stream crossings, and possibly encroach on additional private residences before it could rejoin the current route." Yet no new “clearing of a corridor” would be required. HDD can be used to go under woodlands and croplands, just as it is being proposed to go under homes, schools, and roads. Sunoco just isn’t willing to consider it, presumably because they would have to go to the trouble of obtaining new easements. In other words, they're putting their private profits ahead of our safety. (27)

31. Comment

On behalf of the Thornbury Township Supervisors and other officials of Thornbury Township, we are writing as the Township Engineer to give official public comment on the above referenced project and their Supplemental HOD Analysis as required by the August 9, 2017 Environmental Hearing Board Stipulated Order as follows:

1. Intercept Drills - We have concerns that the proposed intercept drill concept for the South Chester Road HOD will not be accomplished and create greater environmental threats in the process. Another active drill site, exiting by Slitting Mill Road and starting only 1 property away from the South Chester Road HOD site, involved 1,350 ft of failed drilling from October 2, 2017 to October 19, 2017, where proper steering through a section of rock was found to be impossible. Failed Intercept drilling was also performed at this location between October 19, 2017 and November 7, 2017 (almost 3 weeks), upon which the failed intercept drilling was abandoned and an entirely new HOD location was begun. Most of the intercept drilling involved missing the intercept hole location and re-drilling new holes until finally giving up on the concept. From November 7, 2017 until November 20, 2017 the new HOD pilot hole was completed, however, the drill came out 10 feet away from the targeted exit point. This should not be a surprise, as the submitted Supplemental HOD Analysis report states on pages 3, 21, & 22 that "...steering within the Baltimore Gneiss has been problematic ... These minerals and rocks can divert the drill bit from the intended alignment." With the proposed South Chester Road HOD being 6,346 feet in length, and almost 5 times the length of the failed intercept drilling referenced above, we do not have much confidence that an intercept drilling concept will work within the proposed South Chester Road Area.

a. Request - A single drilling location at West Chester Pike, SR 3, with exit point near SR 926 is requested. This would help to reduce construction noise in an adjacent Thornbury residential development and is the more likely scenario to actually be accomplished in the field

2. Inadvertent Returns - We have concerns that Inadvertent Returns (IR) are more likely to occur in a failing intercept drill scenario, where drills will likely need to be realigned and create additional holes to try to line up the intercept as seen at the above referenced Slitting Mill Road HOD site. With the Slitting Mill Road site, 6 IR's occurred in a 1350 ft HOD, whereas many more would be expected with a 6,346 ft HOD within similar geology.

a. Request - The handling of abandoned drill holes should be addressed in writing, as we have concerns about leaving failed drill hole sites open and creating unnatural pathways for groundwater, drilling contaminants, or promoting further inadvertent returns. Special consideration should also be taken with the drilling fluid mixture to minimize such impacts.

3. SR 926 Drill Site Location - The drill location near SR 926 has been moved further south along the SR 352 corridor. This will need to be coordinated with the tire wash rack located within the same area. The wash rack may need to be relocated to allow for efficient and proper usage as required by the Erosion Control Permit.

a. Request - If the SR 926 intercept drill site location is not abandoned as requested above, revised Erosion Control Plans should be submitted, documenting the proposed changes to the SR 926 HOD drilling location, along with any required changes in the wash rack location.

4. Noise Level consideration - The drill location near SR 926 will involve noise from not only the drill and construction equipment during work hours, but also from generators and heaters used outside of Township permitted work hours to keep drilling equipment and fluids from freezing overnight. The overnight noise from the generators and heaters has already generated a complaint, which Sunoco addressed by adding more sound barriers/sound curtains in the area of the Slitting Mill Road drill rig site. The referenced Slitting Mill Road HOD is located much further away from residential homes than the SR 926 site, which may have drilling equipment as close as 50 feet to a residential structure.

