

GENERAL COMMENTS – COMPANY

9.COMMENT

See attached files for reasons Sunoco should not proceed. I have a building where they want to put it and a sewage system that is 100% in the path, no one has been in contact!!! tired of there constant harassment. name and address on attachments 3rd photo is of them pumping drilling fluid into stream, I had called DEP ,they came and said that it was OK
[Attachment – To All Interested Parties](#) (5933)

10.COMMENT

After looking over some of the permit files, I also had to send these maps apparently used for applications of permitting by Sunoco for our area. They are very outdated, as our development and Oxford Drive is not even shown on it, off of Sheep Hill Road. There is a little (bend) or turn to the south in the ME 1 pipeline on shown on this map that is located right where our residential development is now located since 1998. If they just decided to reroute and go straighter, now, through the close farm fields a little to our north, they would safely go around us and much of the delineated wetlands. Why not? It seems to just make more sense not to turn into our development and house like the older smaller 8 inch gasoline/distillate pipeline(s) and now ME 1 volatile NGL line does, Since our development was approved and permitted around that smaller 40 foot easement with 20 foot No Build Zones on each side of pipes of different conditions than these much more volatile larger diameter, higher pressured NGL pipelines. I really don't believe Sunoco Logistics included our development in their plan until later. They just followed the old easement without looking into the details of our situation here. SPLP even had to come back and add a wider Temporary Work Area closer yet to our house, well, and pool about a month after negotiations had already been presented by Percheron. And it may be why we have continued to seem to hear SPLP has changes and not what was originally explained or discussed.
[Attachment – Map Used by Sunoco for DEP Permits](#)
[Attachment – Old Map Used for DEP Permit](#) (5934)

11.COMMENT

I have a question. Is there a way I can find out if Sunoco had ever considered any alternative routes through our area or around our neighborhood? Because I would like to know why if they did not; and if there are, why did they not consider them? Could you at least acknowledge that you have received my testimony for my specific situation? If you can help me get an answer to my other question regarding reroutes, it would be appreciated. Just seems they could have saved much digging or boring under wetlands, safety issues, and so much personal property damage by going around our development.
(5934)

19. COMMENT

We write concerning the pipeline. We moved into our home at 425 Sheep Hill Road Newmanstown 16 years ago. At that time there were regulations for our property. Sunoco believes they have the power to change regulations as they see fit. We were forced to hire an attorney to get answers and protect ourselves and our "American Dream" Sunoco wants

more of our land for their pipeline to flow a large portion of their product right out of America. They require temporary workspace and for our property additional workspace. They would not answer our question to what that would be used for. Our attorney got the answer, a boring pad for drilling under the road. The compensation they offered barely pays our property taxes for one year, yet they have been disrupting our lives for years now, not to mention the actual time frame our property will be used to complete the project. The conditions of these new pipelines are not the same as the old 1936 easement that only had language in it for more pipes of the same conditions to be laid. That means same size, diameter, pressures, products, etc. This would now become more dangerously close as it would be within the 20 foot "NO BUILD ZONE" that was established here. If someone investigated Sunoco they would find a lot of shady practices going on. Our family of 6 and many others pay the price for the corporate greed and deception. I hope you do all that's in your power to help us. (5950)

22.COMMENT

Our agenda is to keep Sunoco from building these two 20-inch pipelines though a property we vowed to conserve, and to carry on living in peace. We are fighting this project legally, based on the fact that this project serves no public need, but is rather for the private profit of a few billion-dollar corporations. I am humbly asking the department to deny the Chapter 105 permits based on your knowledge that there is no necessity behind the project and that it will cause irreparable harm to our Pennsylvania forests, wetlands, waterways and air. Wetlands on my family's property would be destroyed by this project. This not due to lack of an alternative route, but because creating an extended route through our property is cheaper. As the proposed route enters our property, it does so following alongside an existing pipeline route (not owned by Sunoco) that borders us. At a certain point, Sunoco's proposed route takes a sharp turn into the heart of our property and continues in a diagonal fashion, making an additional stream crossing and traversing wetlands. Just over the top of the ridge, not even a mile from our property, the route makes a sharp diagonal turn back in the other direction. The only explanation for these wild diagonal cuts is that if Sunoco were to continue straight they would need to cross a cluster of private properties. It is my belief that Sunoco chose to cut through our wetlands and stream in order to avoid having to engage in additional easement agreements and subsequent payouts. I would like to note that many of these properties in question are hunting cabins, not occupied year-round, and that I do not believe that Sunoco avoided these properties in order to reduce human impact (they have shown that they will put these pipelines through very populated residential areas). The wetlands in question would be trenched out and back filled, and would be gone forever. The area contains vernal pools and important habitat for amphibians. The mislabeling of these forested wetlands as "emergent wetlands" was most likely intentional in order to avoid necessary mitigation. The forest canopy that existed there could clearly be seen from satellite imagery, and Sunoco initially surveyed on foot in early 2015. That time of year it would also be difficult to miss the size and extent of wetlands. However, Sunoco underreported this size and extent. Sunoco also omitted a stream crossing on our property in their application to the department. This convenient omission makes the stream system look as if it is disconnected from the rest of the Juniata Watershed. This is completely inaccurate. Again, the stream that was omitted can clearly be seen from satellite imagery on Google maps and should be clearly visible with professional programs. You can't miss it if you are out on foot. This stream lies below a steep hillside that was, until March 29 of this year, a flourishing white-pine and mixed hardwood forest with trees over 100 years old. I have since seen the stream cloud up after even a light rain. Sunoco made no attempt to control sedimentation during clearcutting and the area has been left for five months in this condition

Attached below is a link to photos of the second stream crossing created by Sunoco's diagonal cut through the property. This is part of the same stream system but further upstream. Sunoco made no attempts to prevent the filling of this stream with debris during clearcutting. They are making no plans to horizontally drill under any stream on the property or the wetlands on the eastern side. These already impacted streams fill a pond on the western side of the property. Sunoco says that they plan to horizontally drill underneath this pond. However, the property owners have never seen a diagram of the geology, have never had HDD explained to them, and have never been told how deep Sunoco plans to drill underneath. Regardless of attempts at HDD, this pond would be severely impacted by the damage upstream. The pond is an important habitat for migratory aquatic birds. This spring, we noted a spotted salamander nest in the pond and a mallard duck nest adjacent to the pond. It is frequented by Canadian geese and blue herons. It is filled with turtles and frogs. No studies of wildlife have ever been conducted on the property by Sunoco, the department, or any other agency, so impacts cannot be fully understood. Moving forward with this project with so little information would be a reckless endeavor. Little Trough Creek is the first named creek that our small streams contribute to. This creek is just to the west of our property and rests in a hundred-year flood plain. It continues to the Juniata River, the Susquehanna and ultimately to the Chesapeake Bay. This creek supports fish and thousands upon thousands of amphibians. We do not wish to see the creek impacted by loss of our connecting streams. I do not believe that these impacts have been properly assessed because the loss has not been admitted. Sunoco simply claims that our streams will suffer no impacts although we have already seen them impacted. In addition to above-ground water, we are deeply concerned about our groundwater which is our drinking water supply. No baseline testing has been done. Sunoco has agreed to do some baseline testing in places where property owners signed agreements. Are we not afforded the same simply because we oppose Sunoco's pipeline? Who will take on this responsibility? Will DEP help us to set a baseline if Sunoco will not? Having to do this testing ourselves has become impossible at this point due to our legal expenses regarding the question of eminent domain (this question has yet to be decided in the Pennsylvania courts). The burden should not fall on us; it should fall on the developer. They have billions of dollars and would make many more by putting our drinking water at risk. This baseline water testing should be a requirement across the board. It is the least they can do.

