



July 29, 2016

Ms. Roberta Zwier
Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC.
2800 Post Oak Boulevard, Level 6
Houston, Texas 77056

Re: Technical Deficiency
Atlantic Sunrise Pipeline
Application No E36-947
APS No. ID No. 880147
Conestoga, Drumore, Manor, Martic, Mount Joy, Rapho, Pequea, Eden, East Donegal,
and West Hempfield Townships, Borough of Mount Joy
Lancaster County

Dear Ms. Zwier:

The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has reviewed the above referenced application package and has identified the following significant technical deficiencies. *Chapter 105 Dam Safety and Waterway Management regulations* includes information that will aid you in responding to some of the deficiencies listed below. The deficiencies are based on applicable laws and regulations, and the guidance sets forth DEP's preferred means of satisfying the applicable regulatory requirements.

As you are aware, Department staff in three different regional offices is reviewing seven other Chapter 105 permit applications associated with this project. While the regional offices have coordinated the review of the applications and the identification of deficiencies, it is possible that deficiencies raised in the Department's other deficiency letters may be applicable to this permit, even though not stated herein. The Department recommends that Williams evaluate whether any of the deficiencies identified in the other Chapter 105 permit application deficiency letters, beyond those deficiencies identified in this letter, necessitate revisions in this permit application.

Note: Due to multiple reviewers and the size of the document there may be some duplicate deficiencies although every attempt was made to eliminate duplications.

Technical Deficiencies

1. Upon further evaluation by the Department and in accordance with the 25 Pa. Code § 105.13(e), complete delineation of impacts to wetlands, streams and floodways needs to be provided for the Department to perform the required environmental review of the application and make a proper permit decision. The impacts to wetlands, streams and flood ways cannot be based on remote sensing. 25 Pa. Code §105.13(e)(1)(i)(A) requires a complete demarcation of the floodplains and regulated waters of this Commonwealth on the site. This

requirement will not be waived under 25 Pa. Code § 105.13(k) as remote sensing or national wetland inventory data alone may not identify all wetlands, streams and floodways present, nor does it adequately identify any unique characteristics of the wetlands, or the functions that they provide. As such, the remote sensed impacts will require in field verification, and all relevant portions of the application will need to be revised prior to making a permit decision. *[25 Pa. Code §105.13(e)]*

2. Several flume crossings are shown in the ES Plan Sheets along the length of the pipeline. Clarify, with the drawings, if the flume crossing is proposed in a regulated waterway. If the crossings are located within a regulated waterway, provide a detailed impact table for the resource crossing identifying all the impacts associated with this crossing. Revise all other application documents to reflect any additional impacts. *[25 Pa. Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]*
3. Provide adequate provisions for shut-off in the event of break or rupture. Provide locations and description of how this action will be completed in the event rupture occurs. *[25 Pa. Code §105.301(9)]*
4. Provide agency clearance letters and copies of correspondence from the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission, Pennsylvania Game Commission, Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the proposed pipeline, including no-access parcels, and the mitigation area, and identify any mitigation measures that are recommended or required. Please be advised that additional deficiencies may be generated pending responses from resource agencies. *[25 Pa. Code §105.14(b)(4)]*
5. Provide clearance or approval from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) for cultural, archeological, and historic resources for the proposed water obstructions and encroachments, mitigation area, and areas necessary to construct the water obstructions and encroachments. *[25 Pa. Code §105.13(e)(1)(x); §105.14(b)(4) & §105.14(b)(5)]*
6. Provide plans or a detail for the restoration of stream beds at open cut stream crossings. This should include replacement of native stream bed material. This should include replacement of native stream bed material and assurance that no significant changes in bed grade occur. *[25 Pa. Code §§105.13(e)(1)(i)(G) & 105.13(e)(1)(ix) & 105.1, Mitigation & 105.13(e)(1)(x) & 105.15(a)(1) & 105.14(b)(4) & 105.16(d) & 105.13(e)(1)(i)(G) & §105.242(c)]*
7. Explain how the final “restored” wetland elevations will be determined. *[25 Pa. Code §105.13(e)(1)(ix)]*

8. It appears that several waters of the Commonwealth could be crossed using trenchless installation methods. Provide a revised alternatives analysis that incorporates a discussion of alternative crossing techniques (conventional bore, HDD, micro-tunneling, etc.) addressing each resource crossing individually and explaining why trenchless installation methods are not appropriate. *[25 Pa. Code §§105.13(e)(1)(viii) & 105.18a]*
9. The following deficiencies relate to the proposed HDD *[25 Pa. Code §§105.3(a)(4) & 105.11(a) & 105.13(e)(1)(i) & 105.13(e)(1)(iii) & 105.13(e)(1)(x) & 105.14(b)(4) & 105.301(1) & 105.301(7) & 105.301(5) & 105.301(3) & 105.151(1) and (3) & 105.161(a)(3) and (4)]*:
 - a. Provide plans and cross sections indicating pipe size, placement, and locations for all wetlands, streams, floodways and floodplains where the testing discharges are proposed. The cross sections should depict, at a minimum, the proposed structures, resource boundaries, stream bed and banks, water surface elevation.
 - b. Provide a description and plans of how the water will be discharged, the methods to be utilized, what equipment and structures are proposed to be placed and utilized in waters of the Commonwealth, the length of time which obstructions will remain in place.
 - c. Provide cross sections, profiles, and hydraulic analysis for piping placed in existing stream culverts and along and within stream channels.
 - d. Identify on the plans the location of the proposed HDD electric guide wire, and provide an analysis to show that the wire will not present a hazard to river users.
10. Public water supplies are located within in the vicinity of the proposed pipeline. The application states that there will not be any impacts the water supplies as a result of the pipeline. Provide the supporting documentation that led to this conclusion. Additionally, we recommend that you contact any public water supplier in order to help determine if your project will impact the public water supplier and subsequently provide documentation of interactions, through correspondence, with each supplier. Ensure all Public water supplies in the vicinity of the proposed pipeline are identified within the location map. Enclosed are instructions on how to utilize DEP's eMapPA to identify public water supplies in the vicinity of your project. *[25 Pa. Code §§105.13(e)(1)(ii) & 105.13(e)(1)(x) & 105.14(b)(5)]*
11. The application states that topsoil will be segregated. Provide a revised Enclosure D of the Environmental Assessment that explains how the topsoil depth will be determined in the field. *[25 Pa. Code §§105.15(a) & 105.15(b) & Environmental Assessment Form Instructions]*

