

Diane Ward

902 Grove School Road

Wysox PA 18854

570-268-0978

pekin\_2@yahoo.com

**Public Comments on Environmental Impacts of Williams Atlantic Sunrise Project Wyoming  
County Meeting on 6/12/17 Tunkhannock**

My name and address is: (as listed above). I am a resident of Bradford County but also a property owner in Wyoming County in Tunkhannock Township and Braintrim Township. I am an owner of properties at Lake Carey and along the Susquehanna River and my input today focuses on the preservation of water resources in Wyoming County and beyond.

Attachment E-2 of the Wyoming County permit documents details the current plan for 295 impacts on Wyoming County water resources via pipeline crossings. The preponderance of these are open cut or dam and pump, with 12 crossings by conventional bore, 2 by flume and NONE by HDD. The plan calls for the Susquehanna River to be crossed at Eaton Township by Coffey Dam.

These appalling facts speak for themselves. No use of HDD? Coffey Dam crossing of the Susquehanna River? Should the DEP permit the crossing techniques as currently planned, this belies our state's commitment to the Chesapeake Bay cleanup. The use of long range "peak to peak" HDD crossings at selected sites, at whatever expense, would save thousands of trees, prevent erosion, maintain water quality, retain viewscape and preserve continuous forest lands. HDD crossings, when properly engineered and installed, do not blow out. An HDD crossing of the Susquehanna River would prevent sedimentation of the river during coffer construction, and put the Atlantic Sunrise pipeline safely and very deeply below the river bottom, likely much deeper than planned with the coffer dam construction technique. The alternatives document prepared by Williams did nothing to convince me that open cut, dam and pump, flumes and coffer dams are the way to go. In the absence of HDD, I would propose the "do nothing option": scrap the project and avoid all environmental impact. Since that is not likely to happen, I strongly suggest HDD where there are forests to save, erosion to prevent, or sensitive locations where a deeper pipeline is safer. You pick the sites, but clearly the Susquehanna River is one of the crossings that deserves this treatment. One of the inconsistencies that appalls me the most is that in the siting of this pipeline, one of the basic siting principles stated by Williams for

the project route was to select a route where the Susquehanna River crossing was consistent with HDD. The use of HDD for the river was implied to the public at that time. If HDD is not to be used, then the routing could potentially have been very different. As far as I am concerned, Williams made a commitment to HDD when they included this factor in their routing principles and rationale and I am holding them to this commitment.

Another issue concerns how projects discuss and share greenfield and co-location statistics. Williams' stated definition for co-location, "lies within or abuts", is deceiving to the public. Everyone likes to hear that pipelines have been "co-located" versus greenfield. Co-location which only abuts, or has only 5% overlap or other minimal overlap as I have seen in the details of this project, results in significant deforestation and should not be allowed to be given the co-location label. If Williams' definition is driven by the DEP's definition, then the DEP's definition should be changed. Co-location should be defined as a complete or significant overlap (pick a number - 75%?) with the existing right of way. Locations which abut or have minimal overlap should be defined with new terminology.

I am also concerned about the current plan to use alternative route 12A - which places the pipeline in the vicinity of Leonard Creek near SR307, with the blast zone encompassing the Beaumont Inn, where weddings and other large events are conducted. I am also opposed to any plans, stated or unstated, which may or may not exist to increase the use of the Chapin dehydrator as a result of this project. This facility has already had a number of issues and violates the environment and lifestyle of the surrounding community with unplanned emissions, vibrations, and other intrusions which the DEP is certainly aware of.

The Atlantic Sunrise project is an unnecessary, money making project for the gas industry. It will sell gas which is, in many cases, being stolen from royalty owners who are not being afforded the protection of the minimum royalty guarantee of 12 1/2 % due them. HB557, which is the current bill in a string of bills that the PA legislature has not yet passed, would afford them some protection and should be passed before any additional gas is sold. Although I am not personally affected by payment issues, this is an important issue to the community at large and I support the cause of fair payment to royalty owners.

My personal issue is the environmental impact which cannot be mitigated, trees destroyed which will never be allowed to grow back, and additional erosion, flooding, and sediment load in the Susquehanna River basin. If Chesapeake can successfully use HDD for peak to peak small stream crossings for large gathering lines, then Williams should be using HDD on this FERC project wherever possible despite the cost. They owe that much to us and to the environment.

Thank you,

Diane Ward