As someone concerned about his project, I have taken time to voluntarily explore other areas of impact. For instance, I have seen the place where Sunoco plans to cross the Frankstown branch of the Juniata river. This branch is bordered by a CREP conservation area on private property to the west and the steep slopes of Locke Mountain to the east. The river is used for crop irrigation, and the small family farmers who use it will have their business and livelihoods put at risk. Again, no one seems to know how deep Sunoco plans to drill. Sunoco has also applied to SRBC for a water draw from the Frankstown branch for millions of gallons per day. Can this small branch of the Juniata handle these multiple impacts? Should it have to? Recently, I took some time to explore Sunoco's Raystown lake crossing. This would again, like our property and the Frankstown branch crossing, be an entirely new footprint. Development has taken place on the lake since the installation of Mariner 1 eighty-five years ago. Again, Sunoco wanted to choose a cheaper alternative to going through developed areas. Putting these pipes underneath a recreation area like Raystown is an unacceptable risk. The route is extremely close to swimming areas where people take their children. Swaths of trees would be cut out. I was surprised to see that Sunoco had completed no clearcutting in this area, which is just over the next ridge from my parents' property. Why is this? Why did they need to clear-cut our property 5 months ago, but just a few miles away they have cut nothing? Finally, I will tell you about my

concerns for the Susquehanna river and Sunoco's planned crossing. This would prove to be an immense task. Is Sunoco up to it? They have shown themselves to be extremely careless and accident-prone. They are driven by profit and pressure from their investors, not the rules and regulations put in place to protect our Pennsylvania environment. Our Susquehanna needs help. It needs recovery efforts. It is a river filled with pollution. These problems need to be fixed before more development takes place and more cumulative effects add up. There is no safe or sensitive way to build these pipelines. The work is inherently destructive and dangerous. It requires deforestation, destruction of small waterways and wetlands, encroachment on wildlife habitat and conversion of wild spaces to industrial zones. According to Sunoco's Aquatic Resource Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Plan, additional temporary workspaces are required for stream crossings. When riparian areas require greater care and protection, this seems counter-intuitive. Basically, in order to build major gas transmission lines, it is necessary to cause more environmental damage at more ecologically sensitive areas. Does allowing this fit in with DEP's mission? Regarding concern for human impacts, construction and operation of gas lines puts drinking water at risk. Sunoco has admitted this risk by including in some easement agreements a plan for baseline water testing. They are, however, not offering to do baseline testing on my family's property. Additionally, of utmost concern, is the risk of accidents, spills and explosions. This is both a real and an unacceptable risk. These major transmission lines have no place near homes, schools, workplaces or recreation areas. However, Sunoco plans to cross thousands upon thousands of them. Since I began researching gas pipelines in the spring of 2015, I have read about dozens of accidents in the United States, all of them resulting in property damage and pollution, many of them causing injuries, and some of them causing death. These issues are not beyond the department's scope. In fact, they should be one of your primary focal points. Your agency has a duty to protect the people and environment of Pennsylvania. Issuing permits for a project like Sunoco's Mariner East 2 would clearly be at odds with this duty. DEP mission statement: "The Department of Environmental Protection's mission is to protect Pennsylvania's air, land and water from pollution and to provide for the health and safety of its citizens through a cleaner environment. We will work as partners with individuals, organizations, governments and businesses to prevent pollution and restore our natural resources." [Attachment – Elise Gerhart \(5953\)](#)

24.COMMENT

Pg. 5

Sunoco Logistics does not yet have all its easement agreements in place, and there are still landowners fighting eminent domain proceedings in the courts. Permits should not be issued while these cases are still outstanding.

Sunoco Logistics does not have all of its applications complete. I believe the application for Delaware County is not yet complete. Permits should not be issued without all permits being completed. Sunoco Logistics should not be able to start piecemeal construction of the project.

Our environmental consultant, Schmid and Company, based in Media, PA, disputes the findings of Sunoco Logistics' consultant, Tetra Tech, on several key issues: **1)** Tetra Tech only reported ½ of the streams and 1/7 of the wetlands on our property, **2)** Tetra Tech does not show these streams and wetlands as being directly connected to our pond, **3)** Tetra Tech does not show these waterways as being directly connected to Little Trough Creek, part of the Juniata Watershed, **4)** Tetra Tech misrepresent the wetlands, classifying them as "emergent" when in fact they are clearly "forested", **5)** Tetra Tech did no onsite testing for hydrologic soils until *after* the tree clearing had been done and trees were cut down in areas

that should have been designated as wetlands, **6)** Tetra Tech did no onsite inventory of the flora or fauna to determine the quality of the stream, wetlands, or pond, **7)** Tetra Tech did no onsite inventory to determine the presence of any endangered/threatened species of flora or fauna, but instead relied on the online index, which only indicates probability, **8)** Tetra Tech did no onsite inventory of the types of trees present on the property until *after* the trees had been cleared, and **9)** Tetra Tech did no chemical analyses (pH, O₂ levels, etc.) of either the streams or the wetlands, **10)** request has been sent to and received by the Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore Division, for a jurisdictional determination of the waterways on our property. Permits should be denied based on Tetra Tech's misrepresentation of the characteristics of the wetlands, streams, and pond, and the pending request to the Army Corps. If this many problems have been found on just 3 acres, how many more may be found across the 350 miles of proposed pipeline.

There were no DEP representatives on our property until after April 7, when the clear-cutting was apparently halted. On April 8, one DEP representative briefly accompanied, then left, a Tetra Tech crew who sampled a small section of the temporary workspace soil and who attempted to identify some of the trees standing outside of the cut zone. DEP does not currently have the manpower to enforce compliance or to regulate. It would be better to err on the side of caution and deny these permits.

Sunoco Logistics made no attempt to mitigate any erosion from the steep slope next to our pond, where they propose to have the "temporary workspace." As a result, after some recent heavy rains, our streams, which normally run clear, were cloudy, as were the edges of our pond. Permits should be denied.

The trees in the right-of-way, especially the trees in the "emergent" wetland, will never be permitted to grow back, so the damage done to the forested wetland is permanent, not temporary.

Sunoco Logistics has proven to be a chronic and blatant violator of safety regulations. Sunoco does not operate the most pipeline mileage, but it is number one in the number of violations DEP has already fined Sunoco Logistics several times for spills, leaks, working without permits, etc. Other agencies such as PHMSA, have also fined Sunoco for violations such as shoddy welding. DEP is well within its authority to deny permits based on the number of past violations by Sunoco Logistics.

Chapter 105 does not allow DEP to consider any possible job creation which may possibly be generated through the construction of this pipeline. At the four public hearings I attended, DEP allowed members of various trade unions, and business and industry, to discuss the potential number of jobs which would be generated by this project. Job creation is entirely out of the scope of DEP's responsibility. Permits should not be issued based on potential job creation.

DEP has admitted that it is understaffed and underfunded, particularly in permitting. As stated before, it would behoove DEP to err on the side of caution and logic, and deny these permits.

The Pennsylvania Constitution and DEP's own mission statement talk about the right of Pennsylvanians to an environment with clean air and clean water for now and future generations. DEP---Department of Environmental *Protection*---is duty-bound to *protect* the environment before it is compromised. Businesses and industries such as Sunoco Logistics have a duty to their shareholders to turn a profit, whether this means damaging or destroying ecologically sensitive areas or not. DEP has a duty protect and defend the environment against the practices of companies such as Sunoco Logistics. Therefore, Chapter 102 and 105 permits should be denied.

This pipeline cuts a swath through seventeen counties of this Commonwealth. DEP is not justified in limiting the number of public hearings to five. Spreading these hearings across

the width of the state creates an undue burden on anyone wishing to make oral public comments. DEP should reschedule these hearings so that there is one hearing in each of the affected counties.

Given the numerous misrepresentations of “facts” by Sunoco Logistics, and given its track record for providing false or misleading information, more time should be allotted for file review by the public and by technical experts. In addition, the presence of still incomplete application(s) should halt the consideration of permits. Based on this, the public comment period should not officially begin until ALL permits are deemed complete, and only then should the public comment period be extended to 45 days to allow for complete review.

[Attachment – Ellen Gerhart](#) (5955)

29. COMMENT

In 2012, Chester County obtained from the National Park Service a \$58,000 American Battlefield Protection Program grant to study the Battle of the Clouds. On Sept. 16th 1777 after victory at Brandywine, the British army marched north through West Chester intent on finishing off the rebel army. To meet the threat, Washington began deploying on high ground south of Lancaster Pike between Exton and Malvern. Crown forces attacked and the American left and right flanks collapsed. A torrential summer storm ensued preventing what could have been a catastrophic defeat for the Americans and the end of the revolution. My property sits on this high ground and was identified by the study to be where Pennsylvania militia was posted as the right flank of Washington's line and where the Hessian regiment that defeated the militia camped for several days. This area remains one of the last undeveloped sites associated with the Battle of the Clouds. My property and the adjacent Exton Station HOA land have been chosen by Sunoco Logistics for horizontal directional drilling, pipeline staging and assembly associated with the Mariner II project. During easement negotiations, Sunoco answered my request for a comprehensive cultural study with a shovel test and told me nothing was found. Repeated requests for a copy of the test report were ignored. Sunoco broke off negotiations and condemned my property. To avoid expense of litigation I followed legal advice to drop my request for a cultural study and settled with Sunoco. I expressed my concern about possible destruction of artifacts of The Battle of the Clouds to township and county commissioners and state and federal representatives. When contacted by public officials Sunoco denied that the battle took place and officials told me they can do nothing more to address the threat to possible battle field /encampment artifact destruction. Hearing that pipeline equipment was about to be moved onto my property I contacted Southeast Pennsylvania Historical Recovery Group who had done work at Brandywine Battlefield. They came with 15 metal detectors working 4 hours on my one acre property. Along with 40 pounds of scrap metal they uncovered 2 unfired musket balls less than 6 inches below the surface. These and other items are being examined by archeologists who are preparing a report. I informed public officials of the artifact find. Sunoco responded by sending two persons with a single metal detector and searched the adjacent seven acre field, knee high in weeds for two hours. Successful artifact recovery with one detector searching a large area under high vegetation for a short period of time is unlikely. Pipeline construction involves tracked heavy equipment. During the yearlong construction period the top 6 or more inches of soil will be ground up along with any artifacts. Sunoco, with power of eminent domain, will come onto a Chester County Revolutionary War site it does not own, destroy artifacts and then move on. Considering that artifacts have been found, this site deserves a much more comprehensive cultural study than what Sunoco has done to this point. It makes no sense for taxpayers to spend \$58,000 on a study and then allow physical evidence supporting that research to be destroyed. (5956)