12. Revise the application to provide a planting plan to re-establish woody vegetation within the temporary construction ROWs in riparian and wetland areas that are currently forested or dominated by woody species, as was previously proposed and implemented by Williams Transco on a similar project. *[25 Pa. Code §§105.13(e)(1)(ix) & 105.16(d)]*
13. The functions and values provided by shrub species more closely match those provided by forested areas than are provided by emergent areas. Revise the plans to incorporate the replanting of woody species in forested/ scrub shrub areas in the permanent ROW. *[25 Pa. Code §105.13(e)(1)(ix)]*
14. Several streambank stabilization methods are proposed in the Erosion and Sedimentation Control plans. Identify where each type of stabilization measure will be utilized. *[25 Pa. Code §105.21(a)(1)]*
15. Revise the alternatives analysis to show the 600-foot survey corridor and demonstrate that impacts to waters of the Commonwealth within the corridor have been minimized to the maximum extent practicable. The demonstration should address each crossing individually. *[25 Pa. Code §§105.13(e)(1)(viii) & 105.18a]*
16. The application incorrectly identifies watercourses as “waterbodies”. Watercourses and bodies of water are defined differently under Chapter 105. Provide revised copies of all applicable documents. *[25 Pa. Code §105.21(a)(1)]*
17. The application states that blasting may be required to install the proposed pipeline. Clarify if blasting will be necessary in or along waters of the Commonwealth, and identify where it will be proposed. Please be advised that blasting permit from the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission may be needed. *[25 Pa. Code §105.21(a)(1)]*
18. An Aids to Navigation (ATON) plan may be required for this project. Contact Thomas Burrell with the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission at 717.705.7838 regarding ATON requirements, and provide a copy of the ATON approval to DEP. *[25 Pa. Code §105.14(b)(2)]*
19. The Joint Permit Application Plans shall be the final plans for construction. Remove the reference to “Preliminary/Draft” from all plan sheets. *[25 Pa. Code §105.13(e)(1)(i)(C)]*
20. Installation of trench plugs as depicted in the profile view on the E&S Control Plans is likely to result in adverse impacts to the hydrology of waters of the Commonwealth. Provide a revised detail showing the trench plug continuing to the bottom of the trench instead of the top of the bedding material. *[25 Pa. Code §105.18a]*

21. The application states in numerous locations that the criteria used during routing surveys included “minimizing effects at any single wetland crossing to 1 acre or less whenever practicable”. The Department is unable to determine why the 1 acre threshold was utilized when Chapter 105 regulations require minimizing impacts to wetlands to the maximum extent practicable. Revise the application to demonstrate that the routings avoid and minimize wetland impacts to the maximum extent practicable. Transco should assess the applicability of this deficiency to the other counties that are part of this project. *[25 Pa. Code §§105.13(e)(1)(vii) & 105.18a]*
22. According to the Hydrologic & Hydraulic Calculations for Waterbody Crossings (H&H) several waterbody crossings are to be crossed by a dam and pump method. Many of these crossings have excessive Peak Flows that could not be managed by pumping. Detail how these crossings will be stable and how the waterbodies will be successfully passed through or around the work area. Provide tables in the plan drawings depicting pump sizing and rate information to be used by contractors. *[25 Pa. Code §105.161]*
23. The H&H report, Peak Flow Calculations depict culvert pipe diameter and number of culvert pipes for some crossings but not all. Some crossings state “Cross When No Storm Forecasted” in the Flume Diameter and Number of Pipes columns. Provide crossing types and sizing data for these crossings. *[25 Pa. Code §105.161]*
24. In reviewing the plans, trench plugs are indicated to be installed at wetland/upland interfaces. Additional trench plugs may be necessary along the length of the crossing due to length and/or slope to maintain hydrology throughout the wetland. Please review and revise accordingly. Some additional guidance is available within the PA E&S Control BMP Manual. *[25 Pa. Code §105.13(e)]*
25. Provide a detailed impact map identifying all the impacts associated with the following crossings. Revise all other application documents to reflect the additional impacts. *[25 Pa. Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]*
 - a. Permanent Access Road AR-LA-020 crosses waterway WW-T25-2001, shown on the ES Plan 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-AR-LA-020.
 - b. Access Road AR-LA-023.1 crosses waterway WW-T32-2002, identified on the ES Plan Sheet 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-AR-LA-023.1.
 - c. Access Road AR-LA-030 is in the floodway and crosses waterway WW-T25-4002, identified on the ES Plan Sheet 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-AR-LA-030 and shown on the Topographic Project Location Key Map 24-1600-70-14—A/0.00-01, Sheet 8 of 8.

