

DEP Permit # E15-862
DEP Permit HDD Reference # PA-CH-0212.0000-RD
DEP HDD # S3-0370
Township – West Whiteland
County - Chester
HDD Site Name – North Pottstown Pike Crossing

1st Public Comment Period

Commentator ID #	Name and Address	Affiliation
1	Mary Hegeler Delaware County	
2	James Connelly	
3	Lori Stocker 121 Howard Road West Chester, PA 19380	
4	Lois K. Huston 55 Maple Linden Lane Malvern, PA 19355	
5	Mike Walsh 100 Deerfield Lane, Suite 140 Malvern, PA 19355	Trident Mortgage Company, LP
6	Melissa Marshall, Esq. P.O. Box 408 1414-B Indian Creek Valley Road Melcroft, PA 15462	Mountain Watershed Association
7	Aaron J. Stemplewicz, Esq. 925 Canal Street 7 th Floor, Suite 3 Bristol, PA 19007	Delaware Riverkeeper Network
8	Joseph Otis Minott, Esq. 135 South 19 th Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
9	Alexander G. Bomstein, Esq. 135 South 19 th Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
10	Kathryn L. Urbanowicz, Esq. 135 South 19 th Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
11	Jamie Krall	
12	Margaret Quinn 503 Carmarthen Drive Exton, PA 19341	

13	Christina Zettner East Goshen Township	
14	Andrew E. Dinniman 182 Main Capitol Building Harrisburg, PA 17120	PA Senator
15	James and Emily Scarola 504 Lakeside Drive Exton, PA 19341	
16	Virginia and Brian Kerslake 103 Shoen Road Exton, PA 19341	
17	William and Cheryl Wardle 103 Shoen Rd Exton, PA 19341	
18	Nate and Andrea Reiser 105 Shoen Rd Exton, PA 19341	

1. Comment:

I'm a Pennsylvania constituent who lives along the Mariner 2 East pipeline route in Middletown Township (Delaware County) and I'm writing to express my deep concern about the Mariner 2 East pipeline project -- specifically to support the community of Exton where I understand that Sunoco/ETP now plans to run their dangerous pipeline right through the middle of the downtown area – by a grocery store, the library, and two large shopping malls. This will also require the destruction of old growth trees and valuable wetlands. Their proposed solution serves only Sunoco, and not the community.

Here in my township, on a daily basis, I see the gut-wrenching destruction of neighbors' properties being torn up (or condemned) by this large and highly volatile pipeline, which has been permitted to rip through our community endangering lives, ruining property values, and dirtying waterways in the false name of "public utility." It is no secret that Sunoco/ETP acquired their public utility status for this project through roundabout tactics, and that in fact the ME2 pipeline is the exact opposite of “public utility.” It is a blatant violation to property owners (manipulation of eminent domain) and their peace of mind.

When a leak occurs, and the inevitable explosion, there will be virtually no warning because the gases are colorless and odorless and will immediately expand and remain close to the ground, ignited by something as simple as a car ignition or a cell phone call. Read the so-called emergency plans... even first responders will not be permitted to enter the premises once a blast occurs, it's that dangerous. Why is this an acceptable risk to lay this line in densely populated areas?

The sad truth is that Sunoco/ETP has hit only communities where people do not have the political clout or financial resources to fight it. This began before people even knew it was happening – we were blindsided and sold down the river behind closed doors. Honestly, I want to cry when I see those properties (could have been mine) that are being literally ripped apart. It's an incredible loss of property value/equity - of personal safety - of environmental resources - of peace of mind. These are real people -- tax-paying citizens of the beautiful state of Pennsylvania. Who is advocating for them? Even today, I hear people who still think this is just a regular "gas line."

In fact, ETP stands to make massive profits for years to come once these NGLs begin to flow and to be sold – not in the USA, but abroad. The only people being served by this pipeline are the shareholders of ETP. Why does our state care more about the shareholders of ETP than about the safety of its citizens and the sustaining of our cherished lands and clean waterways, when in fact ALL can be served? Please: Do everything you can to require ETP to make a larger financial investment up front to protect the people and the environment by finding alternate, rural routes. If the pipeline must be built, it can not be permitted to run through densely populated areas. Their business profits will come no matter what; there is no doubt about that – so why not make it a win-win. They must find rural routes even if it costs them more to do it. Safety first, profits later.