30. COMMENT

I have received monies for the 2nd time although I was against this line crossing my properties – they claimed eminent domain rights saying if I did not except monies that they would still cross my properties without monies. Last think I wanted was a battle with a company 100,000 times larger than me. First representative info will be attached (John Dillard). Second rep. tried to get me to believe that I had agreed in the first agreement that I agreed to “Multiple” lines for the same amount of monies but I called his bluff. I would have much rather kept my property rights and not received monies. I do live in Washington county.

[Attachment – Clayton Griffith 02-19-13 \(5957\)](#)

32. COMMENT

I am deeply concerned about both the environmental and ethical impacts of granting Chapter 102/105 permit applications for the Sunoco Logistics Mariner East 2 pipeline. Regarding the environmental impact, the proposed pipeline will be traversing critical wetlands and waterways, with the potential for contamination and widespread consequences for our health and well-being. Some land owned by Juniata College where I work is along the proposed path of the pipeline, as is the property of some landowners I personally know. Pipeline accidents are shockingly common, with one compendium listed at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_pipeline_accidents_in_the_United_States_in_the_21st_century . Sunoco was explicitly cited in this list, with the most recent accident listed as occurring on October 13, 2014 when the Sunoco/Mid-Valley crude oil pipeline ruptured and spilled 168,000 gallons of crude oil in Caddo Parish, Louisiana. As for the ethical aspects, from a general perspective, most of the natural gas is destined for international markets, which makes an egregious mockery of eminent domain, particularly in light of the fact of the likelihood that we may suffer negative consequences with obtain little or no gain. From a personal perspective, the landowners I know were unfairly treated and even threatened when they attempted to assert their legal rights. I doubt that their experience is unique and am very concerned, since the pipeline is set to go through over 2700 private properties, many of which are farms with streams and wetlands that are an integral part of the landowners’ livelihood. Arguments for the pipeline center around economics. However, our true wealth exists in our natural environment. It is important that we stand up to the corporations and consider the long-term effects of what we are doing and seriously rethink our priorities. (5959)

33.COMMENT

Please find attached technical comment on Sunoco's Ch. 105 permit application. Please confirm receipt and feel free to contact us with any questions.

We would like to discuss some of the troubling inadequacies of Sunoco’s Chapter 105 permit application. But first, we wish to emphasize that it is critical that the comment period for these Chapter 105 and 102 permits be extended. Due to the massive scale of this state-wide project and the technical nature of the permit applications it is impossible for the public to review the application in a 60 day time frame. If additional time is not ordered, the DEP will violate its duty to the public by depriving citizens of their right to participate in the administrative process.

In order to review the entirety of the Ch. 105 application within a reasonable amount of time, Mr. Kunz requires shapefiles of the proposed route. Shapefiles contain geographic data that allows someone with a GIS program to quickly assess potential impacts of large scale projects such as the Mariner East II pipeline. As a part of Sunoco’s Ch. 105 permit

application a PNDI review was conducted. In conjunction with the PNDI review, Sunoco's contractor Tetra Tech submitted these shapefiles to the DCNR, Game Commission, Fish & Boat Commission, and the USFWS. However, the shapefiles were not included with the rest of the project files available on the DEP's PPP portal. When Mr. Kunz requested the files from DCNR on August 1, 2016, he was told that he was not allowed access to them unless Sunoco permitted it. Furthermore, a DEP staff member later stated that the DEP themselves were not in possession of these shapefiles.

This begs the question: How is it possible for the DEP to deem the Ch. 105 applications technically complete - let alone for DEP to carefully review them - when they do not possess the necessary tools to do so? In addressing this comment we request that the DEP describe the decision-making process by which it deemed the applications complete and technically adequate in the face of this missing information. Please also address the technical review difficulties, if any, faced by PADEP specialists caused by the lack of these GIS data.

1) The applicant is in violation of PADEP regulations

In section H of the Ch. 102 Erosion and Sedimentation form, the application states that the applicant *is in violation* of some Department permit, regulation, etc. However, they answer "no" to essentially the same question in Section E on the Chapter 105 (Joint Permit Application) form. The specific "violations" admitted to in the E&S application for the Mariner East II pipeline project are **not** attached to the information provided to the public in the DEP's online files for M.E. II. The omission of specific violations means either that the application is incomplete, or the online files omitted critical information. An incomplete application should not be accepted for review by the DEP, and by law DEP cannot approve a permit for an entity in continuing violation of its regulations.

2) Significant resources at risk have not been identified.

In one egregious instance in Washington County, two entire stream crossing impacts are not identified or evaluated and the streams themselves (both designated High Quality) are not shown on project drawings. No explanation is provided for the exclusion of these streams. Installing a pipeline through a stream can create irreparable damage. Because they are not identified in the application, if approved, Sunoco would have no obligation to implement the requisite protections for these HQ streams.

3) Significant discrepancies in the location and type of wetlands delineated have been found.

In Jackson Township, Cambria County, within Gallitzin State Forest, the proposed pipeline crosses a stream and wetland complex. The wetland has been identified as Exceptional Value. The stream is a perennial waterway and was designated as High Quality-Cold Water Fishery.

This wetland is characterized by the applicant as PEM (Palustrine Emergent), and the site plans show **it is only herbaceous within the existing pipeline Right Of Way (ROW), where no work is proposed.** But where the new construction is proposed, just south of the existing ROW, it clearly is **wooded, as shown on Sunoco's aerial photos and by the "existing tree line" on the E&S plan drawings.** This means the wetland was improperly characterized.

The consequence of mischaracterizing this wetland as PEM is that it understates the short and long-term impacts that pipeline construction will have, **because instead of a temporary disruption of an herbaceous wetland, there will be a permanent conversion of a forested wetland to herbaceous wetland, or even to upland if the proposed restoration is not successful.**

Another example is in Jackson Township, Perry County, within the Tuscarora State Forest; Laurel Run (designated Exceptional Value). In this case, the applicant identified

four separate wetlands that all are the same type and connected together. More important than this odd mapping convention, however, is the fact **that the actual extent of wetland here is likely to be much larger than has been mapped**, in light of their landscape position at the base of steep slopes and on a broad, flat floodplain adjacent to the streams. Apparently, only two of the five wetlands in this area are proposed to be impacted by the pipeline project, which proposes an open cut method through them. **Both impacted wetlands are characterized as "exceptional value" wetlands, yet no methods to avoid or minimize the impact (by boring or HDD) have been proposed** as is required by the applicant

4) The extent of Exceptional Value Wetlands along the pipeline route likely has been under estimated.

Both Exceptional Value (EV) and High Quality (HQ) waters in Pennsylvania are entitled to Special Protection to prevent degradation when construction activities are being considered. Those waters identified as **Exceptional Value Waters** in Pennsylvania are to **receive the highest level of protection; i.e., no degradation of their quantity and quality.**

Exceptional Value Wetlands, which by DEP's own definition, are considered EV Waters, are to be afforded the same antidegradation "special protection" as streams that have been designated EV Waters, that is: **no reduction of their water quality is to be allowed by federal and State laws.**

Troublingly, in this application there are **instances of wetlands that are along EV streams, and thus qualify as being Exceptional Value, but they are not so listed. This means that if this application is approved by the DEP, they are sanctioning Sunoco's contamination of EV waters without repercussions.**

Two specific examples of EV wetlands that were incorrectly omitted are:

- 1.) Berks County Wetland W301: along Exceptional Value Hay Creek, proposed to have a 55-foot open cut crossing, and a permanent impact of 0.02 acre and:
- 2.) Chester County Wetland A46: along EV UNT to South Branch French Creek, proposed to have a 16-foot open cut crossing, and a permanent impact of 0.015 acre

Mr. Kunz even states that **there are likely to be additional wetlands proposed** been identified. Criterion IV states: [Wetlands located along an existing public or private drinking water supply, including both surface water and groundwater sources, that maintain the quality or quantity of the drinking water supply.]