a. Request - If the SR 926 intercept drill site location is not abandoned as requested above, Sunoco should address how they will be able to provide a more quiet method of powering and heating the drilling equipment and fluids overnight and throughout the construction process. Temporary power and a meter from PECO should be investigated as an alternative quiet source of power for such (PECO power lines are adjacent to the SR 926 drill site). Heaters with better sound proofing and/or additional sound barriers should also be investigated.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project and we look forward to working with you in the future. Should you have any further comments or questions, please feel free to contact me. (28, 36)

Letter – [Catania Engineering Associates, Inc. – 12-11-17 – Arch Bishop / South Chester Road Crossing](#)

32. Comment

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., the Delaware Riverkeeper Network, and Andover Homeowners’ Association, please accept these comments on Sunoco Pipeline L.P.’s (“Sunoco”) re-evaluation report (“Report”) for the horizontal directional drilling (“HDD”) indicated by drawing numbers HDD PA-CH- 0421.0000-RD & PA-CH-0421.0000-RD-16 (the “HDD Site”).

The Department’s Review

Pennsylvanians rely on the Department of Environmental Protection to protect them from dangerous activities that threaten their air, water, land, and health. The Department has recognized that the construction of Mariner East 2 has done damage to the public already. The purpose of Sunoco’s re-evaluations of certain HDD sites is so that it does a better job avoiding harm to the public and the environment in its HDD construction. The Department’s role is to review and assess Sunoco’s Report before deciding what action to take on it.

It is the Department’s duty to review and assess the Report with protecting the public and the environment placed first and foremost. Looking at the individual circumstances at the site in question is key. Critically important is accounting for input from those who live nearby, who have a deeper connection with and greater knowledge about the land than the foreign company building the pipelines through it.

A meaningful, objective and substantive review and assessment by the Department will ensure that new or further HDD operations at the re-evaluated sites will cause minimal, if any, harm to the public and the environment. Anything less than a full, careful, and objective review would endanger the public and the environment. Pennsylvanians place their trust in the Department to do a thorough, science-based assessment, taking into account these and other comments, and approving Sunoco’s recommendation only if it would protect the public and the environment from any further harm.

Comments on HDD PA-CH-0421.0000-RD & PA-CH-0421.0000-RD-16

This HDD site stands out as being in one of the most densely populated areas along the entire pipeline route. It is also far longer than most other drills, at over 6000 feet. The number of potentially impacted residents and vulnerable water supplies is thus especially high. The professional hydrogeologists that Sunoco hired to review plans

for the Site have made a number of recommendations geared toward avoiding complications during the construction process and protecting water supplies. Sunoco has not adopted those recommendations, and instead proposes “no significant changes to the HDD plans” besides implementing standard best management practices. The Report provides no explanation as to why Sunoco has rejected its scientists’ recommendations. It also appears, as with prior re-evaluation reports, that Sunoco has not provided its scientists with all necessary information regarding well locations and features, and that Sunoco has failed to conduct a meaningful alternatives analysis. For these reasons, and as described in more detail below, the present proposal should be denied.

1. Sunoco has not provided a complete assessment of risks to water supplies nor taken necessary measures to protect water supplies.

Sunoco has identified 217 landowners with parcels within 450 feet of the alignment and indicates that it sent mailers to those residents on October 30, 2017. While taking this most basic step prior to the submission of the Report is a move in the right direction, Sunoco has not yet initiated direct contact with all of these land owners to determine the potable water source for each landowner. Any outreach that has been conducted does not appear to have been considered by, and is not reflected in, the analysis provided by Sunoco’s hydrogeologists; that analysis references findings from the PaGWIS system, but does not address any specific well or well production zone locations or features. Until the effort to make direct contact with landowners has been completed and all information gathered from that process is fully considered by Sunoco’s scientists, DEP, and the public, the proposal for this Site cannot be considered complete or determined to be safe.

