

**DEP Permit # E23-524**  
**DEP Permit HDD Reference # PA-DE-0100.0000-RR**  
**DEP HDD # S3-0620**  
**Township – Upper Chichester**  
**County - Delaware**  
**HDD Site Name – Glen Riddle Road, Southeastern Pennsylvania RR Crossing**

**1<sup>st</sup> Public Comment Period**

<b>Commentator ID #</b>	<b>Name and Address</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
1	James L. Duffy	
2	Nicole Palman 40 Rampart E Media, PA 19063	
3	Melisa Romano 1700 Robinson Ave Havertown, PA 19083	
4	Marion Yaglinski Media, PA	
5	Kristine Kallinen	
6	James Fishwick	
7	Aaron Cylinder	
8	Jennifer and Greg Nichols	
9	Russell Zerbo 1330 S Melville St Philadelphia, PA 19143	
10	Paul Barros-Ruof 630 Fiot Ave. Bethlehem, PA 18015	
11	Holly Smallwood 702 Hickory Dr Aliquippa, PA 15001	
12	John Margerum 3232 W Penn St Philadelphia, PA 19129	
13	Deborah Marchand 4807 Stonebridge Dr Gibsonia, PA 15044	
14	Sydney Hausman-Cohen 42 South 15th Street, Apt 603 Philadelphia, PA 19102	

15	William Montgomery 124 Lindley Ln Pottstown, PA 19465	
16	Patricia Skabla 1176 Bridge Road Bensalem, PA 19020	
17	Judy Hartl 240 S 3rd St Philadelphia, PA 19106	
18	Edmund Weisberg 1720 Spruce St Philadelphia, PA 19103	
19	Margaret Goodman 51 Broomall Lane Glen Mills, PA 19342	
20	Bill Ridgeway 842 N Sumner Ave Scranton, PA 18504	
21	Michael Drake Elkins Park, PA 19027	
22	Marcel Minutolo 1442 Barnsdale St Pittsburgh, PA 15217	
23	Eugene Gualtieri 2425 Lombard St Philadelphia, PA 19146	
24	Dana Pavlichko 1514 South Camac Street Philadelphia, PA 19147	
25	Barbara Hemmendinger 1321 Cherry Street Williamsport, PA 17701	
26	Karen Taylor 243 Hilands Ave Pittsburgh, PA 15202	
27	Peter Mayes 418 Anthwyn Rd Narberth, PA 19072	
28	Dawn Eagle 101 S Chestnut St Bath, PA 18014	
29	Phyllis Skupien 824 Brandywine Rd Downingtown, PA 19335	

30	Katherine Packer Philadelphia, PA	
31	Dona Cuppett 32 Highview Drive Telford, PA 18969	
32	Rebecca Smith 6 Hillside Lane Fallsington, PA 19054	
33	Elizabeth Schongar 3009 Squires Manor La South Park, PA 15129	
34	Kelly Yagatich 239 Rosecrest Dr Monroeville, PA 15146	
35	Albert Coffman 116 N Ridge Rd Perkasie, PA 18944	
36	Jay Walker 5806 Howe St. Apartment 7R Pittsburgh, PA 15232	
37	Lana Fishkin 171 Gramercy Rd Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004	
38	Chris Lewis 6038 Hegerman St Philadelphia, PA 19135	
39	James Castellan 42 Rabbit Run Rd Rose Valley, PA 19086	
40	Barbara McNutt 28 Ambling Ln Levittown, PA 19055	
41	Christine Werther 1380 High Ave Abington, PA 19001	
42	David Spangenberg 5743 Lower York Road Post Office Box 215 Lahaska, PA 18931	
43	Richard Spiegel 209 Gotham Ln Monroeville, PA 15146	
44	Anne Taylor 1100 Ellsworth Street Philadelphia, PA 19147	

45	Susan Fineman 6531 Aylesboro Ave. Pittsburgh, PA 15217	
46	Priscilla Mattison 1052 Broadmoor Rd Bryn Mawr, PA 19010	
47	Dona Van Eck 1723 Rialto St Pittsburgh, PA 15212	
48	Roberta Binderman 1901 Walnut Street, Apt. 1103 Philadelphia, PA 19103	
49	Tre Heptig	
50	Todd Lane 2412 Spruce St Philadelphia, PA 19103	
51	Sheri DeOrio 439 Wimer Dr Pittsburgh, PA 15237	
52	Arleen Romano Yardley Drive West Chester, PA 19380	
53	Pamela McIntyre 4130 Painted Sky Rd Reading, PA 19606	
54	Patricia Burroughs 5535 Silo Hill Rd Doylestown, PA 18902	
55	Katie Stanley 139 Winterset Road Baden, PA 15005	
56	Ronald Sebastianelli 130 Palmer Dr. Jessup, PA 18434	
57	Bundy Wist 1414 Larch Ln West Chester, PA 19380	
58	Elhan Suley 56 Steeplechase Dr Holland, PA 18966	
59	Wesley Merkle 3458 Midvale Ave Philadelphia, PA 19129	

60	Lani Frank PO Box 608 Paoli, PA 19301	
61	Robert McMahon 93 W. LaCrosse Ave Lansdowne, PA 19050	
62	Rupika Ketu S 18th Street Philadelphia, PA 19146	
63	Kimberly Seger 11373 Us Route 422 Kittanning, PA 16201	
64	M Doherty 855 N Park Rd Wyomissing, PA 19610	
65	Dorothy Fulton 5907 Eshenaur Dr Harrisburg, PA 17112	
66	Linda Hilf 48 Adams Dr. Cheswick, PA 15024	
67	Grayson Henry 451 Bethlehem Pike Colmar, PA 18915	
68	Margaret Quinn 503 Carmarthen Drive Exton, PA 19341	
69	Ira Josephs 499 W Jefferson St Media, PA 19063	
70	Tamika Holder 1229 N. Frazier St Philadelphia, PA 19131	
71	Bernard Greenberg 894 Jefferson Way West Chester, PA 19380	
72	Mike Peale 5 Worth Hill Ln Aston, PA 19014	
73	Casey Crosby 60 Winding Way West Yardley, PA 19067	
74	Sheila Gallagher 2807 N Delaware Dr Easton, PA 18040	

75	Jason Volpe 826 N Capitol St Philadelphia, PA 19130	
76	Hollis Zelinsky 120 E. Beaver Avenue State College, PA 16801	
77	Suzanne Hall PO Box 732 Mont Alto, PA 17237	
78	Mary Ann Berosh 380 Sunset Hills Dr Freedom, PA 15042	
79	Eileen Killeen 1116 University Dr Yardley, PA 19067	
80	Margaret Watts 12663 Forrest Dr Edinboro, PA 16412	
81	Amy Kolk 9 Inland Rd Levittown, PA 19057	
82	Park Furlong 133 E Bristol Road Feasterville-Treose, PA 19053	
83	N Mulligan Philadelphia, PA 19125	
84	Andrew Eberts West Chester, PA 19382	
85	Susan Garelik 44 Yale Ave Swarthmore, PA 19081	
86	Marie Snavely 445 S Cedar St Lititz, PA 17543	
87	Megan Deely 24 Sandringham Rd Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004	
88	Marta Guttenberg 226 W Rittenhouse Sq Philadelphia, PA 19103	
89	Daniel Safer 3305 Hamilton St Philadelphia, PA 19104	