The proposed pipeline route passes through rural areas where many residents obtain their drinking water from onsite wells and springs (indeed, more than 3 million Commonwealth residents rely on wells for their drinking water supply). In addition, there are more than 14,000 public water supply systems throughout the State. One of the most widely recognized functions of wetlands¹ is their ability to absorb or filter pollutants such as nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediments and thereby to provide an important water quality benefit. When wetlands are located above or along public or private drinking water supplies, that water quality enhancement function is particularly significant. **It is entirely likely that some of the approximately 600 wetlands identified along this pipeline route are helping to maintain the quantity or quality of some drinking water supply.**

Any such wetlands along the Mariner East II Pipeline route would qualify as Exceptional Value Wetlands under criterion "iv". Yet this application **includes no discussion** at all about this criterion, **nor does it describe or even mention whether any of the wetlands along the proposed route are located above or along a public or private drinking water supply.**

So even before gas is flowing through the pipelines, there is already a strong possibility of contamination and degradation to drinking water. This is to say nothing of the hazardous liquid leaks that occur once NGLs are pushed through. Just last year in Edgemont

Township, the gasoline additive Methyl Tert-Butyl Ether was found in private well water near a corroded Sunoco pipeline.

Because of the likelihood that pipeline construction will contaminate drinking water supplies, baseline water testing for properties along the route is absolutely necessary. Several municipalities intend to demand that Sunoco conduct such testing for all homes, schools and businesses that are within 2,000 feet of any proposed horizontal drilling site.

5) Water Quality Antidegradation was not evaluated.

None of the proposed impacts to Exceptional Value Wetlands (which as discussed above are also EV Waters) has been evaluated by the applicant in terms of compliance with the Pennsylvania antidegradation requirements prescribed at 25 Pa. Code Chapter 93.

According to the PADEP Water Quality Antidegradation Implementation Guidance (Technical Guidance Document 391-0300-002; 29 November 2003; page 39) existing uses must be maintained and protected whenever an activity (including construction) is proposed which may affect a surface water. Before it issues any permit, **the PADEP must ensure that none of the impacts to EV Waters (including Exceptional Value Wetlands) will result in any degradation of water quality. How can DEP do this if numerous EV Waters are unidentified in the permit application?**

According to page 60 of the PADEP Water Quality Antidegradation Implementation Guidance, limited activities that result in **temporary and short-term changes** in the water quality of Exceptional Value Waters **can be allowed, but only if all practical means of minimizing such degradation will be implemented.**

Sunoco has done no evaluation of the impacts to EV wetlands in regards to antidegradation requirements. Furthermore, only 37 of 129 (29%) of proposed crossings of Exceptional Value Wetlands have been minimized by the use of boring or HDD methods. Clearly, this project has not minimized degradation to our most important waters and wetlands.

6) Impacts to Exceptional Value Wetlands have not been fully evaluated.

As part of each of the seventeen Chapter 105 applications (one for each county crossed), an “Alternatives Analysis” has been submitted. Most, but not all, of those Alternatives Analyses describe each of the proposed crossings of Exceptional Value Wetlands and discuss why it is necessary. In 5 counties, no Exceptional Value Wetlands were identified by the applicant, so no such analysis was necessary. In 8 counties, all of the identified Exceptional Value Wetlands were discussed. In Blair County, only 15 of the 18 identified Exceptional Value Wetlands were discussed. In Cumberland County, only 9 of the 10 Exceptional Value Wetlands were discussed. **In Cambria and Indiana counties, where pipeline impacts to 21 and 12 Exceptional Value Wetlands (respectively) were identified by the applicant, there was no discussion of them in the Alternatives Analysis. Overall, 37 (out of 129) Exceptional Value Wetlands proposed to be crossed by this pipeline have not been evaluated in terms of potential alternatives to avoid or minimize impacts. This represents an inconsistent treatment of an important resource at risk which must be corrected before review of these applications continues.**

[Attachment – MWA – Ch. 105 – 08-24-16](#) (5960)

34. COMMENT

Water quality should be of paramount concern when considering whether to grant these permits. Along its route, the pipeline will cross 1,227 streams and 581 wetlands areas, including sections of the Middle Creek Wildlife Management Area, which is an Important Bird Area. In total, over 35 acres of wetland and 8.6 acres of riparian land along streams will be permanently impacted.

When confronted with a wetland area or stream, a crossing must be performed. Two methods will comprise 91.5 percent of total crossings on the Mariner II. The first, and most

disruptive method, is an open cut. Using this method, a trench is dug straight-through the wetland like would be done on dry ground and the pipeline is laid. This method is extremely disruptive to wetland hydrology and native flora. It also provides a disturbance, which is an excellent opportunity for invasive species to take hold. Invasive seed can easily be introduced into the wetlands via the heavy equipment required in the digging procedure. Under the current proposal, the open cut method would be used in 74.5 percent of wetland and stream crossings on the Mariner II project.

Another 17 percent of wetland and stream crossings preformed during the construction of the Mariner II, would be done using horizontal direction drilling (HDD). HDD bores a tunnel under wetlands instead of trenching through them, causing considerably less disruption to the impacted area. Wetlands should always be impacted with great care, because they are extremely biodiverse, and act to preserve water quality by filtering out pollutants. Given the decreased impact to wetlands that HDD causes, it seems like plain common sense to use HDD instead of the open cut method if and whenever possible. HDD is more expensive than an open cut, but it is imperative that we protect our natural resources, especially our waterways, as we move forward in developing our natural gas infrastructure.

One issue that should be of concern is Sunoco Logistics' history of disregarding Pennsylvania's environmental regulations. In 2015, at least 42 citations were issued by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection for work being done on the Mariner East I pipeline project. With such a poor record of compliance with environmental regulations, why should they be allowed to continue to expand their infrastructure when they can't even maintain what they currently operate in an environmentally safe manner? Sunoco Logistics' pipelines have proven to be unsafe and a number of their lines have ruptured over the years causing damage to the environment. One leak in 2005 unleashed 260,000 gallons of crude oil into the Ohio and Kentucky Rivers. In 2008, an improperly installed valve caused 12,000 gallons of gasoline to be spilled into Turtle Creek, Westmoreland County Pennsylvania, killing most of the aquatic life along a three mile section of the stream. And yet another spill in Wellington Ohio, resulted in 2,780 gallons of gasoline being spilled and 30 homes having to be evacuated. If the Mariner II were to rupture along one of the more populated sections of its route, such as the Philadelphia suburbs or the Cumberland Valley, it would be devastating to not only the environment, but also the economy.

As you continue to discuss whether to grant Sunoco Logistics these permits or not, please take a moment to reflect on the words of Article 1 Section 27 of Pennsylvania's Constitution, which states.....

"The People have the right to clean air, pure water; and to the preservation of the natural, scenic, historic, and esthetic values of the environment. Pennsylvania's natural resources are the common property of all people, including generations yet to come. As trustee of these resources, the Commonwealth shall conserve and maintain them for the benefit of all the people."

After reviewing all the comments and testimony for this case, you must decide for yourself; can this project go forward while still protecting the constitutionally insured right of the people to a healthy environment? If you are like me and believe that this project poses a clear threat to our Article 1 Section 27 rights, take a stand and oppose Sunoco Logistics' chapters 102 and 105 applications. It is your duty to the citizens of this Commonwealth.