Some potentially serious risks to water supplies have been identified in the Report, and those risks need to be addressed in the context of specific and accurate water supply data. For example, the Report explains that differences in topography “could cause excessive groundwater discharges at the entry/exit points during HDD construction and local water table lowering in the area of the topographic high.” Even if a well does not run dry permanently, a short-term disruption of the water table could result in bacterial contamination of water supplies. Which wells could be impacted by the drop in the water table and the potential severity and duration of the impact need to be addressed. Simply planning to provide replacement water supplies is insufficient, as the goal of the re- evaluation process is to prevent damage.

The vulnerability of water supplies in this area has also already been brought to light in the appeal of the Mariner East 2 Chapter 102 and 105 permits through the affidavit of a local resident and Chairman of the Westtown Township Board of Supervisors, Michael Di Domenico. (Attached as Exhibit A). Mr. Di Domenico lives just over 450 feet from the Site and in his affidavit, he explained that he consulted with multiple hydrogeologists and well drillers who advised him drilling nearby would likely have negative effects on the aquifer on which he relies and his well water. Mr. Di Domenico further explained that in the event of contamination or depletion of his

well, he would be left with no water supply, as he is unable to connect to public water. He was also concerned about water supplies for other residents in his township and pointed out most water towers in Westtown store groundwater from wells. Mr. Di Domenico's affidavit demonstrates the need at this Site for Sunoco to consider impacts to wells outside the 450-foot radius. None of Mr. Di Domenico's concerns appear inconsistent with the findings of Sunoco's hydrogeologists, but it is also clear that the Report does not address or resolve these concerns.

Sunoco's hydrogeologists have made two recommendations specific to groundwater, neither of which appears to have been adopted by Sunoco in its proposed plans for the Site. First, the hydrogeologists recommend monitoring groundwater levels, as this "could provide useful information relative to the potential for lowering water levels and whether the pipe installation actually affects water levels." Second, the hydrogeologists recommended moving the intersection point:

Groundwater flowback to the entry point(s) may be an issue due to the hill near the midpoint of the HDD being higher in elevation he [sic] northwest and southeast entry points. . . . It would be advantageous to intersect north of the intervening hill to better manage the groundwater at the southeast entry point. There is more room at this location and adjacent areas, such as the open cut section and LOD for HDD 560-16 could be utilized.

Sunoco should provide a rationale for not adopting these recommendations, and explain how the plans it is proposing achieve adequate protection.

2. The Street Road Thrust Fault presents a high risk of inadvertent return perpendicular to the HDD alignment.

The HDD Hydrogeologic Reevaluation Report at page 4 identifies a fault known as "the Street Road Thrust Fault at the southern end of HDD S3-0541 that is oriented northeast- southwest," perpendicular to the HDD alignment. The fault is "a zone of smaller, southeast dipping planes that may represent a planar zone of enhanced secondary porosity, permitting fluids to flow more easily and farther along these planes than other discontinuities." (Page 5).

The geologists specifically noted that "monitoring of private domestic wells along the Street Road fault, northeast and southwest of the fault / alignment intersection during HDD installation would be useful for minimizing potential water supply impacts." Sunoco did not implement these measures.

We agree with these suggestions and further recommend that Sunoco cross the fault more deeply than it plans to. As can be seen in Figure 2 of the Hydrogeologic Report, the Street Road Thrust Fault crosses the HDD alignment just northwest of Street Road. The HDD borehole is planned to cross Street Road at a depth of 26 feet. Given the identified "weakness in the overburden materials [and] weakness in the bedrock," this shallow depth of crossing a zone of enhanced porosity is plainly

insufficient to protect against inadvertent returns communicated laterally across this thrust fault.

Furthermore, water wells located along the thrust fault should be identified and protected farther out than the 450' minimum, as the groundwater communication will likely be much greater in this zone.

3. The proposed best management practices are insufficient for the geology of the Site, and do not reflect the recommendations of Sunoco's scientists.