Please do all you can to protect our communities from this disaster. Thank you so much. (1)

2. Comment

We are writing to you in reference to the Mariner East 2 HDD. We had problems before with the last drilling with Sunoco for our Private Well and to this day is still not working properly. We have one major question in this new serious of Drilling is there anyway the new project No. S3-0370/PA-CH-0219.0000-RD will be going through our property at 350 North Pottstown pike? (2)

3. Comment

I have recently been made aware of new trenching through Exton, near the Exton Giant to Shoen Road. I believe this is a risky move, putting many in the area at risk. This should be relocated to an area with less people and traffic.

I frankly can't believe that our government has allowed this pipeline at all. It provides nothing for us as citizens and destroys our area and puts our environment and people at risk. We cannot turn back when this is done. (3)

4. Comment

I am writing as a concerned citizen with friends living in Meadowbrook Manor, Exton PA. I have deep concerns about the Sunoco pipeline project that is planned for this neighborhood. This project is seriously dangerous to humans and the environment. These pipes containing high pressure gas will be in a known flood area. During hurricane Irene there was water 10 ft. from my friend's house. The ground can

easily erode and compromise the integrity of the pipes leading to potentially disastrous leaks. This area has wetlands, streams and 100 year flood ways which are home to wildlife, migratory birds and old growth trees all of which would be threatened by dams, disturbance and pollution. This project calls for a blast zone and open cut which will destroy trees and habitat. The minimum requirement of 48" of cover over the pipeline is grossly insufficient. No engineer would ever put their stamp on a project like this.

This project is an enormous threat to municipal and private wells alike. There have already been cases of wells being poisoned in a nearby neighborhood. These residents had no idea and drank the poisoned water for an extended period.

The gas is heavy and a leak would potentially threaten Meadowbrook Manor residents, Chester County Library and Giant patrons, Exton Mall shoppers and Little League players at the adjacent park most of which I frequent often. This entire area is no longer the rural landscape that it was when the old pipeline was installed. It has become a populated suburb and is unsuitable for this project.

I don't wish to see this pipeline in Exton and I need you to take a stand now. Won't you please use your voice to protect the people who live, shop and play here?

Please put your constituents ahead of Sunoco's pockets. (4)

5. Comment

Sunoco's plan for HDD will put pipelines carrying highly dangerous liquefied gases just a few feet underground endangering hundreds or thousands in the event of a leak or someone digging into it as it passes alongside shopping centers, Sunrise Assisted Living senior facility, apartments, houses and Pottstown Pike. The construction would result in the loss of beautiful mature trees and require open trenching through multiple existing pipelines. Mariner East has no business going through Exton or Chester and Delaware Counties in general given the dense population of Pennsylvanians that would be forced to live their lives with a constant risk of a pipeline explosion forever moving forward. HDD drilling never should have been permitted through this valley given its geology per State Senator Andy Dinniman. And this new open trench plan puts the many who live, work, shop, play and travel through Exton at risk. Sunoco was required by the DEP to seriously consider relocation in this re-evaluation and they have yet to substantiate their doing so. (5)

6. Comment

Pursuant to the Corrected Stipulated Order entered on EHB Docket No. 2017-009-L on August 10, 2017 ("Settlement"), 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 number PA-CH-0212.0000-RD (the "HDD Site").

As Sunoco proposes a major modification, Appellants should be clear that these comments are not necessarily the final comments Appellants will make on the proposal. Appellants reserve the right to comment during the official public comment period on the fuller set of application materials.

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-0212.0000-RD

- 1. Sunoco's private water supply information is still incomplete.**

Sunoco has taken some important measures to identify and protect public water supplies. It has fallen short, however, in evaluating risks to private water supplies, despite a large known risk to quantity and quality of groundwater in the area generally. Sunoco recognizes that groundwater is used at this locality for both private and public potable supply. Sunoco has also identified that public water supplies as far as 1,170 feet and 1,600 away from the alignment could be impacted by HDD. It further acknowledges extensive hydraulic connection throughout the local rock formation, and specifically, hydraulic interconnection at and very close to the surface—between 0 and 160 feet bgs. Especially given the level of interconnection at these shallow depths, Sunoco should have analyzed risks to water supplies and well production zones posed by the auger boring or open trenching methods. Inadvertent returns of drilling fluid are not the sole threat to water supplies posed by construction and large scale earth disturbance. Yet, despite the vulnerability of this highly connected hydrologic system, Sunoco has failed to identify and locate private water supplies. Sunoco reports having conducted a survey within 150 feet of the right of way. Presumably this was the survey Sunoco described conducting prior to permit issuance in February of 2017. The Report does not reflect any effort made by Sunoco to contact landowners after the Settlement or in conjunction with this re-evaluation, or to reach landowners within 450 feet of the alignment. Instead, Sunoco has supplemented the original, limited landowner survey with a search of PaGWIS, which it knows to be an incomplete and inaccurate database. PaGWIS revealed several wells in the area and Sunoco has taken no steps to verify the locations. Given that public water supplies at distances of 1,170 feet and 1,600 away from the site were found to be hydraulically connected, the locations and pertinent details of private wells in that same radius also need to be identified so they can be protected.

