

**DEP Permit # E50-258**  
**DEP Permit HDD Reference # PA-PE-0002.0000-RD**  
**DEP HDD # S2-0157**  
**Township – Toboyne**  
**County – Perry**  
**HDD Site Name – Horse Valley Road Crossing**

**1st Public Comment Period**

<b>Commentator ID #</b>	<b>Name and Address</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
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 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite 3 Bristol, PA 19007	Delaware Riverkeeper Network
3.	Joseph Otis Minott, Esq. 135 South 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
4.	Alexander G. Bomstein, Esq. 135 South 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
5.	Kathryn L. Urbanowicz, Esq. 135 South 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council

**1. 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., and the Delaware Riverkeeper Network (“Appellants”), 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-CU-0203.0000-WX & PA-CU-0203.0000- WX-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-PE-0002.0000-RD & PA-PE-0002.0000-RD-16**

##### **1. The redesigned HDD is much improved and better than non-HDD installation methods.**

Appellants believe the dramatically increased depth of cover over sensitive surface features, done through locating the borehole in deeper rock with more structural strength, is a strong improvement over the original HDD design. Appellants support that change.

Appellants also agree that, based on the information of which we are aware about the redesign and the few water wells nearby, the redesigned HDD is a better choice for environmental protection than alternative installation methods.

##### **2. Sunoco should analyze risks to the private water well it identified.**

Sunoco appears to have properly reached out to landowners near the HDD alignment and determined that there are no water wells within 450' of the alignment, which is an improvement over many of the re-evaluation reports we have seen so far.

Sunoco did identify the existence of one water well at 539' southwest of the HDD alignment. While this is not within 450', it is still well within the zone that, given certain hydrogeological conditions, would be susceptible to contamination from HDD operations. Sunoco acknowledges that "[t]he redesign of the HDD will not prevent all IRs." It would be the best practice for Sunoco to do a well production zone analysis for the identified well to determine whether the redesigned HDD would pose an unacceptable risk to the identified well.

### **3. Risks to the nearby impoundments should be addressed.**

The Report discloses that there are two impoundments at the Site, between a third and a half acre each. The Report does not describe the use of the impoundments or contain analysis of whether there is risk to the structural integrity of the impoundments due to the revised HDD plans. Appellants have received reports from several homeowners who live along active Sunoco HDD sites that their houses have shaken from the drilling and they are concerned about their foundations. Any risk to the integrity of the impoundments should be investigated first and minimized.

### **4. The Geology and Hydrogeological Evaluation Report is Incomplete.**

Within the Geology and Hydrogeological Evaluation Report is a statement that “From a geologic perspective, the longer and deeper profile, in conjunction with the proposed engineering controls and/or drilling best management practices, will be used to reduce the risk of an IR.” This and surrounding statements described the revisions to the HDD design, but do not evaluate them or conclude that the specific revisions will actually achieve protection.

It is important for the geologists who analyzed the site to weigh in also on whether the revisions to the design will adequately address the risks present from the original design. At this stage, while the revisions appear to be an improvement, that is still not clear.

### **5. DEP should require implementation of measures to handle and mitigate the risks of produced groundwater.**

The Geology and Hydrogeological Evaluation Report notes the possibility of groundwater coming up to the surface due to the more than 80-foot elevation difference between the entry and exit holes for the HDD. The eastern end is lower, which means that the groundwater would likely be produced on the eastern end. Moreover, the eastern exit hole will be on a slope. Even if the temporary grading for the HDD pad levels the ground, the volumes of groundwater could require handling that results in the produced groundwater running downslope. At the bottom of the slope lies Stream S-L6, the perennial Horse Valley Run. Horse Valley Run is a High Quality cold water fishery with migratory fishes, and is in a naturally-reproducing trout watershed.

This is not a speculative concern. In Delaware County, a similar problem on Mariner East 2 resulted in large inadvertent returns into Chester Creek due to greater volumes of produced groundwater than Sunoco was equipped to handle. This produced groundwater will typically be sediment-laden and liable to cause erosion and pollute waters. See photos in attached Affidavit of Faith Zerbe.

DEP should require Sunoco to have the needed staff and equipment onsite during the time when produced groundwater is the greatest concern. Equipment for handling

produced groundwater should ideally deal with the groundwater at a location where an overflow would not pollute a stream, pond, or wetland, and would cause minimal erosion.

### **Conclusion**

For these reasons, the HDD re-design appeared to be a marked improvement over the original design, but Appellants encourage the Department to require the additional safety measures noted above and request the additional information identified above so that the environmental and public safety risks are fully known before HDD proceeds.

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 - Horse Valley Road Crossing](#)