90	Tim Miller 4601 Flat Rock Rd Philadelphia, PA 19127	
91	Sharon Newman 581 S Creek Rd West Chester, PA 19382	
92	Kathy Orloski 603 Cloverview Cir Pittsburgh, PA 15239	
93	Lynn Mather 7425 Boyer St Philadelphia, PA 19119	
94	Karen Giles 127 Fernwood Dr Portage, PA 15946	
95	Lea Stabinski 130 Mustang Way Eagleview, PA 19403	
96	Phyllis Davidson 428 Bigham St Pittsburgh, PA 15211	
97	Fayten El-Dehaibi 4264 Minnesota Street Pittsburgh, PA 15217	
98	Barbara Cicalese 16 W Montgomery Ave Apt 10 Ardmore, PA 19003	
99	Donna Maloney 7040 Franklin Hill Rd Bangor, PA 18013	
100	Michael Lombardi 19 Morning Glory Lane Levittown, PA 19054	
101	R Shannnon 380 Morvale Rd Easton, PA 18042	
102	Mark Cavanaugh 2147 E Sanger St Philadelphia, PA 19124	
103	Dru Finkbeiner 222 Woodward Rd Media, PA 19063	
104	Ogden Mitchell 4815 Locust St Philadelphia, PA 19139	

105	Jim Gergat 1689 S Main St Bechtelsville, PA 19505	
106	Carol Thompson 2874 Amy Drive South Park, PA 15129	
107	Jennifer Clark 704 Pine Ridge Rd Media, PA 19063	
108	Garry Taroli 15 South Franklin Street Wilkes Barre, PA 18711	
109	Nora Nelle 533 Onward Ave Phoenixville, PA 19460	
110	Melvin Sheets 699 Allendale Rd New Brighton, PA 15066	
111	Suzanne E. Webster Roberson 108 Webster Avenue Downingtown, PA 19335	
112	Barbara Parker 245 Edgewood Sarver, PA 16055	
113	Jason Curtis 2717 Poplar St Philadelphia, PA 19130	
114	Ann Bryan 1165 6th St Beaver, PA 15009	
115	Anne Collins 212 Grape St Philadelphia, PA 19128	
116	William Huber 2243 Jester Ct Tobyhanna, PA 18466	
117	Don Hawkins 1406 Grant St. North Braddock, PA 15104	
118	Laura Wiggins 1120 Rural Ridge Dr Cheswick, PA 15024	
119	Margaret Cristofalo 444 Haverford Ave Narberth, PA 19072	

120	Michael Follman 1019 Honor Dr Bethlehem, PA 18017	
121	Katherine Rubel 2013 Pembroke Drive Glenshaw, PA 15116	
122	Mary Ann Barrett 627 Coleman St Easton, PA 18042	
123	Sherwood Johnson 549 Macleod Drive Gibsonia, PA 15044	
124	Dennis Hartenstine 2425 Hay Creek Rd Birdsboro, PA 19508	
125	Fr. Bernard Survil 131 Clelian Heights Ln Greensburg, PA 15601	
126	William Van Stone 625 Burnham Rd Philadelphia, PA 19119	
127	Ed Hetzel 38 Marina Dr Tunkhannock, PA 18657	
128	Linda Blythe 4433 Osage Ave. Philadelphia, PA 19104	
129	Lynda Ferguson Bishop Hollow Road Newtown Square, PA 19073	
130	Dennis Hartenstine 2425 Hay Creek Rd Birdsboro, PA 19508	
131	Daniel Salmen 73 Berry St Pittsburgh, PA 15205	
132	Susan Solomon 8 Crest Dr Indianola, PA 15051	
133	Eric Johnson Malvern, PA 19355	
134	Brent Farnum Downingtown, PA 19335	

135	Barbara White 329 Franklin Ave Pittsburgh, PA 15221	
136	Ed Dunn 4055 Lasher Rd Drexel Hill, PA 19026	
137	Beverly Williamson-Pecori 1295 Silver Lane Mckees Rocks, PA 15136	
138	Joseph Bertz CMR 423, Box 338 Apo, PA 17050	
139	Henry Frank 2763 Island Ave Philadelphia, PA 19153	
140	Jay Grossman 239 Monroe St Philadelphia, PA 19147	
141	Ann Reynolds 8111 Southampton Ave Wyndmoor, PA 19038	
142	Frances Conwell 5657 Gainor Rd Philadelphia, PA 19131	
143	Cheryl Hinkofer 134 Bodkin St Pittsburgh, PA 15226	
144	Audrey Marsh Media, PA 19063	
145	Tom Kahler 58 Spruce St Ephrata, PA 17522	
146	Gerald Kaufman 126 W. Mt. Airy Ave. Philadelphia, PA 19119	
147	James DeAngelis 1124 Laurel Dr West Chester, PA 19380	
148	Mark Fichman 5715 Solway Street Pittsburgh, PA 15217	
149	Alison Joyce 704 Red Maple Drive West Chester, PA 19380	

150	Joanne Kreil 318 Lower Cherry Valley Rd Saylorsburg, PA 18353	
151	Jenny Graybill 133 E Ferdinand St Manheim, PA 17545	
152	Arlene Taylor 431 Frog Hollow Road Harrisburg, PA 17112	
153	Paula Lynn 19 Rock Hill Rd 5d Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004	
154	John Gorman 37 Sagen Dr Mt Bethel, PA 18343	
155	David Lenker 123 Old Mill Drive Camp Hill, PA 17011	
156	Roelfien Boerema 61 Militia Hill Drive Wayne, PA 19087	
157	Geoffrey Henson 2 Wellfleet Ln Glen Mills, PA 19342	
158	Janet Cavallo 1276 Providence Rd Secane, PA 19018	
159	David Steger 140 Victoria Sq Media, PA 19063	
160	Cynthia Kishinchand 3114 W. Coulter St Philadelphia, PA 19129	
161	Al Ferrucci 5720 Friendship Pittsburgh, PA 15206	
162	Lee Bible 155 Cherry Lane Abbottstown, PA 17301	
163	Kelly Riley 1343 Needham Cir PA 19440	
164	Mark Brody 567 Brookwood Rd Wayne, PA 19087	