- d. Access Road AR-LA-033.1 in in the floodway of regulated waters as identified on the ES Plan Sheet 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-AR-LA-033.1.
 - e. ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 16 – There appears to be a regulated waters crossing between Stations 920+39 and 921+00.
 - f. ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 22 – Verify if there is a regulated water crossing at Station 1250+00.
 - g. The limit of disturbance (LOD) is within the assumed 50 foot floodway of Streams WW-T24-3001A and WW-T24-3001B as shown on ES Drawings 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 32.
 - h. ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 33 – Verify if there is a regulated water crossing at Station 1877+00.
26. Provide a Topographical Project Location Key Map for the following access roads and contractor staging area. Revise all other application documents to reflect any additional impacts. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]*.
- a. Access Road AR-LA-026.2.1, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-AR-LA-026.2.1.
 - b. Access Road AR-LA-026.4, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-AR-LA-026.4.
 - c. Access Road AR-LA-023.2 and Contractor Staging Area L-1-006.3, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-AR-LA-023.2:
 - d. Access Road AR-LA-029.3, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-AR-LA-029.3.
27. Provide an Impact Map for the following items. Revise all other application documents to reflect the additional impacts. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]*
- a. The culvert replacement at Stream WW-T10-004, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 4 of 34.
 - b. For Stream WW-RS-001, shown on ES, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9 sheet 5 of 34.

- c. For Stream WW-RS-1002, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 9 of 34.
 - d. For Stream WW-RS-1001 and Wetland W-RS-1003, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 11 of 34.
 - e. For Stream WW-RS-T49-1001, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 12 of 34.
 - f. For Stream WW-RS-1009, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 13 of 34.
 - g. For Stream WW-RS-1005, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 14 of 34.
 - h. For Stream WW-RS-2002, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 20 of 34.
 - i. For Wetlands W-RS-2001 and W-RS-2001A, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 21 of 34.
 - j. For Stream WW-RS-T49-2001 shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 22 of 34.
28. Reductions of Limits of Disturbance in regulated waters could result in reduced impacts. It is recommended that the regulated waters of the project be re-evaluated and construction limits be reduced where applicable to eliminated or reduce project impacts. It appears that the following impacts can be avoided or reduced for the following locations. It is shown to be possible for several other resource crossings. Revise the plans, incorporate these alternatives to avoid or limit the impacts or provide justifications for why the avoidance or reduction cannot be performed at these locations. [25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(viii), 105.13(e)(1)(x) & 105.21(a)(1)]
- a. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/M-0147-0.58-01, Wetland W-T31-001B – can be avoided by reducing the LOD.
 - b. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/7.15-01, Stream WW-T10-100 – can be reduced by reducing the LOD, as is shown to be possible through Wetland W-T10-101 and Stream WW-T10-004.

- c. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/8.20-01, Stream WW-T31-003 – can be avoided by reducing the 100 foot LOD width to 90 feet or 75 feet.
- d. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/07.47-01, Wetland W-T20-002 – can be avoided by reducing the 100 foot LOD width to 90 feet or 75 feet, and Wetland T20-002 - can be avoided by shifting the pipeline to the northeast.
- e. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/07.47-01, Sheet 1 of 3, Stream WW-T20-002 –can be reduced by limiting the ROW to 75 feet.
- f. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/8.20-01, Stream WW-T35-1001 – can be reduced by moving the pipeline to the south.
- g. Stream WW-T35-1001 –can be avoided by reducing the 100 foot LOD width to 90 feet or 75 feet.
- h. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/9.59-01, Stream WW-T10-1001 - could be reduced by shifting the proposed pipeline route to the southwest. The impact can be avoided by reducing the 100 foot LOD width to 90 feet or 75 feet.
- i. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/9.96-01, Stream WW-T10-1002 – can be avoided by reducing the 100 foot LOD width to 90 feet or 75 feet.
- j. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/9.96-01, Stream WW-T10-1003 – can be avoided by reducing the 100 foot LOD width to 90 feet or 75 feet
- k. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/10.88-01, Stream WW-T35-1002 – can be avoided by reducing the 100 foot LOD width to 90 feet or 75 feet.
- l. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/9.96-01, Stream WW-T10-1002 –can be avoided by reducing the 100 foot LOD width to 90 feet or 75 feet.
- m. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/9.96-01, Stream WW-T10-1003 –can be avoided by reducing the 100 foot LOD width to 90 feet or 75 feet.
- n. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/10.88-01, Stream WW-T35-1002 – can be avoided by reducing the 100 foot LOD width to 90 feet or 75 feet.
- o. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/13.88-01, Stream WW-T36-1006, - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.

- p. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/7.10-01, Wetland W-T10-100 can be avoided by reducing the LOD to 55 feet from the proposed pipe, as is shown to be possible through Wetland W-T10-101. Wetland W-T10-101A could be reduced by limiting the temporary construction right-of-way (ROW) to 75 feet as is proposed at stream crossing WW-T10-004 and W-T10-100 and W-T10-101A could be reduced or eliminated by moving the proposed pipeline location to the east.
- q. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/08.00-01, Sheet 1 of 2, Stream WW-T31-002A - can be avoided by shifting the pipeline to the southwest.
- r. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/10.43-01, Stream WW-T36-1003 - can be avoided by further reducing the LOD.
- s. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/10.88-01 permanent impacts to the watercourse could be reduced by shifting the proposed pipeline to the north or south.
- t. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/11.00-01, Stream WW-T35-1002A - the north-eastern impact can be avoided by further reducing the LOD.
- u. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/13.60-01, Wetland W-T36-1002 -the northern impact can be avoided by revising the LOD.
- v. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/13.62-01, Stream WW-T93-1001 and Stream WW-T92-1002 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline or by shifting the pipeline to the southeast.
- w. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/13.62-01, Stream WW-T93-1001 and Stream WW-T92-1002 - could be reduced by shifting the proposed pipeline to the south.
- x. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/13.70-01, Stream WW-T36-1004, - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
- y. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/13.72-01, Wetland W-T36-1003A and Wetland W-T36-1003C - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
- z. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/14.26-01, Wetland W-T36-1004 - could be minimized by relocating the pipeline to the northeast.
- aa. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/14.26-02, Wetland W-T36-1004-1 and Wetland W-T36-1004-2 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.

