

May 14, 2020

PennEast Pipeline Company LLC
c/o Ms. Amber Holly
Environmental Project Manager
835 Knitting Mills Way
Wyomissing, Pa 19610

Re: Technical Deficiency Notification #2
PennEast Pipeline Project – Luzerne County
DEP Application No. E40-780
APS ID# 893302, AUTH ID# 1111907
Bear Creek Township, Dallas Township, Jenkins Township,
Kingston Township, Plains Township, West Wyoming Borough, &
Wyoming Borough
Luzerne County

Dear Ms. Holly:

The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has reviewed your response to the July 3, 2019 Technical Deficiency Notification, received on October 30, 2019 and supplemental information received on March 30, 2020 for the above referenced application package and has identified the following continuing technical deficiencies. The Chapter 105 Dam Safety and Waterway Management regulations include information that will aid you in responding to some of the deficiencies listed below. The deficiencies are based on applicable laws and regulations. The referenced guidance set forth below provide DEP's preferred means of satisfying the applicable regulatory requirements.

Technical Deficiencies

1. Original Comment #5: It appears there are several wetlands and watercourses with inconsistencies in respect to the municipality where the resource is located on both the Aquatic Resources Impact Table (ARIT) and the Site-Specific Mapping. Please provide consistent municipality locations for watercourses and wetlands. Please revise all corresponding documentation accordingly. [25 Pa. Code §105.21(a)(1)]

This comment was not adequately addressed in the JPA Tech Def Response dated October 25, 2019. Please respond to the comment accordingly.

2. Original Comment #24: The Department does not recommend stockpiling soil or subsoil within the wetland. Evaluate the ability to stockpile soils outside wetland boundaries throughout project when possible. [25 Pa. Code §105.13(e)]

Please provide a more resource specific response, including which crossings will likely require stockpiling within wetland boundaries and a discussion on BMPs used to reduce compaction and mixing of soils. Consider placing this information in the Alternative Analysis Table.

3. Original Comment #33: It appears that there is an access road crossing of stream 041917_MK_1001_P_IM which is not accounted for on the Aquatic Resource Impact Tables or the Site-Specific Crossing Plans. Please account for the impact and revise application accordingly. [25 Pa. Code §105.21(a)(1)]

The response to this deficiency has not been addressed by the applicant. The response is too vague and does not directly discuss the potential access road crossing of stream 041917_MK_1001_P_IM, which is not accounted for in the ARIT or the Site-Specific Crossing Plans. Please provide all information necessary to respond to this deficiency.

4. Original Comment #44: The crossings of Watercourses 050416_DB_1002_I_MI and 121814_JC_1008_P_MI do not appear to utilize trench plugs. Please revise plans accordingly. [25 Pa. Code §§105.13(g), 105.13(e), and 105.21(a)(1)]

Trench plugs are not on the Site-Specific Crossing Plans for resource 50416_DB_1002_I_MI and one trench plug is missing for the newly added wetland 072219_MU_1002_PEM. Please revise for consistency of the application.

5. Original Comment #46: There is a bore pit located in wetland 112014_JC_001_PFO. Consider moving the bore pit out of this wetland or consider horizontal directional drilling (HDD) at this location. [25 Pa. Code §§105.13(e) and 105.21(a)(1)]

Please discuss the ability of an open cut crossing of Meadow Run Road with PennDOT, as stated in the response to this deficiency to avoid the placement of a bore pit in wetland 112014_JC_001_PFO.

6. Original Comment #54: The EA Module 2, Section S2.A.5, suggests the applicant is still in consultation with the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) regarding outstanding issues on the Frances Slocum State Park and Pinchot State Forest impacts. Please provide final documentation and revise application accordingly. [25 Pa. Code §§105.21(a)(1) and 105.24]

It is understood that further talks with DCNR will take place regarding the ROW in Pinchot State Forest. Please revise application if any pertinent changes to the application will take place.

7. Original Comment #55: In the EA Module 2, the application indicates eastern small-footed bat surveys still need to be conducted in the Spring 2019. Please provide the report and update the application where applicable. [25 Pa. Code §§105.13, 105.21(a)(1), and 105.24]

The response states the Phase 2 survey was submitted to the PGC for review. Provide documentation of final determination by PGC when available.