165	Dilla Mastrangelo Maryland Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15232	
166	Bernard Lizak 1805 Evans St Northampton, PA 18067	
167	Ben Cribbs Exton, PA 19341	
168	Judith Marvin 1075 Hardscrabble Lane Lewisburg, PA 17837	
169	Kay Reinfried 797 Scott Ln Lititz, PA 17543	
170	Greta Aul 917 Columbia Ave Lancaster, PA 17603	
171	Judy Scriptunas 3434 Camp Robin Hood Rd. Chambersburg, PA 17202	
172	Victoria English 617 Radnor Valley Dr. Villanova, PA 19085	
173	Helen Elkins 3575 Doe Run Church Rd Coatesville, PA 19320	
174	Mary McCloskey 1727 Clock Tower Dr West Chester, PA 19380	
175	Thomas Campanini 1030 Crest Way Apt 204 York, PA 17403	
176	Suzanne Staggenborg 5621 Beacon St Pittsburgh, PA 15217	
177	Marian Smith Beaver Road Baden, PA 15005	
178	Susan Shaak 3440 Stoner Ave Reading, PA 19606	
179	Logan Welde 967 N American Philadelphia, PA 19123	

180	Bruce Moyer 602 Halteman Rd Souderton, PA 18964	
181	Andrea Saunders Bethlehem, PA 18015	
182	Jason Rash 305 Dogwood Lane Wallingford, PA 19086	
183	Joseph Magid 411 Holly Lane Wynnewood, PA 19096	
184	Sidne Baglini 203 Channing Avenue Malvern, PA 19355	
185	Kenneth Cangin 742 Bracken Court West Chester, PA 19382	
186	Jean Plough 817 Westview St Philadelphia, PA 19119	
187	Marilyn Maurer 538 Ballytore Rd Wynnewood, PA 19096	
188	Edward Smith 190 Shultz Hollow Road Benton, PA 17814	
189	Al Cohen 142 Hoernerstown Rd. Hummelstown, PA 17036	
190	Timothy Grover PO Box 543 Mountainhome, PA 18342	
191	Nancy Ballard 265 Northwestern Ave Philadelphia, PA 19128	
192	Emma Sabin 8417 Shawnee St Philadelphia, PA 19118	
193	Boris Dirnbach 6350 Lancaster Ave Philadelphia, PA 19151	
194	Julie Herring 583 Franklin Way West Chester, PA 19380	

195	Jeanne Held-Warmkessel North Wales, PA 19454	
196	Richard Aldred 37 Twin Pine Way Glen Mills, PA 19342	
197	Olivia Hopkins	
198	Mary Ann Bentz 733 N. Pennsylvania Ave; Morrisville, PA 19067	
199	Gillian Graber 110 Belleauwood Blvd Trafford, PA 15085	
200	Sara Hale 724 Fern St. Yeadon, PA 19050	
201	Alexandra Manning 805 Graystone Ln Downingtown, PA 19335	
202	George Stewart 602 Glengary Drive Pittsburgh, PA 15215	
203	Sheila Siegel 604S.WashingtonSq. Philadelphia, PA 19106	
204	John Bush 301 Gilmer Rd Coatesville, PA 19320	
205	Anne McCormick 375 Dawson St Philadelphia, PA 19128	
206	Laura Horowitz 6544 Darlington Rd Pittsburgh, PA 15217	
207	Greg Navarro 266 Lyceum Ave. Philadelphia, PA 19128	
208	Eileen Brzycki 33 Chestnut St. Newtown Square, PA 19073	
209	JM Lavassaur 75 Ardmore Ardmore, PA 19003	
210	Nick Milam 2300 Buena Vista St Swissvale, PA 15218	

211	Catherine Talarico 1479 Brookfield Rd Yardley, PA 19067	
212	Barbara Pace 250 Mt. Nazareth Way Apt, 310 Pittsburgh, PA 15229	
213	Carolyn Schellhorn 119 E Montgomery Ave Unit 8 Philadelphia, PA, PA 19003	
214	Donna Smith 1367 Harrington Road Havertown, PA 19083	
215	Megan LeCluyse 1018 Christian St Philadelphia, PA 19147	
216	Eileen Rackover 557 Franklin Way West Chester, PA 19380	
217	Robert Jehn 180 South Atlantic Ave. Cochranon, PA 16314	
218	Amy Gross 313 Newbury Ct North Wales, PA 19454	
219	Kathie E Takush 1026 Franklin St Apt 1206 Reading, PA 19602	
220	Susan Butterweck 222 Haverford Ave, apt 4 Narberth, PA 19072	
221	Kathryn Westman 104 Steeplechase Cir Gibsonia, PA 15044	
222	Mike Della Penna 2 Fairway Drive Malvern, PA 19355	
223	Brian Resh 1153 Marticville Rd Pequea, PA 17565	
224	Morgan Greenly 106 Taylors Way Honey Brook, PA 19344	
225	K Danowski 15 Bower Hill Rd Pittsburgh, PA 15228	

226	Diane Kokowski 1336 Methyl St Pittsburgh, PA 15216	
227	Theodore Burger 3370 Woodbridge Cir. Bethlehem, PA 18017	
228	Susan Stedman 5 Park Ave Paoli, PA 19301	
229	Barbara Ritzheimer 5 Locust Street Pine Grove, PA 17963	
230	Amy Lempert 2 Narbrook Park Narberth, PA 19072	
231	Dorothy Maurer 161 Woodstream Dr Norristown, PA 19403	
232	Janet Parlett 108 Karen Circle Coatesville, PA 19320	
233	Mimi Burstein 27 East Central Paoli, PA 19301	
234	Kathleen Doctor 27 Lindenwood Dr Kittanning, PA 16201	
235	Susan Tucker 111 4th Ave Warren, PA 16365	
236	Lila Cornell 338 Norman Dr Cranberry Twp, PA 16066	
237	Robert Lambert 113 W. Allens Ln. Philadelphia, PA 19119	
238	Susan Gottfried 619 Cricklewood State College, PA 16803	
239	Beth Weinet 73 Forge Rd Glen Mills, PA 19342	
240	Martha Evans 100 Styche St Buena Vista, PA 15015	

241	Jack Roberts 307 W Grant St Lancaster, PA 17603	
242	Beverly Foster 364 Conestoga Road Wayne, PA 19087	
243	Roger Desy 510 Beverly Dr Verona, PA 15147	
244	Aaron Cylinder 1024 Second Avenue Media, PA 19063	
245	Dana Stephens 522 Williamson Circle Media, PA 19063	
246	Dale Harris 79 Ardmore Avenue Lansdowne, PA 19050	
247	Marion Yaglinski Hunt Club Lane Media, PA 19063	
248	Ryan Shaak 141 Forge Rd Glen Mills, PA 19342	
249	Katherine Wilde The Green House 308 Manor Road Lafayette Hill, PA 19444	
250	Linda Yu 1510 Middletown Road, 100 Glen Mills, PA 19342	
251	Sherri Fryer 910 Sage St Clymer, PA 15728	
252	Jacqueline Humphries-Bickley 41 Central View Rd Dillsburg, PA 17019	
253	Angela Morgera 4 Spring Street Media, PA 19063	
254	Steve Kapski PO Box 205 Gradyville, PA 19039	