- Wetland W-T36-1004-1 and Wetland W-T36-1004-2 - could be minimized by relocating the pipeline to the south.
- bb. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/14.64-01, Stream WW-T36-1007 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - cc. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/15.33-01, Stream WW-T20-1005 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline. Stream WW-T20-1005 - could be minimized by relocating the pipeline to the northeast or southwest.
 - dd. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/17.01-01, Stream WW-T24-1001- could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - ee. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/18.10-01, Stream WW-T11-2001 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - ff. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/18.85-01, Stream WW-T11-2002 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline, or by relocating the pipeline to the east. Stream WW-T11-2002 - could be minimized by relocating the pipeline to the northeast.
 - gg. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/19.97-01, Wetland W-T32-2004 - could be minimized by relocating the pipeline to the east.
 - hh. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/20.01-01, Stream WW-T24-2001 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - ii. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/20.81-01, Stream WW-T10-2005 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - jj. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/21.11-01, Wetland W-T32-2001 - could be minimized by relocating the pipeline to the north.
 - kk. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/21.14-01, Stream WW-T32-2002 - could be minimized by further reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - ll. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/22.37-01, Stream WW-T10-2004 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - mm. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/23.02-01, Stream WW-T10-2002 - could be minimized

- by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
- nn. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/23.61-01, Stream WW-T42-2004 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - oo. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/23.90-01, Stream WW-T42-2003 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - pp. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/30.13-01, Stream WW-T31-3003 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - qq. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/30.40-01, Wetland W-T31-3003 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - rr. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/30.40-01, Stream WW-T31-3003 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - ss. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/30.63-01, Stream WW-T31-3009 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - tt. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/31.18-01, Wetland W-T31-3006 - the northern wetland impacts could be minimized by further reducing the LOD.
 - uu. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/31.59-01, Stream WW-T31-3007 - could be minimized by further reducing the eastern boundary of the LOD.
 - vv. Impact Maps 24-1600-70-09-A/32.27-01 and 24-1600-70-20-A/32.27-01, Stream WW-T31-3006 and Wetland W-T31-3004 - impacts to one or both of the regulated Waters could be minimized by relocating the pipeline.
 - ww. Stream WW-T31-3005, Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/33.00-01 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - xx. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/33.57-01, Stream WW-T31-3002A and Stream WW-T31-3002 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline. Stream WW-T31-3002A - could be minimized by relocating the pipeline to the southwest.
 - yy. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/33.62-01, Wetland W-T31-3002 and Wetland W-T31-3002-1 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline,

Wetland W-T31-3002 - could be minimized by relocating the pipeline to the southwest,
Wetland W-T31-3002-1 - could be minimized by relocating the pipeline to the southwest.

- zz. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/34.02, Stream WW-T31-3001 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - aaa. Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/34.03-01, Wetland W-T31-3001 - could be minimized by relocating the pipeline to the northeast or southwest.
 - bbb. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/34.47-01, Stream WW-T24-3001 - could be minimized by reducing the LOD from the center of the pipeline.
 - ccc. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/0.24-01, Wetland WW-T10-001A - impacts to the wetland could be avoided by shifting the pipeline to the southwest.
29. The streams lengths shown on the following Impact Maps are inconsistent with the "Impact Table for Individual Permit Application". Clarify the discrepancy and revise the applicable document as necessary. *[25 Pa Code §§105.13(e)(1)(viii), 105.21(a)(1) & 25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]*
- a. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/7.15-01, Stream WW-T10-100.
 - b. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/M-0147-0.58-01, Stream WW-T10-003 and Stream WW-T10-003A.
 - c. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/M-0184-0.85-01, Stream WW-T10-004.
 - d. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/7.15-01, Stream WW-T10-100.
 - e. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/08.00-01, Sheet 1 of 2, Streams WW-T31-002 and WW-T31-002A.
 - f. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/8.20-01, Stream WW-T31-003.
 - g. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/9.59-01, Stream WW-T10-1001.
 - h. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/9.96-01, Stream WW-T10-1002.
 - i. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/10.11-01, Stream WW-T10-1003.

- j. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/10.88-01, Stream WW-T35-1002.
 - k. Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/11.00-01, Stream WW-T35-1002A.
30. It appears Access Road AR-LA-004, shown on Erosion and Sediment (ES) Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-AR-LA-004, will cross a regulated waters at a point located near Station 4+00. Verify and provide revised application documents reflecting any additional impacts. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]*
31. The following deficiencies relate to Access Road AR-LA-010.2, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-AR-LA-010.2 *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]*
- a. Provide the access road location on the Impact Drawing 24-1600-70-14-A/0.00-01.
 - b. Parts of the access road are shown in the floodway. Provide revised application documents reflecting the additional impacts.
32. Clarify if Access Road AR-LA-018, shown on Topographical Project Location Key Map 24-1600-70-14-A/0.00-01, Sheet 5 of 8 is the same as Access Road AR-LA-018.3, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-AR-LA-018.3. Revise the application documents as appropriate. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]*
33. It appears that the Access Road AR-LA-023.2 crosses regulatory waters between Stations 9+00 and 10+00 and the Contractor Staging Area L-1-006.3, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-AR-LA-023.2 may be in the floodway. Verify and provide revised applications documents reflecting any additional impacts. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]*
34. Provide the ES Drawing for Access Road AR-LE-027, as shown on Topographical Project Location Key Map 24-1600-70-14-A/0.00-01, Sheet 7. Revise all other application documents to reflect any additional impacts. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]*
35. It appears that the pipeline will cross regulatory waters between Stations 325+00 and 330+00 (Latitude: 39.903493°N, Longitude: 76.298206°W. Verify and provide revised application documents reflecting any additional impacts. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]*