The Report argues that "HDD specialists and geologists employed by SPLP have investigated the HDD design and subsurface geologic conditions and concluded that the original HDD design for the 16 and 20 inch pipelines, as summarized in the introduction, have a minimal risk of inadvertent returns (IRs) if implemented." Unfortunately, this is contradicted by the attached HDD Hydrogeologic Reevaluation Report. That report "has identified a few issues that need to be addressed to minimize the risk of IRs and potential adverse effect to the local bedrock aquifer."

As explained in the hydrogeologic report, previous attempts to drill through the gneiss bedrock found in this area for the installation of Mariner East 2 have proven problematic for steering due to the heterogeneous nature of the rock, which can divert the drill bit from the alignment. Sunoco's scientists point out that "plans for the HDD should take steering issues into consideration, especially if intersect drills are considered." (emphasis added). The scientists recommend: 1.) governing drilling rates, 2.) using greater than typical alignment checks, 3.) lower bit pressure, 4.) lower mud pressure, and 5.) use of a diamond bit. According to the scientists, these may be "the only practical solutions for optimizing progress and staying on alignment."

It appears Sunoco does not intend to implement any of these changes. Instead, it proposes to employ the same vague best management practices that it has suggested for each site it has re-evaluated. Not only do these BMPs fail to reflect the recommendations of their scientists, but, as has been pointed out before, Sunoco does not say that these measures are new, or were not employed during its earlier, problematic phase of HDD across the Commonwealth.

Taken together, the geology of the area, and Sunoco's decision not to accommodate that geology in its plans, call into question Sunoco's ability to actually install the pipelines where it intends to install them. Deviating from the planned alignment and course corrections would result in greater disruption underground, increasing risks of IRs, threats to groundwater, and destabilization of the geology.

4. Sunoco has not conducted a meaningful alternatives analysis.

Sunoco's brief, generalized discussion of the re-route alternative does not provide enough information about alternative routes to determine whether re-routing is preferable. It describes a potential route to the southwest as requiring clearing of

“new greenfield” and then dismisses that alternative without providing any basis for comparing that route to the planned route. A meaningful alternatives analysis requires quantitative and qualitative details about the potential environmental impacts at each location, as well as the safety of each.

In fact, the “new greenfield” terminology is misleading at best and factually incorrect at worst. The planned alignment involves the acquisition through eminent domain of a greatly expanded easement across the preserved, residential open space owned by the Andover Homeowners’ Association. This expanded easement is next to an existing twenty-foot wide easement; but because the expanded easement consists of treed, maintained open space, it is in fact “new greenfield” itself. Sunoco’s argument that it has chosen the planned alignment for the purpose of avoiding the taking of “new greenfield” fails because it is simply wrong. Sunoco should be required to discuss alternative routings in meaningful detail, accurately quantifying the specific amount of “new greenfield” in each.

In addition, the Andover residential subdivision contains a historic site registered in the Historic Resource Inventory of Thornbury Township, Delaware County. This site contains two structures built during the late 1700s, the foundations of at least four other structures, and a wide field of potential historic or cultural significance which has not been evaluated by Sunoco, the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission, or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This site was previously determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The Andover Homeowners’ Association believes it is possible that items of significant historic and archeological significance, and possibly human remains as well, may be contained in the area which Sunoco proposes to disturb as part of the planned alignment. In fact, grubbing activities by Sunoco in the vicinity of its proposed new greenfield easement has brought artifacts to the surface. Sunoco should be required to discuss alternative routings in meaningful detail, evaluating and quantifying the effects on cultural and historic resources of each alternative. Without such analysis, the appropriateness of the proposed route cannot be verified.

Conclusion

For these reasons, we request that this proposal be denied.

Thank you for considering these comments. Please keep us apprised of your next steps on the proposed HDD Site. (29-33)

Letter – [Clean Air Council – 12-11-17 – Arch Bishop / South Chester Road Crossing](#)

33. Comment

I am a resident of Westtown within walking distance of not one but two proposed drill sites. I am against any kind of drilling in this area. With regards to HDD specifically we have already seen an excessive number of inadvertent returns along the route. This demonstrates to me the inadequacy of Sunoco's plan and their proposed controls and the inability of DEP to effectively monitor their operation.