255	Gina LoBiondo 105 Green Briar Ln Havertown, PA 19083	
256	Chloe Wist 1414 Larch Lane West Chester, PA 19380	
257	Sherlene Evans 1945 Olive Street Reading, PA 19604	
258	Ed Grystar 717 Washington Ave Oakmont, PA 15139	
259	Louis Kyle 8009 Navajo St Philadelphia, PA 19118	
260	Patricia Libbey 379 Ripka St 3B Phila, PA 19128	
261	Rich Surdyk 2059 Plainview Ave Pittsburgh, PA 15226	
262	Christopher Minich 313 Roberts Rd. Lewis Run, PA 16738	
263	Dennis Schaef 715 Limber Rd Meadville, PA 16335	
264	Billy Pepmeyer 1829 Middle Rd Glenshaw, PA 15116	
265	Randy and Lydia Stettler 4403 River Road Mt. Bethel, PA 18343	
266	Roberta Bunsick 125 Briarwood Road East Stroudsburg, PA 18302	
267	Barry Yelen 34 Dawes Ave Kingston, PA 18704	
268	Patricia Greiss 198 1/2 York Rd. Carlisle, PA 17013	
269	Christian Paul Schneider 3 Tioga Street Elysburg, PA 17824	

270	Jason Gowen Wyncroft Dr Media, PA 19063	
271	Gail Neustadt 1503 Grand Cypress Lane Presto, PA 15142	
272	Marjorie Greenfield 4109 Apalogen Rd Philadelphia, PA 19129	
273	Peter Adams 2728 Shelly St Pittsburgh, PA, PA 15203	
274	Jessica Krow 3118 W Penn St Philadelphia, PA 19129	
275	Megan Hess 7431 Boyer Street Philadelphia, PA 19119	
276	Ellen Sinclair 217 Lochwood Lane West Chester, PA 19380	
277	Sheila Erlbaum 7150 Bryan St. Philadelphia, PA 19119	
278	Edward Loeber 3 Pheasant View Dr Dillsburg, PA 17019	
279	Donna Gensler 1730 Duffield St Pittsburgh, PA 15206	
280	Lionel Ruberg 1382 Newtown Langhorne Rd Newtown, PA 18940	
281	Ann S Harris 1315 Denniston St Pittsburgh, PA 15217	
282	Karla McNamara 155 McCartney Ln Baden, PA 15005	
283	Jon Nadle 858 Gladys Ave Pittsburgh, PA 15216	
284	Brian Moore 2332 S 20th St Philadelphia, PA 19145	

285	Diane Krassenstein 7617 Fillmore St Philadelphia, PA 19111	
286	Christina Munko 1105 Overlook Drive Vandergrift, PA 15690	
287	Jen Grisin West Chester, PA 19382	
288	Stephen Kolter 640 Nutt Rd. B204 Phoenixville, PA 19460	
289	James Scarola 504 Lakeside Dr. Exton, PA 19341	
290	Linda Myers 9075 Playhouse Rd Petersburg, PA 16669	
291	Joyce Lay 1586 Pine Run Rd Rochester, PA 15074	
292	Courtney Smith Philadelphia, PA 19130	
293	Alan Przeworski 118 E Vaughn St Kingston, PA 18704	
294	Erin Ortiz 105 Highfield Road Villanova, PA 19085	
295	George Trovato 1281 Lower Demunds Road Dallas, PA 18612	
296	Lori Dennis 4980 Erbs Bridge Road Mechanicsburg, PA 17050	
297	Rachel Davis	
298	Sean Duffin 395 Hilltop Rd Paoli, PA 19301	
299	Cheryl Whittaker 465 Greenwood Road Kennett Square, PA 19348	
300	Dan Behl 18 James Hayward Rd Glen Mills, PA 19342	

301	Donna Nase Harleysville, PA 19438	
302	Meredith Jones 325 Green Lane Philadelphia, PA 19128	
303	Jessica De La Hoz 333 Britt Road North Wales, PA 19454	
304	Carole & J William Hemphill 17 Hindman Avenue Burgettstown, PA 15021	
305	Linda Polishuk 1424 Grand Oak Lane West Chester, PA 19380	
306	Allison Vetter 218 Pine Rd Wallingford, PA 19086	
307	Thalia Gray 626 Summerlea St Pittsburgh, PA 15232	
308	Catherine Smith Smith 904 N Providence Rd Media, PA 19063	
309	Daniel Sigmans 1447 N Hollywood Street Philadelphia, PA 19121	
310	Roberta Camp 713 S Warnock St Philadelphia, PA 19147	
311	James Curtis 693 W. Sawmill Rd. Port Matilda, PA 16870	
312	Frank Evelhoch, II 17 Pamela Dr Mechanicsburg, PA 17050	
313	Brock Dilling 406 Melvins Ln Alexandria, PA 16611	
314	Sarah Ceasar 820 Merchant Street Ambridge, PA 15003	
315	Anne Brennan 1609 Rodman St. Philadelphia, PA 19146	

316	Linda Theophilus 420 Nike Dr Pittsburgh, PA 15235	
317	Barbara VanHorn 41 Petersburg Lane Duncannon, PA 17020	
318	Joyce Gilmore 27 Garman Rd Kutztown, PA 19530	
319	Georgann Kovacovsky 323 Cheers Road New Bethlehem, PA 16242	
320	Erin Halloran 339 South Atlantic Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15224	
321	Janet Rafferty 1352 Sugar Maple Ct. New Cumberland, PA 17070	
322	Cindy M. Dutka 6547 Haverford Ave. Apt 4 Philadelphia, PA 19151	
323	Linda Wichmann 357C Gringo/Independence Aliquippa, PA 15001	
324	Herbert Elwell 350 Button Hill Rd Lawrenceville, PA 16929	
325	Debbie Smith 274 Glen Riddle Rd. Media, PA 19063	
326	Sa Reilly 316 Midland Ave Wayne, PA 19312	
327	MaryAnne Troy 1002 Birchwood Lane Glen Mills, PA 19342	
328	Denise Bonk 2608 E Venango St Philadelphia, PA 19134	
329	Leo Dolle 325 N Princeton Ave Swarthmore, PA 19081	
330	Ann Kuter 562 Taylor Ave Warrington, PA 18976	

331	Shae White 336 Catch Penny Lane Media, PA 19063	
332	John and Sandra Walker 538 Mt. Pleasant Road Bloomsburg, PA 17815	
333	Harry and Jill Brownfield 74 Acker Road Newport, PA 17074	
334	Amy Cornelius 623 S 9th St Philadelphia, PA 19147	
335	Roger West 43 Elberon Ave Lansdowne, PA 19050	
336	Jack Miller 130 Delong Rd Middleburg, PA 17842	
337	Laura Fake 443 W High St Womelsdorf, PA 19567	
338	Victoria English 617 Radnor Valley Dr. Villanova, PA 19085	
339	Paula Lim 309 Southvue Drive Pittsburgh, PA 15236	
340	Patricia Danzon 140 Pennsylvania Ave Bryn Mawr, PA 19010	
341	Jenn McGinley 167 Indianola Rd Pittsburgh, PA 15238	
342	Cindy Veloric 1165 Norsam Rd Gladwyne, PA 19035	
343	Patrick Fillette 154 Valley Drive Churchville, PA 18966	
344	James Sam Miller 233 Baer Dr. 11 Erie, PA 16505	
345	Victoria Buckley 619 Huffs Church Rd Alburtis, PA 18011	