[Attachment – Letter to DEP on M2 PL - DiPaulis](#)

[Attachment - Article 1 Section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution](#) (5961)

35. COMMENT

Please accept this email as my comments against the approval of the Mariner II pipeline. Sunoco/the pipeline builders caused over \$80,000 worth of damage to my property in Union Township Washington County when they drilled under Mingo Church Road. I had extensive flooding and drill mud all over my property. Comments were made that "we will make things right", however nothing was done until I sought legal action via hiring an attorney. Throughout the entire process every individual that I dealt with including members of the DEP, Union Township and every entity associated with the pipeline went out of their way to be unhelpful to remedy the damage that was caused. Given the amount of damage in the amount of flooding of my property with the first pipeline I have no reason to expect there will be any difference if Mariner II is approved. I am currently in communication with my attorney to determine my next step to ensure that my property is not permanently damaged with any subsequent pipeline construction. (5962)

49. COMMENT

In Huntingdon county I have personally witnessed and can testify to the blatant disregard for environmental regulations that sonoco logistics has committed in the deforestation for the East Mariner pipeline. I have heard from professional 3rd party environmental surveyors about the gross inadequacy with the companies surveys regarding wetlands and erosion. I have witnessed intimidation, abuse and disrespect of property owners. I have seen this company consistently lie to the public, land owners and most importantly in regards to these permits, you the DEP. They keep using resources to get people to regurgitate the same talking points about jobs and economics when there would be more jobs fixing existing infrastructure of theirs that is failing. Why jobs and economics are constantly talked about as if they have relevance at a DEP forum is beyond me even if their claims were true! So far over 90% of the workers I've seen had out of state plates. Maybe I'm just being naive in thinking that someone is going to read this and actually do something about it but I like to think that there are honest people working for the DEP that haven't lost focus what they are supposed to be protecting...the environment not the interests of Dallas based company. please do not issue the permits that they are asking for, doing so would open the floodgates to much more destruction. Please extend the comment period so that you can get the information they have been hiding from you so you can make an informed decision. (5979)

51. COMMENT

It is very disheartening, as private citizens, to be exhorting our Department of Environmental Protection to protect our constitutional rights under Article 1 Section 27 of our Pennsylvania Constitution, and to uphold the integrity of DEP's Mission and Statement of Values. These documents must inform and direct all decisions made on behalf of our resources, and the welfare and safety of Pennsylvanians. Sunoco is motivated by profits and money saving measures. Sunoco is not in the business of protecting, conserving or restoring our water resources. DEP is not funded nor staffed to adequately monitor and enforce best management practices. Last February, DEP Secretary John Quigley noted that DEP "does not have enough staff to meet the needs of any of its programs." Sunoco is not prepared nor willing to implement best management practices in all stream crossings and all wetland encroachments, and the company has a lengthy list of violations.^{4,5,6,7} This is an untenable situation that will result in more degradation and destruction of our water resources. In fact, Sunoco's proposed pipeline project will traverse more than 300 miles across southern PA and transport industrial volumes of highly explosive, odorless, tasteless natural gas liquids (ethane, butane, propane) to Marcus Hook for shipment overseas. These pressurized pipelines have a high risk potential to cause devastating damage to people, animals, and our environment.

61. COMMENT

My name is Joan Leach. My husband and I own a 23 acre farm in Cumberland County where we raise a small herd of cattle. I would like to comment on Sunoco's Pennsylvania Pipeline Project and its impact on water crossings. We are well aware of the requirement to keep our animals from streams and wetlands and to manage our manure to prevent contaminating the Chesapeake Bay and the environment. All construction sites must protect from erosion and runoff. If Sunoco is permitted to trench its way through most of Pennsylvania's water obstacles, where is the DEP's concern for the Chesapeake Bay and the environment? How much mud and silt will be sent downstream? The private citizen must abide by the law. Will Sunoco, a major corporation, be given a pass? (5987)

63. COMMENT

For the reasons listed below, I strongly oppose the building of the Sunoco Pipeline's Mariner East 2 project, which will be harmful to Pennsylvania's environment. Sunoco Pipeline L.P. has submitted applications for stream and wetland crossing permits for the Mariner East 2 (a/k/a Pennsylvania Pipeline) project under Title 25, Chapter 105 of the Pennsylvania Code, requesting denial of the applications. I am in agreement with the position of the Clean Air Council, Mountain Watershed Association, and other public interest groups, which have researched this issue. Sunoco's applications are missing important pieces of information and prove that the pipeline project would do great harm to the valuable public resources of our Commonwealth. Sunoco's applications are incomplete and inaccurate. Independent wetlands experts have identified additional wetlands and streams that the pipelines would cross that Sunoco failed to count. DEP can't measure damage to streams and wetlands it doesn't know exist. The applications are also missing required sections and contain inaccurate maps. Sunoco had electronic map files that could have made evaluation of its pipeline project much easier, but withheld them from DEP and from the public. It was premature for DEP to open a public comment period on June 25th, 2016, before the public could review complete and accurate permit applications. For example, Thornbury township (Delaware county) has informed Sunoco that its plans are NOT CONSISTENT with its expensively developed local stormwater management plans. No permits should be issued until Sunoco submits complete and consistent plans, and the public has an opportunity to comment on them. With respect to the environment, a 2015 leak from a Sunoco Pipeline in Edgmont township contaminated soil and groundwater with a gasoline-type product. MTBE, a gasoline additive manufactured by Sunoco, is currently being detected in private wells near the leak. And the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has spent nearly three-quarters of a billion taxpayer dollars to clean up leaks of MTBE. Mariner East 2 would damage and destroy protected wetlands. Sunoco plans to dig through and tear up protected wetlands, including wetlands that the state deems "exceptional value." Though Sunoco promises to let some of these wetlands come back over time, it would clear-cut forested wetlands and do harm to other wetlands that can't be repaired. This is against the law. Sunoco could go around or drill under these wetlands, but it has chosen not to in order to save money on their bottom line. Mariner East 2 would do great harm to health, safety, and the environment. It is apparent from Sunoco's applications that Mariner East 2 would prove disastrous to Pennsylvania's environment. Everything from the quality of our streams to the preservation of our farms to the purity of our tap water would be affected by these pipelines. Sunoco has a bad track record for leaks in its pipelines and for violations of state laws, which makes this application all the more concerning. For all of these reasons, I respectfully request that PADEP reject Sunoco's applications for stream and wetland

crossing permits for its Mariner East 2 / Pennsylvania Pipeline Project as incomplete and legally flawed. (5989)

69.COMMENT

I am attaching a letter to endorse the Mariner East II Pipeline. I hope you take time to read this and I encourage you to act in the best interest of the people who will need the service this pipeline provides, as well as the construction companies and the people they support. I would ask you to consider the permits for the Mariner East II Pipeline. This pipeline is desperately needed. To move cheap affordable energy to the citizens of Pennsylvania. This Pipeline project will be built with the best Pipeline Builders in the world. Pennsylvania workers need these good paying jobs to support their families and communities.

I am writing in support of the proposed Sunoco pipeline project, otherwise known as the Mariner East 2 pipeline project. On behalf of the local and national members of the United Association that will work on and benefit from this project, I encourage the Department to issue the permits required for the pipeline project.

Sunoco Logistics has gone above and beyond in preparing for the construction of this pipeline project. I am confident that their plans for waterway and wetland crossings will meet and go beyond what's required. It's clear from the thousands of pages of documents submitted by the project that they have carefully reviewed and planned ahead; any impacts will be thoroughly mitigated.

While it is important any project of this magnitude receive a thorough review, I encourage the Department to move quickly to approve the necessary permits. This project stands to create jobs and economic development opportunities throughout the region.

Construction of Mariner East 2 will be undertaken by highly skilled union members like myself who are committed to a safe and successful completion of the project.

[Attachment – Pipeliners Local 798](#) (5995 – 5997, 5999, 6000, 6004 – 6048, 6059, 6079, 6092, 6259, 6263, 6268, 6313, 6314, 6354, 6355, 12650 – 12728, 17076 – 17219, 29614 – 29682, 26737 – 29800 – 344 nonlegible signatures)

79.COMMENT

Mariner East 2 will benefit our industry by bringing in more product, specifically connecting to several local terminals including Schafferstown and Harrisburg, in addition to the thousands of construction jobs and general economic benefit to the communities where our businesses are based. As you also know the Mariner East project is infusing 4.2 billion dollars into the Pennsylvania economy and has been estimated to create over 30,000 direct and indirect jobs during the construction phase alone, nevertheless the added benefit of long-term tax revenues for counties to invest in roads, schools, and public safety. Our industry as well as natural gas pipelines and utilities must adhere to strict safety regulations. Sunoco representatives briefed our association and we have heard firsthand how they will utilize the most advanced safety technology and monitoring systems. They will also work with all regulatory agencies to fully comply with laws and regulations to protect sensitive areas and insure safety.

Given these points, we urge the Department of Environmental Protection to approve the permit for Mariner East 2.