36. The following deficiencies relate to ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 13 [25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]
- a. The extent of Stream WW-T92-1002 is inconsistent with Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/13.62-01. Clarify the discrepancy and revise the application documents, as appropriate.
 - b. Wetland Crossing W-T36-1004 is inconsistent with Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/14.26-01. Clarify the discrepancy and revise the application documents, as appropriate.
 - c. Clarify the designation of Wetland W-RS-T36-1004-1. The designation of the wetland is inconsistent with Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/14.26-02. Revise the application documents, as appropriate.
37. On ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9, Sheet 22 of 34, the impacts to Stream WW-T42-2004 are shown to be minimized; however, Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/23.61-01 depicts a permanent crossing. Clarify the discrepancy and revise the application documents, as appropriate. [25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]:
38. Clarify if the Contractor Staging Area CS-CSA-LA-1-005.1, shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-CSA-CS-CSA-LA-1-005.1 is the same area as CS-CSA-LA-1-005 shown on the Topographical Project Location Key Map 24-1600-70-14A/0.00-01, Sheet 5. Revise the application documents as necessary. [25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]
39. Provide ES Drawings for Contractor Staging Areas CS-CSA-LA-1-006.2 and CS-CSA-LA-1-006.1 as shown on the Topographical Project Location Key Map 24-1600-70-14A/0.00-01, Sheet 6. Also provide ES Drawings for Contractor Staging Areas CS-CSA-LA-1-007.1 as shown on the Topographical Project Location Key Map 24-1600-70-14A/0.00-01, Sheet 7. Revise the application documents as necessary. [25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]
40. Indicate the site location on the Topographical Project Location Key Map and provide an Impact Map for the Hydrostatic Test Water Withdrawal Area LA-163 as shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-CS-LA-163 and for the Hydrostatic Test Water Withdrawal Area LA-164 as shown on ES Drawing 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9-CS-LA-164. Revise the application documents as necessary to reflect any additional impacts. [25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x)]

41. The application does not adequately explain the need to install the pipeline across watercourses “in the wet”. Installation of the pipeline across watercourses “in the wet” may result in adverse impacts to water quality in watercourses that are being crossed. Select an alternate crossing technique for each crossing where work “in the wet” is currently proposed, and remove the “in the wet” detail from the ES plans or provide a demonstration that the selected crossing technique avoids and minimizes impacts to the watercourse to the greatest extent practicable. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(viii)]*
42. Impact Drawings – Clarify what Existing TGPL R/W stands for as shown in the Legend. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)]*
43. The stream length on Stream WW-T10-001 on Map Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/0.24-01 is inconsistent with regard to the stream length impact. Clarify the discrepancy and revise the applicable document as necessary. *[25 Pa Code §§105.13(e)(1)(viii) and 105.13(e)(1)(x)]*
44. On Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/M-0147-0.58-01, Stream WW-T10-003A – A small corner of the LOD is shown encroaching in the floodway of the stream in the north-west vicinity where the LOD widens from 75 feet to 100 feet. Revise the plan to avoid the impact or provide justification for why the LOD cannot be reduced in this location. *[25 Pa Code §§105.13(e)(1)(vii) & 105.13(e)(1)(viii)]*
45. The following deficiencies relate to Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/7.10-01 *[25 Pa Code §§105.13(e)(1)(viii) & 105.21(a)(1)]*
 - a. Clarify the wetland boundaries. It is difficult to differentiate the boundary line between W-T10-101A and W-T10-101C.
46. The following deficiencies relate to Impact Map 24-1600-70-20-A/14.26-02 *[25 Pa Code §§105.13(e)(1)(viii) & 105.13(e)(1)(x)]*
 - a. Wetland W-T36-1004-2 - It appears that permanent impacts to the wetland will occur which are not identified in the application. Revise all documentation as necessary and explain why this impact is necessary.
47. The following deficiencies relate to Impact Map 24-1600-70-09-A/34.02-01 *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(viii)]*

- a. Stream WW-T31-3001 - Utility line crossings of streams should be accomplished so that the line is at a right angle, where possible. Revise the plan to minimize impacts by crossing at a right angle or provide justification for why the pipeline cannot be revised at this location.
48. The stream and wetland boundaries overlap on several impact sheets. Provide revised impact sheets with the wetland and stream boundaries clearly delineated. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(i)(A)]*
49. Provide a typical plan showing the crossing layout. The DEP finds it unclear where the dam and pump by-pass will be located in relation to the Bridge Equipment Crossing (BEC) and where the BEC will be located in relation to the pipeline. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(i)(C)]*
50. Provide specific sizing for the BEC pipes, for each resource crossing, which will meet the specification provided on Sheet 24-1600-70-26-A/BEC-01, Note 8. Ensure to provide sufficient documentation supporting the size specification. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(i)(C)]*
51. Provide documentation the BEC pipes, for each resource crossing are sized so that the normal flow depth in the pipes is less than half the diameter of the pipes. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(g)]*
52. Changes in proposed project impacts at various locations have occurred since initial application submission. Clearly explain what led to these changes for each location where increased impacts are now proposed and clearly explain why these impacts are necessary. In addition, clearly explain why some impacts have been lessened and explain why this can't occur at other locations. *[25 PA Code §105.13(e)(1)(viii)]*
53. Several small and headwater tributaries will be impacted by this project. Avoid impacting the tributaries or explain how they will be restored to the pre-construction conditions when 2-foot contours are being utilized; which are, in many cases, greater than height of the banks of the watercourses, and provide a site specific restoration detail for each watercourse. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(i)(G) & §105.13(e)(1)(ix) & §105.1, Mitigation & §105.13(e)(1)(x) & §105.15(a)(1) & §105.14(b)(4) & §105.16(d)]*
54. Provide a detailed site specific pollution prevention and control plan that addresses potential inadvertent returns as well as hazardous and non-hazardous chemical releases. *[25 PA Code § 105.21(a)(3)]*