346	Jill Turco 2428 Manton St Philadelphia, PA 19146	
347	Richard Metz 910 Bent Lane Erdenheim, PA 19038	
348	Andrew Yuen PO Box 42 Mount Pocono, PA 18344	
349	Yolanda Perry 102 N 45th St Apt 1 Harrisburg, PA 17111	
350	Robert III Matthews 4006 Gideon Rd. Brookhaven, PA 19015	
351	Anna Marie Snader 704 Sycamore Dr West Chester, PA 19380	
352	Joel Jacobs 2 Locust Holw Carlisle, PA 17015	
353	Denise Kahley Wayne, PA 19087	
354	Elaine Dellande 1220 Graham St. Bethlehem, PA 18015	
355	Tabassam Shah 114 S. 8th Ave Clarion, PA 16214	
356	Margaret Hazuka 12 Humlers Ln Telford, PA 18169	
357	Bob Steininger 100 Westridge Place South Phoenixville, PA 19460	
358	adrienne gallagher 81 W Park Av Sellersville, PA 18960	
359	Kate Ashburn 114 E Princeton Rd Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004	
360	Bernadette Marie Ondus 1002 Railroad Street Danville, PA 17821	

361	Helene Rosen 92 Grandview Dr Warminster, PA 18974	
362	Gary Lewis Phoenixville, PA 19460	
363	Mike C. Martin Lane Norwood, PA 19074	
364	Libby J. Goldstein 331 Queen St. Philadelphia, PA 19147	
365	Linda Addis 5144 Lamor Rd. Hermitage, PA 16148	
366	Robert Kelly 391 Howarth Rd Media, PA 19063	
367	Lora Snyder 14 Gradyville Rd Glen Mills, PA 19342	
368	Elise Gerhart 15357 Trough Creek Valley Pike Huntingdon, PA 16652	
369	Beth Weinet 73 Forge Rd Glen Mills, PA 19342	
370	Laura Yim 109 Aberdeen Ter Wayne, PA 19087	
371	Michelle Alvare 134 Hastings Avenue Havertown, PA 19083	
372	Ruth Fauman-Fichman 5715 Solway Street Pittsburgh, PA 15217	
373	Vincent Prudente 1826 Fitzwater Street Philadelphia, PA 19146	
374	Peggy Acosta 155 N 2nd St Womelsdorf, PA 19567	
375	JoAnn Williams 108 Judith La Media, PA 19063	

376	Brenda Hartman 1138 Douglass St Reading, PA 19604	
377	Melissa DiBernardino 1602 Old Orchard Lane West Chester, PA 19380	
378	Laurel Husk 77 Church Rd Fl 1 Telford, PA 18969	
379	Anne Jackson PO Box 516 Morgantown, PA 19543	
380	Zach Barber 3532 Beechwood Blvd Pittsburgh, PA 15217	
381	Renee Grant 58 Chandler Cir Pen Argyl, PA 18072	
382	Robert Ruffin 3443 W Penn St Philadelphia, PA 19129	
383	Donald Azuma 2051 Fitzwater St. Philadelphia, PA 19146	
384	Margaret Reiter 151 View Ct Saylorsburg, PA 18353	
385	Linda Berger 4101 Timber Ln Philadelphia, PA 19129	
386	Donald Charles 1868 Bertram Road Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006	
387	Thom Fistner 620 S. Bergen St Bethlehem, PA 18015	
388	Larry Gaugler 3793 Chestnut St Emmaus, PA 18049	
389	Ron Richter 926 Prospect Ave Bethlehem, PA 18018	
390	Linda Brodeur 2942 Cornwall Rd Bethlehem, PA 18017	

391	Lorraine Heagy 6 Sussex Place Lititz, PA 17543	
392	Michael Kirchner 5959 Jacobs Ave Harrisburg, PA 17112	
393	Benjamin Kline 1025 Evergreen Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15209	
394	Susan Patrone 1529 S 13th St Philadelphia, PA 19147	
395	Charles Hollister 2091 Oldroyd Rd Columbia Cross Roads, PA 16914	
396	Richard Johnson 1134 Tasker St Philadelphia, PA 19148	
397	Pamela Van Fleet 1705 McClures Gap Rd. Carlisle, PA 17015	
398	Christopher Garriga 416 Meadowhurst Ln Media, PA 19063	
399	Daniel Shapiro 1651 Beechwood Blvd Pittsburgh, PA 15217	
400	Alan Tuttle 1418 Westwood Ln Wynnewood, PA 19096	
401	William Fraser 2517 E Boston St Philadelphia, PA 19103	
402	Nora Nash 609 S. Convent Road Aston, PA 19014	
403	Julia Rolf 3034 Baltz St. Philadelphia, PA 19121	
404	Doris Dick 129 Alleyne Dr Pittsburgh, PA 15215	
405	Jeanne Mann 706 Foss Ave Drexel Hill, PA 19026	

406	Mark Sentesy 1105 Old Boalsburg Rd. State College, PA 16801	
407	Melissa Haines 176 Ronald Road Aston, PA 19014	
408	Sally Campitelli 4 Dorset Rd Glen Mills, PA 19342	
409	Joan Russo 36 Whitney Lake Rd Hawley, PA 18428	
410	Kristin LoFurno 180 Bortondale Rd Media, PA 19063	
411	Alia Rahman 2207 Catharine Street Philadelphia, PA 19146	
412	Jamie O'Connell Brick House Farm Lane Newtown Square, PA 19073	
413	Kathryn Westman 104 Steeplechase Cir Gibsonia, PA 15044	
414	Lori Bartholomew 608 Lilac Way Media, PA 19063	
415	Christine Durst 29 Ivy Lane Glen Mills, PA 19342	
416	Tim Hoy 268 Carsonville Rd Halifax, PA 17032	
417	Phoebe Reese 604 Essex Ct Pittsburgh, PA 15238	
418	Susan Porter 2134 Hemlock Farms Lords Valley, PA 18428	
419	Paul Palla 45 N Carlisle St Greencastle, PA 17225	
420	Dawn Griffin Havertown, 19083	
421	Carol Carmon	