Again, the point of this re-evaluation process is to use better processes and information to plan these crossings, not to plan them and then produce paper justifying them. It is important that the Department ensure that these analyses are complete before approving them.

Because Sunoco has failed to identify the water supplies and the nature of the water supplies and groundwater near the HDD Site, it cannot determine whether any hydrogeological interference caused by the proposal would put water supplies at risk. Without that information, the Department cannot approve Sunoco's proposal.

2. Sunoco has not assessed the surface impacts of its proposal.

Sunoco's proposed change to open trenching and auger boring comes with significant increased surface impacts and multiple acres of additional disturbance. Sunoco has failed to address these impacts, but provides general, unsubstantiated assurances the impacts will be avoided. This is insufficient, especially when Sunoco initially selected HDD for this location to "avoid adverse impacts to the extensive urban development." The fact that it is now apparent HDD cannot be completed safely does not negate the adverse impacts that lead Sunoco to choose HDD to begin with. A complete discussion and analysis of these impacts is needed for DEP to be able to make an informed decision regarding the appropriateness of this approval.

In assessing the adverse impacts to urban development implicated by this proposal, it is important that Sunoco use up-to-date and complete information. In the Report, Sunoco's adjacent feature analysis is not based on a field study or other current information, but aerial photographs from 2015. Sunoco could not have properly considered impacts to adjacent features when it does not even know what is currently happening on the ground. Even a cursory map search reveals a children's education center and a senior living facility in very close proximity to the site, both serving vulnerable populations for whom construction could pose health risks.

Sunoco must also provide a discussion of how the proposed change to crossing methods would impact streams and other waterways. While Sunoco asserts that impacts will be avoided, construction of bridges, substantial earth disturbance, and trenching in close proximity to waterways undoubtedly will affect those waters. These impacts must be disclosed and understood.

This site is also immediately adjacent to the Swedesford Road crossing, which recently triggered an outpouring of community concern as residents learned about the plan to switch to open trenching there. A lot of those concerns apply here too. The Site is located in the heart of Exton, in a densely populated area surrounded by local business and residences which the pipeline threatens to disrupt with the proposed route.

3. The Report addresses only one of the two pipelines that needs to be re-evaluated at this location.

The Report addresses the plans for HDD PA-CH-0212.0000-RD, which is along the 20 inch pipeline. This is indicated by both the title of the report, and the fact that only one drilling alignment diagram was included as part of the Report. Under the Settlement though, the HDDs at this crossing for both the 20-inch and 16-inch pipeline needed to be reevaluated. It is unclear why the Report did not address both, but without clarification on the scope of this report and providing additional information, Sunoco is expected to submit a separate report detailing the plans for the 16-inch drill.

Conclusion

For these reasons, Appellants request that the Department seek more information from Sunoco about its re-evaluation recommendation for this HDD Site, as detailed above, before making its determination.

Thank you for considering these comments. Please keep us apprised of your next steps on the HDD Site. (6-10)

Letter – [Clean Air Council – 11-21-17 – North Pottstown Pike Crossing](#)

7. Comment

Please reconsider the pipe installation in Exton. We are already seeing sinkholes from digging, and the danger will only increase as more is done. Exton is a beautiful, safe community, and this is an unnecessary danger. I live on Shoen road and am terrified about this! (11)

8. Comment

Don't Do it!!!! It is a huge Risk to our environment and local businesses. This is a densely populated area and a high consequence area. It will run too close to homes and businesses. Sunoco has no concerns with continued Notices of Violations, they disregard permit regulations. Sunoco has shown repeated failure to comply with the law (Clean Streams Act, repeated failure to notify DEP of spillage of industrial waste. The placing of this Pipeline is a blatant disregard for the safety, welfare, and well-being of the community and the people who live and work here. (12)

9. Comment

I am a resident of East Goshen Twp. who is directly affected by the Mariner East 2 project. I have been following the progress of this project since the inception and attended many municipal meetings as the project has progressed through various stages. I am very well informed of Sunoco's (the Company's) plans for the project and have great concern for the proposed modifications for the area referred to in the above-referenced permit.