[Attachment – Pennsylvania Propane Gas Association](#) (6054)

82.COMMENT

I would like to, in the strongest possible terms, state my opposition to the above-mentioned pipeline. At the West Chester public hearing on August 10th, there were numerous well-informed, well-spoken persons who expressed quite clearly all of the reasons that the

pipeline is a hazardous, and likely disastrous, project. Those who spoke in its favor were persons who have potential employment on the project. There was no representative from Sunoco, and I consider this a very arrogant stance on their part. I've written a number of letters to Senator Toomey about this and other environmental issues, and his replies always mention the economic advantage of jobs creation. What I'd like to hear about from him and your agency is what the true price of proceeding on this project is. Jobs may be temporary, but the environmental devastation that this pipeline would bring about will be permanent. The opposition to the unnecessary, habitat-disruptive pipelines is nationwide. There is opposition in the Dakotas. Officials in Oklahoma are investigating the possibility that fracking is causing their unprecedented freakish weather. There are fires burning out of control in California, and please see the statement from NASA. Let's put the environment before the economy. Without taking serious steps to stop climate change, not just jobs, but life itself will be permanently damaged. Thank you; I look forward to hearing from you. (6056)

84.COMMENT

I write to say the public hearing process you have put into place is flawed. Here is the definition of a public hearing: an official meeting where members of the public hear the facts about a planned road, building, etc. and give their opinions about it: a public hearing on/about sth The city planning commission will hold a public hearing on the casino design next week. <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/public-hearing> Part of the benefit of attending a public hearing is that you can hear the views of fellow Pennsylvanians. Also a benefit of attending is that one can gain a view on the consensus on the issue at hand, at least at the given hearing. These comments collected by PA PUC are not just for the hearing of those at PA PUC collecting the information. The public comments are for the public, those who pay taxes for the democratic process we have in place. Another reason this process is flawed is you are having the only five public hearings and holding them in August (8, 9, 10, 16 and 18) when many people are taking vacation time. This is inconvenient. Even if it is not intended, having the public hearings in August has the appearance you don't want to hear from Pennsylvanians at public hearings, not really. Finally, changing the format of the fifth and final public hearing, so that it had a different format than the other four public hearings was wrong. Instead of attending as expected a public hearing, suddenly one is participating in a format at which members of the public are ushered separately into private rooms. Changing the format was a unilateral decision by the PA PUC. I am unaware any notice was given to the public that you all were changing the format. Many of us are familiar with lengthy discussions which occur regarding the format of presidential debates, for example, and that those who are participating first discuss options and then AGREE on the format. Again, this may not be intended, but changing the format of the public hearing unilaterally was undemocratic and not good government. Also it has the appearance you don't want Pennsylvanians to hear from other Pennsylvanians. Certainly if I were ushered into a private room rather than allowed to share my comments as per the format at the other August public hearings, I would certainly be intimidated. This was a power play, to put it plainly. I can see that perhaps you all perceived a dilemma with having members of the public disagree on the proposed pipeline. Perhaps there were "professional" or "paid" public commenters present too, who might be intimidating. But changing the format unilaterally was a mistake in my view. Regrettably if the PA PUC chose to hold additional public hearings using the real format, it may be the trust is broken and Pennsylvanians will not participate in their own democracy. That does not bode well for the proposed pipeline plan. There is no rush. You could hold additional real public hearings. Please forward a PDF of the public comments

given at the public hearings. Also if they were video recorded I would appreciate a link to that. I do want to state I am opposed to the pipeline for several reasons. We in PA have been told we need to frack and drill for reasons of national security. Next the reason given is because it's good for business and job creation. The fact is, as you know, there is already agreement with companies in Norway for one who will buy the fossil fuels which may be piped over Pennsylvanians property. Selling to another country is not national security. But it may be good for business. For Sunoco. Which is not a public utility. Sunoco is not a public utility, it is a company. Yet it is benefiting by being deemed a public utility. The fact is that already public monies, even those used to pay for the PA PUC are now being used instead of Sunoco's own monies. So Pennsylvanians already are underwriting this company's project as unwilling investors even before the new pipeline has even been built. Also, the threat and the use of eminent domain on unwilling homeowners is wrong and unAmerican. Importantly the fossil fuels remaining will be used up and then gone. The pipeline effort will produce short-lived results. PA will resemble decaying casino-abandoned Atlantic City. The pipeline is not smart business investment. It is not innovative, dynamic, exciting green research and investment. It is literally dinosaur-thinking. We should be investing in a big way in PA in new energy sources. This would be the smart businesslike thing to do. Tremendous numbers of jobs both in research and also in manufacturing would be created. Other cities (Fort Collins, CO is just one example) are going green and reducing consumption and pollution implementing solar and other methods. PA could be a state of cities, municipalities and boroughs who are going green. Fort Collins owns some or all of its utilities. By contrast, Pennsylvanians are already paying for a private company's proposed investment. Finally PA could choose to conserve and protect our "PA Wilds". A few years ago in the newspaper one week you'd see a photo of Governor Corbett talking about fracking. A few weeks later you'd see a photo of him in a canoe pointing to a hawk, "hawking" the PA wilds. We in PA can make a great choice in conserving our woods and protecting our water. Once our woods are damaged, clear cut and gone and once our waters are polluted, the damage is done. Watching PA maybe make a mistake like this is terrible. My vote is NO to the pipeline and YES To a more democratic public hearing process. I look forward to hearing from you. (6058)

85.COMMENT

I am writing to let you know that I am concerned about the Mariner East Pipelines and the state's use of eminent domain in the interest of Sunoco. I think this is a shameful practice that is both unconstitutional and immoral. As a voter, I want to let you know that I am particularly concerned about this issue. In particular I have fond memories of the Linvilla Orchard and would hate to see any section of it destroyed in the interest of a global corporation that is not a good citizen to our local community (6060)

105.COMMENT

I am writing to oppose PA DEP allowing the Mariner East 2 fracked shale gas liquids pipeline. I understand that written public testimony as well as testimony at the scheduled hearings is invited, and the deadline for written submission is August 24th. I know this testimony is supposed to be focused officially on ground disturbance and water quality impacts. Those impacts are very significant, but Mariner 2's harmful impacts extend way beyond ground and water quality concerns. Mariner East 2, if built, will carry shale gas liquids, which are hazardous, volatile and explosive—endangering the lives and harming the properties of thousands in its path. The purpose of the pipeline is primarily for export the liquids overseas, which would pollute and create climate harms at every phase: drilling, fracturing, waste; processing and export; end use. The Pipeline itself, the fossil-fuel derived

energy to compress/ship/decompress shale gas liquids are all fraught with fossil fuel climate-changing impacts and danger of explosions. And harms from all phases of fracking itself are well-documented. This pipeline, all new pipelines, and all other fossil fuel-supporting infrastructure must be stopped, because we simply must stop extracting, then burning fossil fuels. We need to keep the remaining fossil fuels in the ground. This July was the hottest year, world-wide, on record (since 1880). Climate science-based predictions of higher temperatures, floods, fires, extreme storms, droughts/desertification, melting of polar ice caps, ocean acidification, release of methane from melting tundra and the resulting displacement of people and other creatures have all come to pass. It is wrong to keep on doing business-as-usual, and to pretend that this corner of the world—Pennsylvania—should be exempt from doing all it can to keep fossil fuels in the ground. Pennsylvania must re-focus: go all-out on conservation measures and developing renewables. Before fracking, then-Governor Ed Rendell was bullish on development of wind farms—we need to get public policy back to supporting and increasing the support for energy conservation and renewables. In addition to new pipelines being plain wrong, it is also immoral and wrong that that Pennsylvania's courts and state agencies allowed the cart before the horse: before any approval of the pipeline, they smoothed the way for Sunoco and ordered local law enforcement to escort the company's crews onto private citizens' properties so that Sunoco could clear-cut for the proposed path of the Pipeline. Three acres of Steven and Ellen's Gerhart's property was cleared for this purpose against their permission. Thousands of other landowners in Pennsylvania are also affected. Some, like the Gerharts (who are threatened with more clear-cutting), are refusing and facing eminent domain proceedings. Please do the right thing for us all: stop the clear-cutting, and stop the Mariner East 2 Pipeline. I look forward to acknowledgement of my statement, and I hope for a favorable response. (6080)

151. COMMENT

One of the most powerful, rich and influential supplier of fuel in the USA should not be allowed to take our country's resources and export them just for profit. The working tax paying people that will have a dangers pipeline in their backyards will end up with no say in its building or existence, what a shame, it's already a done deal, you're just going through the motions, like a puppet. Records show that Sunoco has the worst safety record of 1,518 active pipeline operators, plus its parent company the Energy Transfer Partners, based in Dallas, Texas is not thinking of building this pipeline to help supply our needs, but only for exporting our natural resources for money, it's just pure greed. Mariner East 2 pipeline to export our resources should not be built, there is no reason our country needs this, again it's just greed of the ETP firm. (6203)

189. COMMENT

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to comment on the Pennsylvania Pipeline Project. I am a landowner in Derry Township, Westmoreland County. My residence is situated on 7 acres and the PA Pipeline project runs through my property. Last year, repairs were made on Sunoco's 8" line. I had two areas on my property that were disturbed to make the repairs. The rehabilitation work was insufficient as there are compaction issues from the track hoe and large rocks that are on the surface because clean topsoil was not used in the backfill process. This is my yard, not a pasture or forested area. Sunoco never fixed those problems. So, now onto this project. Can anyone tell me what size lines are going in? Is it two 20" lines, is it a 20" and a 16". I can't seem to get a straight answer. Now to the issues I am facing on my property with this new project:

- The limits of disturbance (LOD) come within 43' of my home and 38' of my garage.