422	Sharon Strauss 758 St. Georges Road Philadelphia, PA 19119	
423	Hayden Smith 3525 N 16 St, 1R Philadelphia, PA 19140	
424	Eva Swidler 707 Latona St. Philadelphia, PA 19147	
425	Kelly Cifone	
426	Steve Vasquez	
427	Bobbie Marie	
428	Noam Fischhoff 423 Cedarville St. Pittsburgh, PA 15224	
429	Teri Priest	
430	Linda Healy	
431	Annie Hollis	
432	Sharon Galt	
433	Jerry McMullen, Ph D. 200 Hillside Drive Exon, PA 19341	
434	George Alexander Kennett Square, PA	
435	Abbie Wysor 423 N. Jackson Street Media, PA 19063	
436	Robert Kelly 391 Howarth Rd Media, PA 19063	
437	Lorraine Peterson, 8 Rampart West Media PA 19063	
438	Lora Snyder 1443 Gradyville Rd Glen Mills, PA 19342	
439	Carolyn Barcomb 218 Painter Road Media, PA 19063	
440	Margaret deMarteleire	
441	Katie Solic	
442	Nathan Simcox Flora In Upper Chichester, PA 19061	

443	Bibianna Dussling 76 War Admiral Lane Media, PA 19063	
444	Diane Smith 1380 Paxon Pl Media, PA 19063	
445	Pam Magidson	
446	Christine Durst 29 Ivy Lane Glen Mills, PA 19342	
447	Susanna Monteleone 38 Rampart E Media, PA 19063	
448	Nancy Harkins	
449	Brent Groce 325 S 25th St Philadelphia, PA 19103	
450	Paul and Rosemary Conway 433 Martins Lane Media, PA 19063	
451	Melissa Marshall, Esq. P.O. Box 408 1414-B Indian Creek Valley Road Melcroft, PA 15462	Mountain Watershed Association
452	Aaron J. Stemplewicz, Esq. 925 Canal Street 7 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite 3701 Bristol, PA 19007	Delaware Riverkeeper Network
453	Joseph Otis Minott, Esq. 135 South 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
454	Alexander G. Bomstein, Esq. 135 South 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
455	Kathryn L. Urbanowicz, Esq. 135 South 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
456	Michele O'Brien	

**1. Comment**

My name is James Duffy and I live in Chester County. The issues of the Mariner East Pipeline has been one that I have followed for a couple of years now. I beg you to strongly reconsider the plans for this pipeline project. Sunoco's reputation for lax practices and, speaking from personal experience, their inattention to detail and lack of concern of their workspace, should not be rewarded. The plans under advisement for Delaware County in Middletown township present many concerns. I'm especially

concerned about this project plans to safely plans to place two pipelines into one casing and still safely detect errors or defects that may arise in a timely fashion.

Please move to strike down this project. (1)

## **2. Comment**

My comments are specifically for the section of the pipeline designated as "S3-0620".

Thank you in advance for taking the time to read this through.

My husband, two young daughters (a third on the way any day now!) and I live in the Riddlewood neighborhood of Middletown Township. The pipeline runs directly in front of our neighborhood in extremely close proximity to our neighbors who live close to Route 452. When we moved into the neighborhood 2.5 years ago, I noticed the signs protesting the installation of the pipeline, but at that time, the knowledge that a pipeline was going in did not deter us from purchasing our home. I've followed progress (or truly, lack thereof) over the last years and continue to be baffled by the missteps and mistakes that this company has made. I initially didn't worry because I trusted (wrongfully, I see now) that a top company in business for over 100 years and who specializes in this type of infrastructure would be able to safely and swiftly install a line transporting whatever it was they needed to transport while mitigating as many risks as possible to local home owners. Sadly, I've read article after article about local residents who have endured years of noise, damage to property, incarceration, and threats from workers. All the while being expected to just accept a high risk living situation once the pipeline is installed because how can a company who has made so many mistakes be sufficiently trusted? I know that statistically speaking, pipelines are "safer" than road transport (as in number of incidents), but I can't help but worry about Sunoco after all the mistakes they've made. How can we sleep soundly knowing that simply by living in our home we are putting our family at great risk simply because a company cannot manage to safely install a pipeline?

I was notified of some of the potential problems with the new proposed plan and I'd like to share my concerns. I fully understand I am a layperson when it comes to pipelines and transportation of hazardous materials, but I hope that by expressing my distrust and confusion, I can be reassured by someone of authority that my best interests as a citizen, homeowner, and tax payer are at least being considered in the equation.

I understand that the new proposed plan appears to have been hastily drawn up and is rife with mistakes. One such mistake is that only one of the three geological surveys that are mentioned to be included in "Attachment C" are actually there. How can the DEP sufficiently evaluate the plan if it is missing said documentation?

Another proposed action is to house two pipelines within one casing. I was informed that the legal spacing between two pipes within a single casing must be 12'. The proposal would only allow for 4 inches. Is this still within a safe range?

There are more errors that have been pointed out, and I urge you to please consider all the people who live in this dense residential area. Were something to go wrong, many, many lives would be at stake. I stay home with my small children, so I feel we are at increased risk just being here. I can imagine parents who send their children to Glenwood Elementary feel similarly.

Thank you again for your time and for considering all of us here in Riddlewood. (2)

**3. Comment**

I oppose any HDD or open trench along Glen Riddle Rd for the Mariner East pipelines. The karst land in this area makes any drilling or digging an unsafe risk to residents. This is been displayed all along the Mariner East Pipeline already, with more than 90 spills of drilling fluid and several sinkholes. The amount of fines and violations thus far is unimaginable. How long will the corruption continue to promote corporate profits over residential safety?! Now that there is an open criminal investigation, I hope all those who are involved in ensuring this pipeline is pushed through will soon be caught. I hope I can begin to trust my government and the department of environmental protection to do what they vowed to do under the constitution and protect the safety and health of residents, air, water and our environment. Energy transfer partners and Sunoco have shown us time and time again, they are in it for money, not for the good of Pennsylvania. This is our home is not theirs and this project must be stopped immediately and permanently. We cannot continue to allow the oil and gas companies to destroy Pennsylvania, the nation and most importantly everyone's home, planet earth. There is no planet B. (3)

**4. Comment**

It is way past time to put an end to this pipeline. It has caused too many problems for PA residents with no end in sight. In addition to threatening our lives and property, it is causing environmental destruction.

And as if that's not enough, gas fracking contributes to climate change at a time when we are in a climate emergency. Want to know why and how? Read this:  
<http://priceofoil.org/2019/05/30/gas-is-not-a-bridge-fuel/?fbclid=IwAR2VQTuSGBV07ZTSgiZcFTApO3XSPvajVCeZ4ls0X9EoU8F5g65UA16d49k>

I expect you to stop this insanity and protect PA residents and our climate instead of ETP's profits. (4)

**5. Comment**

I have had a front row seat for the last 23 months with Mariner 2. Please show us you still have the authority to help citizens protect their land and environment. I am surrounded by substandard work, drilling morning noon and night, my ROW agent performs his job with conscious gross negligence. For 100 years it has been a status symbol to live on my road. In 2019, Mariner 2 leaves a trail of devastation. It will

not recover in my lifetime. DEP - Please flex some muscle. We need accountability.  
(5)

**6. Comment**

I witnessed the Sunoco pipeline incompetence starting on April 17, 2018 when the drilling liquid burst through the ground. This occurred directly next to Building C. The videos I took daily through October showed just how poorly drilling fluid was contained. So now we want to enter new pipes through 40 year old pipes is just a time bomb waiting to blow. History shows that until they kill men, women and children nothing will be done. This is at the feet of all government agencies including but not limited to Middletown, EPA, State and Federal agencies. We lost our sting, summer and fall to their mud, loud trucks, untold numbers of workers taking our parking spots and disrupting sleep and stress associated with nonstop such activity.  
(6)

**7. Comment**

To put it all simply, none of this is safe and every last aspect of this project should be deemed as illegal in every possible way. There is clearly no profit in any way whatsoever and needs to be taken down now. (7)

**8. Comment**

I am writing regarding section ID S3-0620 of the ME2 pipeline. I work directly across Pennell Road from Tunbridge Apartments, and I am very concerned with this permit application.

