

August 24, 2016

Re: Sunoco Pipeline L.P. Applications for Chapter 105 Permits for the "Pennsylvania Pipeline Project" / Mariner East II, Nos. E31-234, E34-136, E36-945, E38-194, E50-258, E67-920, E06-701, E07-459, E21-449, E22-619, E23-524, E15-862, E02-1718, E11-352, E32-508, E63-674, E65-973

Dear Program Managers:

My name is Jordan Hoover and I work and reside in Saltlick Township, Fayette County. I have been involved in the public review process of Sunoco LP's Pennsylvania Pipeline Project (Mariner East 2) for the last few months and will be submitting my formal technical comments to you today.

I would like to note that over the past few days I have been in contact with a County Conservation District in the Southwest Region in an attempt to obtain a copy of any technical review comments in their possession regarding the Mariner East 2 project. Other conservation districts along the proposed route were forthcoming with this vital information, allowing citizens to complete a more thorough review process and to create more useful comments for your consideration. I have been unable to acquire this information here locally but was told that the comments do exist, but are in "draft form" and would not be ready for release to the public until "early September." As you know, the public comment period deadline is today at 4pm. I believe that not being given the opportunity to review any and all pertinent information regarding this application obstructs every citizen's right to full transparency and meaningful participation in this process.

Another issue I would like to raise is the fact that, according to information provided on the PA DEP's Pennsylvania Pipeline Portal, Sunoco is lacking approval from multiple municipalities in the southwest region with regards to compliance with local stormwater and floodplain management plans. I have attached a copy of Table 14-1 to this email for your reference.

It is plainly stated in 25 PA Code, Chapter 105, Section 105.13, that any application must be accompanied by both stormwater and floodplain management analysis, including letters from counties and municipalities that either approve or deny the application's plans based on their individual management plans. The Department's obligation with respect to incomplete applications is spelled out as such: "When the Department or delegated local agency determines that an application or registration is incomplete or contains insufficient information to determine compliance with this chapter, it will notify the applicant in writing. The applicant shall have 60 days to provide the information necessary to complete the application or registration. Thereafter, the Department or delegated local agency will consider the application to be withdrawn by the applicant."

46 percent of municipalities in the southwest region show a "TBD" (to be determined) designation with regards to consistency with local stormwater plans, while 50 percent show a "TBD" designation with regards to floodplain consistency. This table appears to be timestamped March 22, 2016. Admittedly, it is possible that a more up-to-date table exhibiting greater levels of compliance exists, but we as the general public can only review the documents we are currently and readily provided.

In my opinion, this discrepancy alone is enough to deny Sunoco LP's application in its current form. I urge you to consider the issues I have briefly detailed here today, as well as the many other thoughtful, well-researched comments from concerned citizens all along the 350-mile proposed route, cutting through 17 counties in the commonwealth.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please keep me apprised of any future actions related to Sunoco LP's applications for these Chapter 105 permits.

Sincerely,

Jordan Hoover
1414 Indian Creek Valley Rd.
Melcroft, PA 15462
jordan@mtwatershed.com