8. Original Comment #65: Please include in the HDD Inadvertent Returns and Contingency Plan and the Erosion and Sediment Plans provisions to contact the Department immediately by email, phone, or electronically delivered letter if a loss of pressure or an inadvertent return occurs during the horizontal directional drilling operations. Drilling operations should not continue until a Professional Engineer (PE) or Professional Geologist (PG) has performed an inspection of the drilling site and drill alignment. The PE or PG should then notify the Department in writing that the drilling can commence without the risk of an inadvertent return.

Should an inadvertent return occur during drilling operations, a Re-evaluation Report should be submitted to the Department by the PE or PG examining the drilling alignment and ensuring that another inadvertent return is unlikely. The Department will need to review this submitted information and approve the restarting of drilling operations. [25 Pa. Code § 105.302(6)]

The response to the above deficiency adequately addressed concerns regarding the inadvertent return. However, the Department recommends that the HDD Inadvertent Returns and Contingency Plan also include the statement, “In the event of an unaccounted-for drilling fluid pressure loss, accompanied by losses in drilling fluid return volumes at the drill rig entry location where swabbing does not restore drilling fluid flow, the HDD Contractor will enact the HDD Inadvertent Return and Contingency Plan and notify the Department.”

9. Original Comment #72: In the Alternative Analysis Table: Riverine Resources (S4), some streams specifically state they can be crossed within 24 or 48 hours. Please state the expected crossing time for each resource. Based on previous projects, unexpected circumstances can arise during stream crossings which result in an extended crossing time. Please state if any streams are expected to exceed the recommended crossing time of 24-48 hours (respectively). Discuss the plan of action if the proposed crossing timeline is exceeded, and state the proposed timeline in both the AA table and construction narrative. [25 Pa. Code § 105.21(a)(1)]

For some resources, the Alternatives Analysis Table’s Justification column states “Workspace reduced to 75' in stream and floodway. Estimated crossing timeframe is 24 hours,” but the Adhering to Construction Timing Windows Column is not checked. Please clarify.

10. Original Comment #75: In the Wetland and Riparian Reforestation Plan, consider replanting shrubs up to the 10-foot wide buffer (between 15 and 5 feet from center of pipeline) in exceptional value watersheds, where trees would otherwise not be permitted or consider replanting shrubs across the entire ROW, where tree roots would otherwise not be permitted, as stated in the EA Module 3 “A 10-foot wide operational

easement centered on the pipeline will be maintained in an herbaceous or scrub/shrub vegetative state in emergent or scrub-shrub wetlands.” [25 Pa. Code §§105.16(d) and 105.18a(b)(3)(ii)(B)]

Please reconsider the above request, “In the Wetland and Riparian Reforestation Plan, consider replanting shrubs up to the 10-foot wide buffer (between 15 and 5 feet from center of pipeline) in exceptional value watersheds, where trees would otherwise not be permitted.” The planting of shrubs which grow less than 3-inch dbh or are less than 20 feet tall should not pose a risk to the pipe integrity. Planting shrubs would quicken reestablishment of shrub-scrub habitat, which PennEast will maintain with mowing less frequently than once every three years as stated in the EA section S4C.

11. Original Comment #78: The Department requests function and value mitigation at a rate of 2:1 for conversion impacts to “other” PFO wetlands, 2.5:1 for conversion impacts to EV PFO wetlands; 1.5:1 for conversion impacts to “other” PSS wetlands, and 1.75:1 for conversion impacts to EV PSS wetlands. [25 Pa. Code §§105.14(b)(13) and 105.20a(a)(2)]

The response and corresponding table are acceptable. The Department would like to reiterate that cleared PFO wetlands and grubbed PSS wetlands require more than a 1:1 mitigation ratio, regardless of whether they are located within the right of way or temporary workspace, owing to the time it takes for the resource to recover to its previous functions and values. The mitigation impacts are a different calculation from the impact tables elsewhere in the application. The Department recognizes PennEast’s commitment to replant impacts in the temporary work space as partial, but not entire, mitigation of these resources. Please assess the amount of mitigation needed for this project outside the 30-ft maintained ROW and incorporate this calculation into the total required mitigation.

12. Original Comment #79: Please submit final documents in the Compensatory Wetland Mitigation Plans that are not labelled “Draft.” [25 Pa. Code §§105.20a(a) and 105.21(a)(1)]

The Department understands that these documents will be finalized and filed with the county courthouse upon issuance of a PADEP and USACE permit. Please provide documentation within sixty days after permit issuance.