55. Specific to the *Permittee Responsible Mitigation Plan* [25 PA §§Code 105.13(e)(1)(ix), 105.20a, and 105.21(a)(1)]

- a. According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, “Bog turtles usually occur in small, discrete populations, generally occupying open-canopy, unpolluted, herbaceous sedge meadows and fens bordered by wooded areas”. Therefore:
 - i. Explain how the proposed mitigation will enhance bog turtle habitat when woody species are proposed to be planted and the area will no longer be maintained in an emergent state.
 - ii. Clearly explain why planting woody species in a bog turtle wetland is an appropriate form of compensation to offset PFO wetland impacts.
- b. As currently proposed, the compensatory mitigation easement boundaries are likely to be difficult for the landowner and for Sunoco Pipeline, L.P. to identify. Provide a revised plan to include a method of permanently demarcating the easement boundaries.
- c. In regards to two new Sunoco Pipeline, L.P. pipelines that are proposed to cross the Hibred Farms mitigation site:
 - i. It appears that the Sunoco Pipeline, L.P.’s construction workspace will encroach on the proposed easement boundaries. Revise the plans to show the construction workspace, and provide documentation to show that the mitigation will remain viable.
 - ii. Provide documentation from Sunoco Pipeline, L.P. to support the assertion that the proposed mitigation easement boundary will not conflict with the proposed ROW for the Sunoco pipelines, and that no future expansion of the existing pipeline ROW will be attempted.
 - iii. Explain how invasive species will be managed in the Sunoco Pipeline, L.P. ROW, or explain why management is not necessary.
- d. The Planting Plan in the Permittee Responsible Mitigation Plan proposes wetland tree and shrub plantings at densities of 200 per acre. However, Table 6 in Section 6 of the Permittee Responsible Mitigation Plan indicates that no PFO wetlands will occur in the post-mitigation condition.

- i. Explain why tree and shrub plantings of 200 stems per acre will not result in PFO wetland creation.
 - ii. If PFO wetland creation is not anticipated, explain why the proposed mitigation is appropriate to offset PFO wetland impacts.
 - e. While the Department understands that RES will implement and conduct monitoring and maintenance of the mitigation area on Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Company's behalf, Williams Transco, as the permittee, will ultimately be responsible for the establishment of the mitigation area. Revise the mitigation plan report to clearly reflect this.
 - f. According to the provided functions and values assessments for wetlands W-T10-100, and W-T20-002, the wetlands provide a principal function of fish and shellfish habitat. However, according to the application, the Permittee Responsible Mitigation area will not provide this function. Therefore, explain how the mitigation area is appropriate to compensate for impacts to wetlands W-T10-100 and W-T20-002.
 - g. Explain why the application states that the Hibred Farms Mitigation area does not provide principal functions of flood flow alteration, nutrient removal, sediment/toxicant retention, uniqueness/heritage, sediment stabilization, and production export, but will when mitigation activities are complete. The DEP finds it unclear how the function of the wetland will be changed through the mitigation procedures proposed.
56. Section 6 of *Permittee Responsible Mitigation Plan* indicates that no exceptional value PFO wetlands will be impacted in Lancaster County. However, Table L(d)-1 in Attachment L of Enclosure D of the Environmental Assessment identifies wetland W-T10-003 as being an Exceptional Value, PFO wetland. Clarify this inconsistency and revise all documentation in the application as necessary. [25 PA Code §105.21(a)(1)]
57. Section 6 of the *Permittee Responsible Mitigation Plan* states that impacts to PSS wetlands are temporary because the areas will be allowed to revert to PSS wetlands. The application further states that a 10-foot permanent ROW will be maintained as frequently as once annually. Provide documentation to support the claim that scrub shrub wetlands will establish with such frequent mowing and further clarify in the application if vegetative maintenance will involve herbicides. [25 PA Code §§ 105.18a & 105.21(a)(1)]