- The new lines cross two small streams on my property.
- The new lines will cross my personal gas line from a shallow well twice.
- My driveway is impacted as well as a french drain, a drain from a downspout, and a dusk to dawn light.
- The two new lines will cross under the existing 8" line on my property causing additional disturbance.
- The main stream has a bank that is stabilized with New Jersey barriers to prevent erosion and damage to my bridge which is my only access to my property. These barriers will need to be replaced properly to prevent erosion around my bridge. I asked to meet with a Sunoco representative to have the line moved away from my home (and there is room) and was told by my attorney the line is not moving. I asked that the new gas lines running through my property be bored (HDD) instead of the cut/trench method and was told that Sunoco was not going to bore my property. HDD is commonly used to bore under streams and roadways and this is a perfect case for that use. In my humble opinion, it seems like Sunoco is not willing to work with certain landowners. I am not against pipeline project, but Sunoco has not worked with me in the best interest of the land and water resources that impact my property. After the mess that was left after the repairs on the 8" line last year, I can only imagine the issues I am going to deal with on this project. I would like a DEP representative to visit my property in my presence to witness the issues I am facing. Again, thank you for providing me this opportunity to comment.

I am on call to go out west to help fight the fires that are occurring. I am a retired DCNR Bureau of Forestry District Forester and I am very familiar with this project as it goes through the Gallitzin State Forest where I used to work. I was not allowed to be part of the process on State Forest land because of the conflict of interest.

What good would it do if I did testify? I just want the line bored through my property and I don't think that is asking too much considering the issues.

If I am not on a fire assignment I hope to attend the public meeting.

I think by testifying, Sunoco will make it that much harder to work with me to resolve my problems. Please have someone from your staff contact me to look at the site.

Will the Waterways and Wetlands staff meet with me on my property? I was hoping to hear from them by now. (6206)

195. COMMENT

While it is not the responsibility of the Department to notify landowners of nomenclature discrepancies, it is within the power of the Department to adjust the public participation meeting and comment schedule in order to achieve continued transparency between the Department, community and officials. PSC is concerned that the public has indeed been unnecessarily disenfranchised by Sunoco's failure to publicly and openly disclose changes and to be transparent in their actions. A consistent name of the project must be utilized to avoid confusion by citizen and local officials who have been engaged in an ongoing confusion created by Sunoco in using project names of Mariner East Projects (referenced in varying stages as East, 2 and 2X). It is within the power of the Department during this comment period to aide the public and eliminate this sort of ludicrous form of disenfranchisement.

Sunoco was afforded nearly a year to "get it right" in notices of permit incompleteness and opportunity to resubmit applications to meet completeness standards. Sunoco is in the business of building pipelines, is not foreign to Pennsylvania legal requirements, permitting and approval processes. The public is still new to participating in the permitting process, and in fact, each new pipeline project typically brings a new demographic of stakeholders to the educational and

participatory process. As such, PSC suggests the public be afforded, albeit a less than commensurate opportunity, to review the complexity of the filings, participate in public meetings with the Department and through our requests be afforded robust participation and meaningful results in this review. The objective in pipeline permitting is, after all, public and environmental safety, not expediency. [Attachment – Pipeline Safety Coalition](#) (5943)

227. COMMENT

I have several concerns concerning these pipelines and hope the PADEP will impose some safety improvements to the Sunoco apparent plans.

The horizontal drilling process and the apparent intent by Sunoco to disregard "Best Construction Practice" by not sealing the void between the borehole and pipe, calls for more regulatory action for increased safety of residents. It would also be good practice to have mandatory water testing of residents water before construction and at regular intervals afterwards. According to a nearby resident at the West Chester hearing, Sunoco refused to discuss such testing.

Sunoco Malfunction History: A local researcher discovered that Sunoco has a long record of hazardous liquids leaks, averaging more than two of them each month for the last ten years. Many of these leaks occurred right here in our part of Pennsylvania. I heard recently that there was a Sunoco pipeline incident in Edgmont (thought to be on Meadow Lane)

I am a Thornbury Township, Delaware County, resident, living approximately 2200 ft to the West of the site of the present Sunoco Pipeline and the proposed expansion of the site to accommodate two new pipelines. In addition I live approximately 1800 ft to the East of the path of the right of way of one or more of the pipelines that cross our Township. My water supply is from an on-site well. The wrong decisions on the proposed pipeline may have serious detrimental health and economic affects on my and my neighbors future. In addition decisions on this pipeline will set a precedent for future pipeline expansion or modification. [Attachment – Lawrence Barrett](#) (6278)

257. COMMENT

I write with regard to the proposed Mariner East II pipeline. I've learned recently that Sunoco has applied for erosion and sedimentation control permits for the pipelines in Delaware County. For consideration for the people, the businesses, and the flora and fauna of the region, I respectfully ask that you reject the applications for these permits. Delaware County is where both sets of my grandparents chose to raise their families. My parents were born and raised and still live there. I lived there for all of my childhood and young adult life. As many families in Delaware County did, my family always visited Linvilla Orchards. It is a haven in suburbia; a place to learn the incredible joy of fruit right off of a tree, to appreciate the beauty of the night woods in taking a hayride along its edge, to feel connected with community and small business. I was dismayed to learn that the proposed pipeline is to cut through this land. The harm done with such a cut cannot be healed in the course of a year or even a decade; it would be many, many years before the trees would return to a point of productivity. An entire generation would be harmed and not even realize what was denied them. In a world in which we are disconnected from so much of the ground and soil that sustain us, Linvilla is unique in the community: a place that celebrates the seasonal work and beauty that is the fabric of Pennsylvania's history. It becomes increasingly unique each year. My mother brought my siblings and I there to see chickens and ducks and goats, to enjoy local honey, to eat apples grown in our neighborhood. She now delights in taking my three-year-old nephew there and introducing this love of our land and its inhabitants to him. Please prioritize the people, the places, and the animals and

farms and forests of Pennsylvania over the desires of corporate industry that has no ties and no love for our region. (5378)

283. COMMENT

[Attachment – Danbro, L.P.](#) (6333)

289. COMMENT

As a resident of Media, PA, in Delaware County, I oppose the Mariner East projects for reasons ranging from the immediate health of my children to our larger environmental future. The DEP has grounds to withhold a permit from Sunoco and its subsidiaries.

1. Sunoco has a poor track record of maintaining decent safety and environmental standards in the Philadelphia area and beyond. Even the U.S. Justice Department has pursued actions against Sunoco.

<https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/documents/sunoco-cd.pdf>

<http://aldianews.com/articles/local/philadelphia/two-dozen-permit-violations-point-breeze-refinery-opposition-expansion-grows/41231>

<http://www.law360.com/articles/141662/sunoco-fined-over-troubled-pa-refinery>

2. Fossil fuel transportation and refineries, specifically high-pressure natural gas pipelines, have not been proven safe for our children, families and residents. Marcus Hook's Your own staff report this related to Sunoco's Point Breeze refinery:

https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-10/documents/bk1_thur_2_gross-davis_thurs.pdf

3. Investing in fossil fuel infrastructure is a dead end, a short term, poor investment for Pennsylvanians and for our environment. They require expensive repairs and tax breaks to maintain. We now know that fossil fuels are never an environmentally sound choice.

<http://www.bizjournals.com/philadelphia/news/2012/07/02/sunocos-philadelphia-refinery-will.html>

Based on Sunoco's past poor safety and environmental record, and present plan to transport and ship out environmentally hazardous fossil fuels for benefit of Sunoco and its subsidiaries, not the PA citizens, taxpayers and environment, the DEP should oppose all permits by Sunoco, Sunoco Logistics, and their contractors in relation to the Mariner East project. (6340)

293. COMMENT

Please find attached letter with comments hereby offered by AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM) regarding Chapter 105 Water Obstruction and Encroachment Permit Applications, Sunoco Logistics Mariner East 2 Project. In addition, AECOM requests to have the option to offer this testimony at the planned public hearing in West Chester, Pennsylvania, Chester County: Wednesday August 10, 2016 – 6:30 P.M – 9:30 P.M. – Sykes Student Union at West Chester University, 110 W. Rosedale Avenue, West Chester, PA 19382.