13. Original Comment #80: The off-site Compensatory Wetland Mitigation Plan Performance Standards provide for a contingency of 30% canopy cover prior to the end of monitoring.” Department guidance, Design Criteria - Wetlands Replacement/Monitoring, DEP Doc. No. 363-0300-001, suggests 85% survival of planted species and a monitoring period of not less than five years. The contingency regarding “30% canopy cover prior to end of monitoring” will not be acceptable. Please revise the off-site Compensatory Wetland Mitigation Plan Performance

Standards to be consistent with the Department guidance. [25 Pa. Code §§105.20a(a), 105.21(a)(1), and 105.13(e)]

Although the statement regarding the 30% canopy contingency was removed, parameters for plant survival were not added to the application. Please provide performance standards for plantings. Moreover, the Module 4 document states “If survivorship is below 75% within a restored wetland or riparian area, PennEast will discuss remediation measures,” but this is not included in the monitoring plan. Please revise documents accordingly.

New Comments:

14. Post-Construction Wetland and Watercourse Monitoring Plan should also include the monitoring of secondary impacts to hydrology, i.e., the loss of hydrology, to all watercourses with a drainage area of less than 100 acres, including those watercourses that originate within the project ROW. This should be included in the 5 years of monitoring reports. Specifics should include:

- The monitoring reports shall contain information describing the presence or absence of hydrology at the time of inspection, a narrative comparison to hydrology present in the watercourse during pre-permitting field investigation(s), and photographs of the watercourse.
- If the monitoring identifies a diminution or complete loss of hydrology, the permittee shall evaluate whether the activities authorized by this permit caused the loss of hydrology and submit this evaluation to the Department for review.
- If the Department determines that the activities authorized by this permit are contributing to the loss of hydrology, the permittee shall prepare a written plan to correct the loss of hydrology to the watercourse. The permittee shall implement the approved plan within ninety (90) and submit this plan to DEP for review and approval. If DEP identifies any deficiencies with permittee’s plan, then the permittee shall provide DEP a written response to address the stated deficiencies within 15 days of receiving written notice of DEP’s deficiencies, unless DEP extends that timeframe in writing.

Please identify resources with a drainage of less than 100 acres and include the above language in the Monitoring Plans.

Pursuant to 25 Pa. Code §105.13a of DEP’s Chapter 105 Rules and Regulations you must submit a response fully addressing each of the significant technical deficiencies set forth above. Please note that this information must be received within sixty (60) calendar days from the date of this letter, on or before **July 13, 2020**, or DEP may consider the application to be withdrawn by the applicant.

You may request a time extension, in writing, before **July 13, 2020** to respond to deficiencies beyond the sixty (60) calendar days. Requests for time extensions will be reviewed by DEP and considered. You will be notified in writing of the decision either to grant or deny, including a specific due date to respond if the extension is granted. Time extensions shall be in accordance with 25 Pa. Code §105.13a(b).

If you believe that any of the stated deficiencies is not significant, instead of submitting a response to that deficiency, you have the option of asking DEP to make a decision based on the information with regard to the subject matter of that deficiency that you have already made available. If you choose this option with regard to any deficiency, you should explain and justify how your current submission satisfies that deficiency. Please keep in mind that if you fail to respond, your application may be withdrawn or denied.

Should you have any questions regarding the identified deficiencies, please contact Michael Luciani, Application Manager, at 570-826-3089 or by email at mluciani@pa.gov and refer to the Application Number referenced above to discuss your concerns or to schedule a meeting. The meeting must be scheduled within the 60-day period allotted for your reply, unless otherwise extended by DEP. You may also follow your application through the review process via *eFACTS on the Web* at: <http://www.ahs2.dep.state.pa.us/eFactsWeb/default.aspx>.

Sincerely,



Kevin S. White, P.E.
Environmental Group Manager
Regional Permit Coordination Office

cc: Sarah Binckley, AECOM
Luzerne County Conservation District
US Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District
PA Fish & Boat Commission, Division of Environmental Services
Bear Creek Township
Dallas Township
Jenkins Township,
Kingston Township
Plains Township
West Wyoming Borough
Wyoming Borough