There are a significant number of people in this area with private wells that will be at risk if this project proceeds. The risk is too high in a highly populated area such as this. One of the drill sites is adjacent to an elementary school. (34)

34. Comment

I am a resident of Westtown Township in Chester County and I am opposed to drilling in this area. Given the number of inadvertent returns that have already occurred for this project and Sunoco's failure to comply with the agreement negotiated with Clean Air Council, Delaware Riverkeeper and Mountain Watershed how can they be allowed to proceed? This is a densely populated suburban area but many people still rely on private wells and they would be at risk.

In addition this is within close proximity to Ridley Creek which would also be threatened. (35)

35. Comment

Pursuant to the Corrected Stipulated Order entered at Environmental Hearing Board Docket No. 2017-009-L on August 10, 2017 (“Order”), please accept these comments on Sunoco Pipeline L.P.’s (“Sunoco”) re-evaluation report (“Report”) for the horizontal directional drilling (“HDD”) proposed under “DEP Permit HDD Reference # PA-CH-0421.0000-RD.” (“Arch Bishop / South Chester Road Crossing” in Westtown Township, Chester County and Thornbury Township, Delaware County).

The Department’s Review

Pennsylvanians rely on the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to protect them from hazardous industrial activities that threaten their air, water, land and safety. The Department has recognized that the Sunoco’s construction of its proposed Mariner East 2 hazardous, highly volatile liquids export pipeline has already done immense damage to the public. The purported purpose of Sunoco’s re-evaluations of certain proposed horizontal directional drill (HDD) sites is to so that it does a better job assessing and mitigating the obvious risks to the public safety associated with the Mariner East project.

DEP’s role is to review and assess Sunoco’s Report before deciding what action to take on it. In considering whether to permit further construction to take place, it is DEP’s responsibility to review and assess the Report with the primary goal of protecting the public, not to advance Sunoco’s interests. Looking at the individual circumstances at the site in question is key. Critically important is accounting for input from those directly impacted by the project, who have a deeper connection with and greater knowledge of the land and the area than the alien company that proposes to construct transmission pipelines through it.

A meaningful, objective and substantive review and assessment by the DEP must ensure that any new or continued construction operations at the re-evaluated sites will cause minimal, if any, risk to the public safety and the environment. Anything less

than a full, careful, and objective review would endanger the public and the environment. Pennsylvanians place their trust in the Department to do a thorough, science-based assessment, taking into account these and other comments, and approving Sunoco's recommendation only if it would protect the public and the environment from any further harm.

Comments on DEP Permit HDD Reference # PA-CH-0421.0000-RD

This proposed HDD site stands out as being in one of the most densely populated areas along the entire pipeline route. It is also far longer than most other drills, at nearly 7,000 feet. The number of impacted residents and vulnerable water supplies is thus especially high. The hydrogeologists that Sunoco hired to review plans for the Site have made a number of recommendations geared toward avoiding complications during the construction process and protecting water supplies. Yet Sunoco has not adopted those recommendations, and instead proposes "no significant changes to the HDD plans" besides implementing standard "best management practices." The Report provides no explanation of why Sunoco has ignored its scientists' recommendations. It also appears, as with prior re-evaluation reports, that Sunoco has not provided its scientists with all necessary information regarding well locations and features. Critically, Sunoco has failed again to conduct a meaningful alternatives analysis. For these reasons, and as described in more detail below, the present proposal should be denied.

Sunoco has not conducted a meaningful alternatives analysis

Sunoco's brief, generalized discussion of the re-route alternative does not provide nearly enough information about alternative routes to determine whether re-routing is preferable. It describes a potential route to the southwest as requiring clearing of "new greenfield" and then dismisses that alternative without providing any basis for comparing that route to the planned route. A meaningful alternatives analysis requires quantitative and qualitative details about the potential environmental impacts at each location, as well as the safety of each. Without such analysis, the appropriateness of the proposed route cannot be verified.