[Attachment – AECOM 08-09-16](#) (6344)

“Natural gas liquids (NGLs) pipeline projects play an important role in addressing our clean energy needs, in addition to helping develop and sustain the natural gas and related industries in Pennsylvania. While these projects bring vital jobs and investment to our region, it is critical that they adhere to all applicable Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and other agency requirements. The successful delivery of these projects requires the right combination of services, people and expertise all coming together to solve complex and unique challenges. At the same time, these projects must

develop and protect the natural systems and shared resources that cities, regions and people depend on to grow and thrive. Sunoco Logistics' Mariner East 2 pipeline exemplifies the right type of infrastructure project."

295. COMMENT

I am writing to express my support for the Sunoco Logistics Mariner East 2 Pipeline Project. I support for the Mariner East 2 Pipeline project project because...As a resident of Pennsylvania, it concerns me that PA (and most other states) suffers from aging and outdated infrastructure. Updating existing and building new pipelines not only helps conserve our natural resources, it reduces the carbon emissions to our environment. The mid-Atlantic region has suffered in recent years with the loss of many jobs, especially in the construction industry. The full economic impact of this recession will affect future generations. This project, and Sunoco, will provided hundreds of permanent jobs, jobs that provide skilled workers with a fair living wage. In addition to the permanent positions, thousands of long term temporary jobs in fields ranging from architecture to science and everything in between will be created, boosting not only the local economy but improving the that tax base and providing the resources for our communities to continue making positive changes for years to come. Local contractors, suppliers, and manufacturers along with hotels, restaurants and many other area businesses continue to benefit directly and indirectly from the Mariner East 2 project. In closing, knowing that an economically and environmentally responsible company, Sunoco, is behind this project, I feel confident that every aspect will be handled safely and efficiently. I urge you to strongly consider supporting this project, and thank you in advance for your consideration. (6346)

307. COMMENT

Good morning, Mr. Williamson, please accept these brief comments regarding the Permit No. E38-194 filed with regard to the Mariner East II Pipeline. I would respectfully request that the public comment period regarding the permit application be extended at least thirty (30) additional days and that additional public hearings be scheduled in all affected counties. I would request that the strictest scrutiny be used in reviewing the permit application in light of the fact that Sunoco has a history of safety and environmental violations and that the permit application be rejected as deficient and not within the public interest. Thank you for your time and consideration. (6361)

309. COMMENT

I am writing to you regarding Snnoco Pipeline's Mariner East 2 Project and their Title 25, PA Code, Chapter 102 (Erosion & Sediment Control) and Chapter 105 (Water Obstructions & Encroachment) permit applications. I am a resident of Huntingdon County owning property that is involved in the construction of the Sunoco Pipeline's Mariner East 2 Pipeline Project. I would simply like to state for the record that Sunoco Pipeline representatives have been in touch with me since 2013 for this project. They described how it would impact my property, and over the course of the past three years have shared irrfmmation on construction methods, environmental protection practices, and pipeline safety. The company encouraged me to attend the Open House session they held in my county, where I was given the opportunity to directly question the Project Manager and senior project officials representing Right-of-Way, Environmental, Safety, and Construction. During negotiations, I found Sunoco to be respectful, fair and responsive to my concerns. Having dealt with Sunoco for nearly 3 years on Mariner East 2, I can attest to the company's commitment to transparency to ensuring that landowners are irrfomed during project development. This letter does not require a response.

(6363-6375)

311. COMMENT

I am writing to you regarding Sunoco Pipeline's Mariner East 2 Project and their Title 25, PA Code, Chapter 102 (Erosion & Sediment Control) and Chapter 105 (Water Obstructions & Encroachment) permit applications. I am a resident of Cumberland County owning property that is involved in the construction of the Sunoco Pipeline's Mariner East 2 Pipeline Project. I would simply like to state for the record that Sunoco Pipeline representatives have been in touch with me since 2013 for this project. They described how it would impact my property, and over the course of the past three years have shared information on construction methods, environmental protection practices, and pipeline safety. The company encouraged me to attend the Open House session they held in my county, where I was given the opportunity to directly question the Project Manager and senior project officials representing Right-of-Way, Environmental, Safety, and Construction. During negotiations, I found Sunoco to be respectful, fair and responsive to my concerns. Having dealt with Sunoco for nearly 3 years on Mariner East 2, I can attest to the company's commitment to transparency to ensuring that landowners are informed during project development. This letter does not require a response. (6377)

321. COMMENT

[Attachment – Blair County Planning Commission 08-27-16](#) (6428)

334. COMMENT

Good evening. Mitch Trembicki, Delaware County, 187 Hilltown Road, Glen Mills. I'm speaking tonight in concern of groundwater and possible pollution that the drilling and the trenching from Sunoco will cause to that situation. I have a well, a private well. And when private wells are installed in Delaware or Chester County, certain protocols have to be followed, including putting a casing down in the bedrock and filling the bore hole around the casing with grout to the surface. Thus insuring no surface pollution will make it into the groundwater supply polluting my well or my neighbor's wells.

Sunoco has specifically said that when they trench or do horizontal drilling, and by the way they said that they will be drilling down in our area of East Goshen and neighboring townships to 160 feet, well in the bedrock. When I had my well installed ten years ago, they hit bedrock at 40 feet. The average depth of drilling will be 72 feet in our area. They have refused to consider the point between --- the void between a 30 inch bore hole and the 20 inch pipe grouting it, thereby reducing or eliminating surface contaminants entering the aquifer. I think this is a huge concern the DEP needs to look at.

When they come up to the surface either to start the bore or when they go from trenching to boring, there is only four feet from the surface to that site. This will allow surface pathogens, bacteria and chemicals to enter that void between the pipe and the bore hole. Any contaminants can thereby get into our aquifer and spread out in many directions. So just the process of installing this pipe by Sunoco creates a burden on well owners in my area. Well owners are burdened with the responsibility of paying for the grouting to have the well installed. That is best management practices. What I'm asking is that you insure best management practices are also enforced by Sunoco, thereby insuring the integrity of our wells, surface pollutants to my neighbors and my own wells.

The other concern I would like to bring up in my last minute is that Delaware County Conservation District has submitted four pages of concerns that, as of yet, have not been answered. So you're having this hearing tonight without us having all the information at hand. I would like to submit that document to you so that it can be reviewed and answered.

So that we know what's going on with the questions that the Conservation District has in regards to the integrity of surface and groundwater in our area, Delaware County.

Lastly, through all of my working career I've been a union member acting as a union rep and I understand the need for good paying jobs. But this project is not, in my opinion, a force of good paying jobs. It is going to be a force of pollution that we will have to deal with in the future. Thank you.

[Mitch Trembicki \(8-10-16 Meeting Transcript\)](#) (29690)

335. COMMENT

With regards to sensitive areas, Sunoco Logistics has committed to minimizing construction areas within wetlands and waterways. They've committed to horizontal directional drilling in sensitive areas. They've committed to not clearing forested wetlands above drills to reduce impact to sensitive areas. They are committed to preserving natural waterways and wetlands. In particular, they won't be withdrawing or discharging into the basin.

With regards to safety, I absolutely understand concerns about transporting hazardous liquids to our backyards. The Frasier Institute published a report about natural gas pipelines that said they are in general safe, and pipelines are more --- are safer than rail. What goes in general safe mean? The U.S. Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Association had kept a database of statistics since 1996. For natural gas pipelines, the 20 year average for fatalities has been two per year. The average for injuries has been nine per year. For hazardous liquid transmission lines, which is what Mariner East II will be, the 20 year average for fatalities has been one per year and the 20 year average for injuries has been two per year. Now let me be clear, every injury, every fatality is one too many. But I'm asking you to understand those statistics. And I support PHMSA which is working hard right now to actually increase the safety of pipelines.

As many people have stated, this pipeline will be transmitting --- transporting constituents that are used as a feedstock in things that we all use, water bottles, laptops, Aspirin, football helmets, those kind of things. And it cannot be understated that this is Pennsylvania's opportunity to leverage a resource in our State to become an energy hub and become and to build our economy. And we're talking about 30,000 jobs during this construction. We're talking about \$4.2 billion in economic impact to the Commonwealth during construction. After that, we're talking about 300 to 400 jobs on an annual basis. And \$100 to \$150 million of impact to the State of Pennsylvania. Thank you so much. And I just want to commend everyone here for a lot of thoughtful comments. Proud to be American

[Skelly Holmbeck \(8-10-16 Meeting Transcript\)](#) (6343)