58. It appears that many of the stream crossings can be accessed from both banks, thereby eliminating the need for temporary road crossings and limiting impacts to the watercourses. Revise the alternatives analysis to explain why each proposed temporary road crossing is necessary. *[25 PA Code §105.13(e)(1)(viii)]*
59. The functions and values data sheets are not completed in their entirety. Provide completed data sheets. *[25 PA Code §105.21(a)(1)]*
60. The functions and values data sheet for wetland W-T20-002 does not appear to be completed properly. Provide a revised data sheet. *[25 PA Code §105.21(a)(1)]*
61. Provide plans and cross sections indicating pipe size, placement, and locations for all wetlands, streams, floodways and floodplains where the proposed water withdrawal piping is to be installed. The cross sections should depict, at a minimum, the proposed structures, resource boundaries, stream bed and banks, water surface elevation. Provide a description and plans of how the water will be withdrawn, the methods to be utilized, what equipment and structures are proposed to be placed and utilized in waters of the Commonwealth, the length of time which obstructions will remain in place, and other details. Provide a cross sections, profiles, and hydraulic analysis for piping placed in existing stream culverts and along and within stream channels. *[25 PA Code 105.13(e)(1)]*
62. The following deficiencies relate to the proposed hydrostatic test water withdrawal *[25 PA Code §§ 105.13(e)(1) &105.31(b)(1)]*:
 - a. Provide plans and cross sections indicating pipe size, placement, and locations for all wetlands, streams, floodways and floodplains where the proposed water withdrawal piping is to be installed. The cross sections should depict, at a minimum, the proposed structures, resource boundaries, stream bed and banks, water surface elevation. If a permanent intake, outfall or pipe will be installed in Stream WW-T20-1001, a Submerged Lands License Agreement will be required.
 - b. Provide a description and plans of how the water will be withdrawn, the methods to be utilized, what equipment and structures are proposed to be placed and utilized in waters of the Commonwealth, the length of time which obstructions will remain in place.
 - c. Provide a cross sections, profiles, and hydraulic analysis for piping placed in existing stream culverts and along and within stream channels, if applicable.

63. Stream WW-T20-1001 is navigable waterway of the Commonwealth. Therefore, installation of the pipeline requires a Submerged Lands License Agreement. Provide additional documentation as indicated on the enclosed form. *[25 PA Code §105.31(b)(1)]*
64. Revise section A.9 of Enclosure D of the Environmental Assessment to discuss and identify impacts to preserved farms and/or farms with agriculture preservation easements or restrictions. *[25 Pa Code §§105.13(e)(1)(x) & §105.15]*
65. Section B1 of Enclosure D states that wetlands will be monitored for a period of 3 to 5 years. Clarify what factors will be used to determine the length of the monitoring period and provide a plan to correct any deficiencies identified during the monitoring period.
66. The application incorrectly identifies the chapter 93 designation of WW-T10-001 as CWF, MF, when the correct 25 Pa Code, Chapter 93 designation is HQ-CWF, MF. Revise all applicable documents in the application to accurately identify the Chapter 93 designation of the watercourse. *[25 PA Code §105.21(a)(1)]*
67. The application incorrectly identifies the Chapter 93 designation of WW-T10-001A as CWF, MF, when the correct 25 Pa Code, Chapter 93 designation is HQ-CWF, MF. Revise all applicable documents in the application to accurately identify the Chapter 93 designation of the watercourse. *[25 PA Code §105.21(a)(1)]*
68. The alternatives analysis application states that the proposed pipeline will be co-located with existing pipeline ROWs where possible. However, it does not appear that the pipeline is co-located with existing utilities throughout much of Lancaster County. Provide plans showing nearby existing utility ROWs and provide an explanation of why the pipeline was not co-located in those locations. *[25 PA Code §§105.13(e)(1)(viii) & 105.18a]*
69. Identify and show the location of the “cultural resource sites” mentioned in the discussion of Alternative 12. Additionally, clearly explain why additional impacts to Waters of the Commonwealth are warranted. *[25 PA Code §105.13(e)(1)(viii)]*
70. As discussed in the April 28, 2014 response letter from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Annual Ryegrass is discouraged due to its tendency to compete with native species. Revise all applicable sections of the application to propose alternatives to annual ryegrass, such as cereal oats or grain rye. *[25 PA Code §105.13(e)(1)(ix)]*
71. Explain why construction ROWs in wetlands exceed the maximum width of 75 feet as recommended by FERC. *[25 PA Code §105.18(a)]*

72. The Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission currently manages Fishing Creek as a Wild Trout Stream from the Headwaters to Silver Spring Road. However, based on recent surveys, the wild trout designation will be extended downstream to the mouth. Therefore Watercourses WW-T10-001 and WW-T10-001A are considered wild trout streams. Revise all documents as necessary. *[58 PA Code §57.11(b)(4)]*
73. Wetland W-T10-003 appears to be identified as Wetland W-T10-003C on drawing number 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9 Sheet 2 of 34 of the ESCGP-2 plans. Clarify if this is the case and explain the discrepancy. *[25 PA Code §105.21(a)(1)]*
74. An in-kind culvert replacement is proposed on drawing number 24-1600-70-28-A/LL113_9 Sheet 4 of 34 of the ESCGP-2 plans, but this activity is not identified in the Chapter 105 application. Therefore: *[25 PA Code §§105.13(e)(1) & 105.21(a)(1)]*
 - a. Clarify if the culvert will be replaced as a part of this project.
 - b. Identify the type and size of the culvert to be replaced.
 - c. Provide revised plans and application documents that include the impacts associated with the replacement of the culvert.
 - d. Ensure that the requirements of 25 Pa Code, Chapter 105, Subchapter D are met.
75. The extents of stream WW-T32-2002 of W-T32-2002 on drawing number 24-1600-70-20-A/21.11-01 are unclear. Although the hatching depicts a wetland near the southern LOD, impacts are shown to be stream impacts. Clarify this inconsistency. *[25 PA Code §105.13(e)(1(A))]*
76. Explain why stream WW-T42-2004 is shown to be avoided on Sheet 22 of 34 of the ESCGP-2 plans but is shown to be impacted on Drawing No 24-1600-70-09-A/23.61-01 in the Chapter 105 application. *[25 PA Code §105.21(a)(1)]*
77. Explain why impacts to wetland W-T31-3005 are identified as a stream impact on Drawing Number 24-1600-70-09-A/31.59-01. *[25 PA Code §105.21(a)(1)]*
78. The application states that Tucquan Creek is a Scenic watercourse. Therefore, provide copies of correspondence with PA DCNR's Bureau of Recreation and Conservation, and provide copies of all documents that may need to be revised as a result of coordination with DCNR. *[25 PA Code §105.14(b)(5)]*