In fact, the "new greenfield" terminology is misleading at best and factually incorrect at worst. The planned alignment involves the acquisition through eminent domain of a greatly expanded easement across the private, preserved, residential open space owned by the Andover Homeowners' Association. This expanded easement is next to an existing twenty-foot wide easement; but because the expanded easement consists of treed, maintained open space, it is in fact "new greenfield" itself. Sunoco's argument that it has chosen the planned alignment for the purpose of avoiding the taking of "new greenfield" fails because it is simply wrong. Sunoco should be required to discuss alternative routings in meaningful detail, accurately quantifying the specific amount of "new greenfield" in each.

In addition, the Andover residential subdivision contains a historic site registered in the Historic Resource Inventory of Thornbury Township, Delaware County. This site contains two structures built during the late 1700s, the foundations of at least four other structures, and a wide field of potential historic or cultural significance which has not been evaluated by Sunoco, the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission, or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This site was previously determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The Andover Homeowners' Association believes that items of significant historic and archeological significance, and possibly human remains as well, may be contained in the area which Sunoco proposes to disturb as part of the planned alignment. In fact, grubbing activities by Sunoco in the vicinity of its proposed new greenfield easement have brought artifacts to the surface. Sunoco took not the slightest notice or care of these artifacts as it was disturbing them, but they were recovered and remain available for inspection by a competent authority. Sunoco should be required to discuss alternative routings in meaningful detail, evaluating and quantifying the effects on cultural and historic resources of each alternative.

In terms of public safety risks, the planned alignment contemplates the construction of two new hazardous, highly volatile liquid transmission pipelines, at open-trench depth, less than 100 feet from residences in a densely populated "high consequence" area. Every one of the 39 residences in Andover is within 800 feet of the proposed route. One expert model predicts blast and thermal impacts from a large release of highly volatile liquids could extend to 1,800 feet from the point of release. Another expert model predicts "life-threatening effects or death" from heavier-than-air gas at 2,400 feet, and a "lower explosive limit" of flammable or explosive gas² extending to 3,900 feet from the point of release. Corroborating these models, a 2015 accident involving a release of ethane, with ignition, from a 20-inch diameter new pipeline, resulted in thermal damage at 2,000 feet from the point of rupture. And Sunoco has reported more leaks from its pipelines than any other operator tracked by the federal government, 290 of them since 2006 alone. Many of these accidents have occurred in Pennsylvania, including a 2015 leak of hazardous liquids in Edgmont Township; a 2016 rupture which released a reported 55,000 gallons of gasoline near Williamsport (Sunoco's fourth leak on that particular pipeline segment) and a 2017 leak of hazardous, highly volatile liquids in Morgantown. In 2016, the last full year for which data are available, Sunoco reported leaking a greater quantity of hazardous liquids from its pipelines than in the previous six years (2010-2015) combined.

Sunoco has provided no credible plan to protect vulnerable, dense, immobile populations from a release of highly volatile liquids. Last week, in New Mexico, a pipeline accident involving methane (a less dangerous material than highly volatile liquids) prompted the Eddy County Office of Emergency Management to advise, via Twitter at approximately 2:00 a.m., that residents should "self-evacuate" a four-mile diameter circle. That's about 12.5 square miles, or the land area of a typical Pennsylvania municipality. In the case of heavier-than-air, extremely flammable highly volatile liquids, such self-evacuation must be carried out in the correct upwind direction and on foot—vehicles cannot safely be used. Such a scenario is certain to

I would like to know when and how often my well will be tested by them again to insure that I and my family are not affected by contamination from the drilling. I would also like to know what actions Sunoco is required to undertake in the event of well contamination. Will Sunoco pay for a hookup to a public water supply? In the event a public water supply is not available, will Sunoco pay for the reduction in the value of the property, or in the event there is no market for a property with contaminated water, to purchase the property at the fair market value as if there were no contamination?

Thank you for your consideration. (38)