Although safety of this pipeline is also a major concern, I will comment on the environmental aspect of this application. According to the application, "An open trench installation method across these resources will result in temporary, short-term, impacts to streams and wetlands." And also, "The revised construction plan will involve the open cut of Wetland WL-I1, an Exceptional Value (EV) wetland".

How was it determined that the impact to this EV wetland will be temporary and short-term? Delaware County has very few EV streams and wetlands, and they should be protected at all costs.

For this reason, DEP should deny this permit. (8)

**9. Comment**

I strongly urge DEP to deny Sunoco's Report for HDD PA-DE-0100.0000-RR (HDD# S3-0620). The newly proposed plan will remove sections of exceptional value wetlands, disrupt stream ecology and streambeds, and fails to comply with Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration regulations regarding clearance between pipes and underground structures. Placing the pipes in a smaller than required casing could also interfere with the safety mechanism designed to prevent corrosion (cathodic protection) and could lead to possible leaks or ruptures.

This would present grave safety issues for those living near the pipelines and aquatic habitats.

In addition, Sunoco inadequately addressed how it will deal with flooding issues and groundwater discharge while implementing this new plan. The plan also fails to explain why alternative methods for crossing sections of exceptional value wetlands are not acceptable. In addition, the new plan contains numerous errors and omissions, such as misidentifying pipeline measurements, misnaming the township in which the site is, and providing information that contradicts drawings. DEP should deny this flawed plan to ensure the safety of residents from ruptures or leaks and protection of valuable environmental resources. (9 - 419)

#### **10. Comment**

I oppose any HDD or open trench along Glen Riddle Rd for the Mariner East pipelines. The karst land in this area makes any drilling or digging an unsafe risk to residents. This is been displayed all along the Mariner East Pipeline already, with more than 90 spills of drilling fluid and several sinkholes. The amount of fines and violations thus far is unimaginable. How long will the corruption continue to promote corporate profits over residential safety?! Now that there is an open criminal investigation, I hope all those who are involved in ensuring this pipeline is pushed through will soon be caught. I hope I can begin to trust my government and the department of environmental protection to do what they vowed to do under the constitution and protect the safety and health of residents, air, water and our environment. Energy transfer partners and Sunoco have shown us time and time again, they are in it for money, not for the good of Pennsylvania. This is our home is not theirs and this project must be stopped immediately and permanently. We cannot continue to allow the oil and gas companies to destroy Pennsylvania, the nation and most importantly everyone's home, planet earth. There is no planet B. Thanks for your time. (420)

#### **11. Comment**

Please do not allow the use of "direct bore" to place a 48-inch pipe which will then serve as a casing for the combination of both the 20-inch and the 16-inch pipe for the Mariner East 2 and 2x in the proposed Delaware County area. Our county is densely packed as far as population. This pipeline is a logistical nightmare scenario waiting to happen, and I don't believe construction should have begun in the first place, let alone allowing for any changes that would impact the surrounding areas even more severely should there be an issue.

We need to make some hard decisions about what is most important to us as a community. Sunoco has no interest in our well being, only their profit. Kind Regards. (421)

**12. Comment**

I strongly urge DEP to deny Sunoco's Report for HDD PA-DE-0100.0000-RR (HDD# S3-0620). It is simply inadequate. It fails to properly address major issues, thus endangering lives in this populous area. We deserve better! (422)

**13. Comment**

Pennsylvania must put an end to all new fossil fuel infrastructure projects. Our climate obligations demand it. (423)

**14. Comment**

I am writing as a professor of environmental studies to strongly urge DEP to deny Sunoco's newest pipeline plan.

There are all the important reasons for Pennsylvanians to reject this plan: destruction of wetlands, disruption of stream ecology, safety issues in heavily populated areas.

There is also the incredibly important global reason that I imagine you feel are not within your purview, namely the crisis of climate change that must be addressed. Do you want your children to live in a world of daily tornadoes, such as we have had in recent weeks? Do you want your grandchildren to live in a world where climate refugees and environmental collapse threaten not just humans but all life on the planet? Stopping fossil fuel extraction is a moral issue of the highest importance, and government officials are charged with ensuring the public good, not corporate profit. Here is one small step you can take: say NO! Stop Sunoco's madness. (424)

**15. Comment**

Stop the pipeline until they have a geologist study boot road. This is too much too fast! I have a well! (425)

**16. Comment**

The DEP needs to take action to stop Sunoco from acting on and submitting approvals for incomplete and sub-par quality planning. This sloppiness in documentation directly affects the quality of the work product and should not be acceptable for any local, state or federal standard.

Sunoco's plan is infused with errors and omissions (sub-par quality planning). On page 11 of the section entitled "HDD Hydrogeologic Reevaluation Report" (page 24 of the PDF), it is stated that "the reports for the three geophysical survey events are provided in Attachment C". But only one of the three is there. The DEP cannot evaluate (and should not accept) an incomplete submission.

Casing issues. The report proposes the use of "direct bore to place a 48-inch pipe which will then serve as a casing for the combination of both the 20-inch and the 16-inch pipe. But there is not enough room inside a 48-inch pipe to hold them both safely. There would be, at most, 4 inches between the two pipes and between each of them and the casing. PHMSA (the federal Pipeline Hazardous Material Safety

Administration) requires at least 12 inches between the pipes and between them and the casing. The proposed spacing is illegal.

This use of a casing presents an additional safety hazard: if there were to be a leak anywhere along the encased pipeline, the gases would almost certainly follow the casing to the one end or the other of the cased-in section, resulting in far higher risk in that area than would otherwise be the case.

Another major problem associated with the casing is that it can interfere with the use of cathodic protection, the standard technique that pipeline companies (including Sunoco) use to prevent corrosion. Cathodic protection depends on a flow of electrical current through the soil to the entire surface of the pipe. The casing is likely to prevent that current from reaching much of the pipe. Still, water will surely get inside the casing, creating the potential for rust. How will Sunoco prevent rust from forming and ultimately causing leaks, if cathodic protection can't be used? There is no answer in the report.

Inadvertent returns. In its conclusion, the report claims that "this method [direct bore] also eliminates the risk of IRs". IRs (inadvertent returns, or "frac-outs") plagued Sunoco's previous attempt to install pipe via horizontal directional drilling (HDD) at this location. But they are not "eliminated" by the direct bore technique. In fact, they are common. Slurry pressure resulting in hydraulic fracturing of the ground will happen. This is simply a false statement.