79. Table L(c)-2 in Attachment L of Enclosure C of the Environmental Assessment incorrectly states that the Bog Turtle was not detected in the project area in Lancaster County, as the turtle was found in or near the Permittee Responsible Mitigation Site. Revise the application as necessary. *[25 PA Code §105.21(a)(1)]*
80. Wetland W-T36-1003 contains a vernal pool component based on the information provided in the application. Restoration of vernal pools can prove to be difficult. Explain why the wetland cannot be avoided. If it can't, provide site specific information on the hydrology and soils, as well as data on why the wetland maintains standing water and provide site specific construction plans, cross sections, and restoration details to ensure that the hydrology and functions and values of the wetland is not altered and it continues to maintain inundation and seasonal hydrology. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x) & §105.14(b)(4) & §105.14(b)(13) & §105.15(a) & §105.15(1) & §105.15(b) & §105.18a(a)(1) & §105.18a(a)(3) & §105.18a(a)(4) & §105.301(4) & §105.301(5)]*
81. Revise Enclosure D of the Environmental Assessment to explain, on an individual crossing and cumulative basis, why open cut pipe installation combined with permanent ROW maintenance will not result in an adverse impact to exceptional value wetlands or a significant adverse impact to other wetlands. The analysis should include a discussion of potential temporary or permanent impacts to hydrology as a result of the open cut, as well as a loss of woody species in forested/scrub shrub areas. Provide a plan to minimize the risk of permanent impacts to wetland hydrology for each wetland where an impact may occur. *[25 PA Code §§105.13(e)(1)(ix) & 105.18a]*
82. Revise Enclosures C&D to assess the condition of, and impacts to forested and scrub shrub riparian areas and the habitat, water quality, and other impacts on watercourses for each watercourse crossing. In general, the DEP recommends evaluating the riparian areas from the top of bank landward 100ft, and if the area utilized is less than 100ft justification should be given as to why. The application should be revised to replant the vegetation lost in both permanent and temporary ROW and workspaces. Alternatively, where it cannot be replaced and provided permanent protection, provide details on why it cannot be replaced and provide compensatory mitigation for the impacts and discuss the impacts to the watercourses in the Environmental Assessment, including water quality impacts. *[25 Pa Code §105.13(e)(1)(x) & §105.14(b)(4) & §105.14(b)(11) & §105.14(b)(12) & §105.14(b)(14) & §105.15a) & §105.15(a)(1) & §105.15(b) & §105.16(d) & DEPs Riparian Forest Buffer Guidance, Document # 394-5600-001]*
- a. To aid in evaluating the condition of and change in condition to watercourses and wetlands, the Department recommends utilizing the Draft Pennsylvania Riverine

Condition Level 2 Rapid Assessment Protocol and the Draft Pennsylvania Wetland Condition Level 2 Rapid Assessment Protocol. This protocol is not for identifying the functions and values of the resources, but rather is utilized to assess the current and proposed conditions of the resources utilizing current environmental principles. While the Protocols are not final, the Department encourages their use. [25 Pa Code §105.14(a) & §105.14(b)(4) & §105.14(b)(13) & §105.14(b)(12) & §105.15(a) & §105.15(a)(1) & §105.15(b) & §105.18a(a)(1) & §105.13(e)(1)(x)]

83. Provide a revised Enclosure D of the Environmental Assessment that includes a plan to minimize impacts to recreational opportunities on the Martic Low Grade and Conestoga Trails. [25 PA Code §105.14(b)(5)]
84. Several different equipment crossing details are provided in the E&S Plans. Revise the plans to identify where each type of crossing will be utilized. [25 PA Code 105.13(e)(1)]

You must submit a response for each of the above deficiencies. The re-submission shall be a complete standalone submission that will be used for authorization under E36-947. You may request a time extension, in writing, before September 27, 2016 to respond to deficiencies beyond the sixty (60) calendar days. Requests for time extensions will be reviewed by DEP and considered. You will be notified in writing of the decision either to grant or deny, including a specific due date to respond if the extension is granted. Time extensions shall be in accordance with 25 Pa. Code §105.13a(b).

Pursuant to 25 Pa. Code §105.13a of DEP's Chapter 105 Rules and Regulations you must submit a response fully addressing each of the significant technical deficiencies set forth above. Please note that this information must be received within sixty (60) calendar days from the date of this letter, on or before September 27, 2016 or DEP may consider the application to be withdrawn by the applicant.

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

Should you have any questions regarding the identified deficiencies, please call Mr. Nathan Phillips at 717.705.4822, and refer to Application No. E36-947, Atlantic Sunrise to discuss your

concerns or to schedule a meeting. The meeting must be scheduled within the 60-day period allotted for your reply, unless otherwise extended by DEP. You may also follow your application through the review process via *eFACTS on the Web* at:
<http://www.ahs2.dep.state.pa.us/eFactsWeb/default.aspx>.

Sincerely,



Edward J. Muzic, P.E.
Civil Engineer Manager, Hydraulic
Dam Safety, Waterways & Wetlands Section

Enclosure

cc: US Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, Michael Dombroskie
US Environmental Protection Agency, Jamie Davis
Lancaster County Conservation District
Aaron Blair, Transcontinental Pipe Line Company, LLC
John Zimmer, TRC Environmental
Borough of Mount Joy
Conestoga Township
Drumore Township
Eden Township
East Donegal Township
Manor Township
Martic Township
Mount Joy Township
Pequea Township
Rapho Township
West Hempfield Township