The Company did not initially apply to use open-cut trenching in this area because it is not a preferred method. Now, after numerous spills of industrial waste into the Commonwealth's waterways, and at some sites that were never initially permitted for HDD, but where Sunoco unlawfully engaged in such activities behind DEP's back and experienced inadvertent returns (IRs), the Company has now elected to move to an alternative, more detrimental method.

It is my position, and it should be the position of DEP that the Company be required to adhere to the original permit conditions and if the Company is unable to perform operations according to acceptable levels of performance then the permit should be vacated and the Company prohibited from performing any further construction in the area.

Under no condition should a modification be allowed due to the fact that the Company is unable to perform in a reliable manner, without detriment to the community and the environment.

Further, based on the Company's recent actions and citations for repeated failures to comply with the law and regulations, the DEP should NOT exhibit any further leniency in the permitting or oversight of this project.

I urge the DEP to enforce the permits with the full force of the law, as both the Governor and the Secretary of the Department indicated would occur. (13)

10. Comment

Please accept the following comments in response to the HDD Reevaluation Report submitted by Sunoco Pipeline, L.P. for DEP Permit number EI S-862, HDD Reference number PA-CH-0212.0000 filed on November 8, 2017.

Following my review of this report, I have a number of significant concerns related to the stated environmental and quality of life impacts for citizens in West Whiteland Township. In this report, Sunoco is seeking to modify the approved permit plan that utilizes Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) techniques and implements open cut trench crossing and four conventional drill bores. The justification for this change was based on information provided by Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc. (GES) in their November 7, 2017 HDD Hydrogeological Reevaluation Report.

To begin, the recommendations by GES in the report only address previously approved HDD construction methods and not the environmental impacts associated with open cut techniques and four conventional bores. I understand that GES was limited here by the scope of their work. However, open cut construction techniques will result in significant impacts to my constituents in terms of personal property, commercial opportunity, and environmental conditions throughout the dense economic and residential Exton region and I must strongly request that public meetings be held prior to consideration of this modification.

The GES report also indicates, in the form of a disclaimer, that they relied on data provided by Sunoco contractors including, but not limited to, "the selection and number of locations of borings, determination of surface elevation, target depths, observation of rock cores during drilling operations, or preparation of boring logs" This disclaimer is not present, so far as I can tell, in the other report related to my district. What is different about this location and how does it affect the recommendations provided by GES?

Furthermore, I have serious concerns related to the number of known and unidentified sinkhole locations along the proposed pipeline route and request that DEP require Sunoco to fully investigate the possibility of sinkhole disturbance along the route prior to consideration. The karst formation in this region was a known quantity before construction, yet the original plan was approved anyway. We need better answers this time.

Finally, while Sunoco claims that the proposed change will eliminate any risk of impact to private or public wells, I must take this opportunity to remind the Department that in the original permit application, Sunoco stated they would not impact wells using HDD techniques. While the Department did call attention to this incorrect statement in the Technical Deficiency notice dated September 6, 2016, the data provided by Sunoco related to private wells was ultimately inadequate and resulted in private wells being rendered unusable. I strongly recommend that DEP not simply take Sunoco at their word that private and public water will remain

unaffected and that the Department require Sunoco to provide detailed information that ensures these resources remain protected.

While Sunoco has gone through the motions of reevaluation, it is clear that the information provided is insufficient. It is my strong recommendation that the Department reject this report as incomplete, call for significant public involvement and participation, as well as require Sunoco to perform complete impact evaluations to ensure construction activities do not cause permanent and irreparable harm to the environment and citizens in West Whiteland Township. (14)

Letter – [Senator Dinniman – 11-22-17](#)

11. Comment

We're writing to share our continued deep concerns about Sunoco's proposals to trench through the heart of Exton. This segment, S3-0370, and the adjacent S3-0381, would run in close proximity to our home, a senior living facility, and places where multitudes live, work, shop, play and travel.

In short, while HDD is obviously off the table for good reason, trenching is not a suitable alternative for our area. Immediate environmental damage includes the clear-cutting of mature tree lines and damming of streams in a FEMA-designated floodway — one that already has ongoing issues with storm water management.

More broadly, using trenching for this and other adjacent segments places our densely populated, highly developed, High Consequence Area (HCA) — land, water, and lives — at unacceptable levels of risk. This is given that pipeline failures are inevitable, despite promises of safety — look no further than recent news events like the explosion just two days ago in Detroit. Placing these much larger lines with highly pressured, exceptionally explosive liquids just below the surface substantially adds to the potential for catastrophic consequences. Sunoco and its contractors have explicitly affirmed this in prior communications, saying “HDD was initially designed for this area due to dense population and topography” (Tetra Tech letter to DEP on July 24, 2017).

Now that Sunoco has deemed that HDD isn't viable, far too late — after getting buy-in from the government and community for HDD without doing the proper analysis, and after an ever-growing list of spills — they're using this same reason as an excuse for not being able to find another path. They state that “due to the developed congestion of the area including residences, businesses, roads, and other utilities, there are no reasonably practicable reroutes for the pipeline in this area” (HDD Analysis for North Pottstown Pike Crossing).

The DEP must strongly challenge Sunoco's assertion that there is indeed no alternate path, and that it doesn't just suit Sunoco's interests to be “co-located with existing pipeline and other utility corridors” in order to hasten the project's completion and begin turning a profit. While this immediate area is certainly congested, there are

areas not far from here where that's not the case. There's no evidence that Sunoco did their due diligence in evaluating such alternatives.

It should not be a foregone conclusion that these new pipelines will continue to be constructed through this area, just because they originally gained approval under the pretense of HDD. In this case, "Plan B" (trenching, boring, and the related consequences) is simply unacceptable. It's a deal-breaker that ultimately requires Sunoco to find an alternate path — even if it means broadening their search radius to look outside the immediate vicinity of the current path.

Thank you for your careful consideration in this matter that is very important to us, our community, and the protection of our environment and safety. (15)

12. Comment

I am writing to respond to the request for comments for Sunoco's re-evaluation for the Shoen Rd to Giant section of Mariner East in West Whiteland.

Open trenching in this section would put this community at great risk with the pipelines being only a few feet underground and susceptible to accidental drilling or digging into. Such an accident, or any kind of leak would be a disaster, with the heavy population density, vehicular traffic and people utilizing this area. The pipelines would run right up alongside a seniors home on Sunrise boulevard, an apartment complex on Shoen Rd, shopping areas and neighborhoods, putting hundreds or thousands of lives at risk depending on the time of day.

In addition to this, open trenching would require the destruction on many mature large trees, ruining our quality of place.

Sunoco was required by the DEP to evaluate relocation and they clearly have not in their report. They need to do this. Mariner East has no business going a few feet underground via open trench through this area. And the geology of this makes HDD not an option. (16)

13. Comment

I am writing to respond to the request for comments for Sunoco's re-evaluation for the Shoen Rd to Giant section of Mariner East in West Whiteland.

Open trenching in this section would put this community at great risk with the pipelines being only a few feet underground and susceptible to accidental drilling or digging into. Such an accident, or any kind of leak would be a disaster, with the heavy population density, vehicular traffic and people utilizing this area. The pipelines would run right up alongside a seniors home on Sunrise boulevard, an apartment complex on Shoen Rd, shopping areas and neighborhoods, putting hundreds or thousands of lives at risk depending on the time of day. Also, another major concern is the poor safety record for Sunoco using HDD in historic Chester County, which is a densely populated, has severely put the land and water ways at

risk of contamination. This pipeline, which is purely for Sunoco's profit, not for our benefit, has put my family and our neighbors into harms way by hitting aquifers and disrupting private water wells. Their careless and reckless attitude for the environment, their delaying of reporting violations, and lack of concern for people and their homes is very disheartening and frightening. Honestly, would any of you like to live next to this pipeline?

In addition to this, open trenching would require the destruction on many mature large trees, ruining our quality of place.

Sunoco was required by the DEP to evaluate relocation and they clearly have not in their report. They need to do this. Mariner East has no business going a few feet underground via open trench through this area. And the geology of this makes HDD not an option. (17)

14. Comment

I am writing to respond to the request for comments for Sunoco's re-evaluation for the Shoen Rd to Giant section of Mariner East in West Whiteland. By completing this section of the pipeline by open trench, Sunoco is putting my family and many others in harms way. The population is very dense in this area with several shopping areas, schools, libraries, developments and parks. HDD has proven to be detrimental to the environment with striking several underground wells and creating unknown damage to the ground underneath. We have been exposed to their lies, hiding their true routes and grouting previous damage to hide their mistakes. We have experienced sink holes in an area prone to sink holes. Sunoco has lied about where they are actually drilling. They do not abide by the law and believe they can do what they want. My family is paying extra insurance now for the risk that Sunoco has established on our home and the unknown damage they caused to the rock formations underneath. They back filled a hole by our home which caused a natural stream in my neighbor's yard and the water could be going anywhere causing future damage. The DEP needs to take our concerns into consideration. (18)