Groundwater issues. The report claims that with direct bore, "there is less probability of a groundwater discharge than with convention HDD drilling." Sunoco had and CONTINUES to have massive problems in controlling groundwater discharge in its HDD attempt (hidden action recently in our township Edgmont Township, Delaware County), resulting in pollution to streams and wetlands and perhaps undetected damage to aquifers. Direct bore may have "less probability" of groundwater problems, but they are still likely, given their scale in the previous attempt.

No real consideration of alternatives. The report dismisses the idea that there could be an alternative route for this pipeline, saying "[Sunoco] evaluated other routes around the rea but reasonable alternatives are not existent due to the density of roads and developments..." In fact, however, Sunoco actually has an operating pipeline (Mariner East 1) running in a separate, parallel easement a short distance away. Was that route ever considered? Apparently it was not, which may mean that no real effort was made to explore alternatives.

There is also no discussion of alternatives to open trenching for crossing the wetlands and streams at the southern end of this stretch of pipeline. Why is this the case? (my neighborhood has wetlands). Why did Sunoco choose direct bore at some locations but not others? This needs an explanation.

Please enforce logical and higher standards. Our experience in our neighborhoods with all the drilling and work is utterly and embarrassingly lacking any form of quality or planning not withstanding any logical oversight by your entity which is your jurisdiction. At the minimum, insuring BASIC, simple quality planning should be a meets minimum activity and bar for Sunoco to follow as the actions they are taking are already destructive enough even with proper planning. (250)

**17. Comment**

Please make it stop. Please conduct your business as if it were your neighborhood. btw, it is your Earth. (426)

**18. Comment**

Sunoco is currently drilling on Boot Road and it is a nightmare. They have caused four inadvertent returns and another major incident today which is yet to be defined. The physical and mental health and safety of our community is being squandered so that Sunoco can make untold fortunes on shipping LNG to Norway for the manufacture of plastics! I am begging you to think about what is happening at the human level. Stop the madness!!! (427)

**19. Comment**

The DEP should not approve any new fossil fuel infrastructure without a clear plan for how the US is going to transition to 100% renewable energy by the middle of next century. Keep it in the ground! (428)

**20. Comment**

I would like to voice my concerns regarding Sunoco's new plan for ME2 and ME2X between Riddlewood and the Tunbridge Apartments in Middletown Township, Delaware County. I live in the neighborhood across Route 452 from Riddlewood. I have many concerns regarding the safety of this pipeline and the lack of regulations. To place this pipeline transporting this product in a such a densely populated area seems grossly irresponsible at the least. With Sunoco's latest plan there will be additional risk placing two pipelines so close in casing. This is against PHMSA regulations and shouldn't even be considered.

I would like the DEP to investigate why a spring has now come through Lenni Road at the intersection of Lenni Road and Elm Avenue. Before Sunoco began their HDD, about a 1,000' from this location, there was no spring or issue with the road. It leads me to believe that an aquifer has been disturbed. Sunoco has caused extensive damage to this area and should not be permitted to continue with another haphazard plan taking risks with the environment and our safety.

The proposal submitted states that there are no options for the location of the pipeline. Is there a reason it cannot follow the path of ME1?

I appreciate your consideration of my concerns in making a decision regarding the proposal. (429)

**21. Comment**

The proposed installation of the NGL pipeline is too dangerous to allow. (430)

**22. Comment**

As a resident of Middletown Township in Pennsylvania, I am writing to beg the DEP to not approve the plans submitted by SUNOCO regarding the ME2 pipeline.

This pipeline goes through my property. They have been working on my land for the past two years. I have lost track to how many violations and fines they have received. This community has been turned upside down by the hardship, damage and safety that has been inflicted on us by this pipeline.

I cannot understand how this pipeline was ever approved as a utility. They have ruined properties, disrupted lives and lowered the value of our homes.

Our beautiful wooded property had possibly 100 tall gorgeous trees ripped from the ground. It is now an awful, noisy, smelly vibrating, disruptive nightmare.

Even though the pipes were put in the ground on my property two years ago they are still using our land as a highway for the construction vehicles and workers. To say it's been a nightmare is an understatement.

Myself as well as our neighbors want to move but can't while our land is all torn up.

Every time we hear any kind of a loud bang or boom, we worry about that pipeline. We live with the constant fear that we can blow up or suffocate at any moment.

This is no way I ever imagined my life to be. And even if I am lucky enough to move away from this nightmare, that only means some other family who is simply trying to raise their children get thrown into the situation as well.

Sunoco's dangerous new HDD plan is in violation of federal recommendations and should not be approved by the DEP. (431)

**23. Comment**

It has come to my attention that Sunoco's new HDD plan is in violation of federal recommendations and should not be approved by the DEP.

Sunoco & the Mariner East Pipeline project has been in our area and disrupting the lives of homeowners and businesses along the pipeline for too long. Beginning with bullying and lying to homeowners and now changing installation process.

And now they want to remove sections of an exception value wetland and put in 2 pipelines in one 48" casing which is in violation of federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration recommendations.

In addition the application contains errors, and is inconsistent with information submitted in its permit applications.

Every wetland, stream and property along the route is at risk of being damaged due to the pipeline drilling. We have already had issues with flooding and property damage to many homes in our neighborhood alone, as well as numerous others along the pipeline.

The worst and most upsetting part of this is the fact that HVLs will be transported through this pipeline precariously close to private residences, Senior Living facilities, community parks and group facilities and the worst. pithing 600 feet of a elementary school!!!

Please do not grant Sunoco permission to run this pipeline. This is not just about the immediate issue of noise pollution, dust, debris, and other construction pollution. This is about the safety of the residents. As you know the concentrated gasses are highly volatile and there would be no time for evacuation. (432, 437)

#### **24. Comment**

I am a resident of Chester County who has serious concerns regarding Sunoco/ETP's Mariner East Pipeline project. In my opinion, this hazardous, highly-volatile pipeline should not be permitted through high-consequence areas such as Chester and Delaware Counties. Near my home in Exton, the lines run under or within feet of many businesses and residences, a senior living facility, a playground, two little league fields, Chester County Library (which has 500,000 visitors per year), Exton Mall (which includes a Main Line Health facility), and under several busy roads and the SEPTA/AMTRACK railway. The pipelines pass through a flood plain created by West Valley Creek. Major sinkholes have developed and wells have been contaminated in our community.

In their arduous attempt to complete the Mariner East project, Sunoco consistently ignores best practices such as PHMSA's advisory against reversing flow and changing products in pipelines. They currently use the 1932-era ME1 and 1937-era 12-inch workaround pipelines to convey natural gas liquids under high pressure. This is an example of their profit-over-safety orientation. Their advisory-be-damned approach places Pennsylvanians at risk.

The current situation in Middletown Township, Delaware County, is yet another case of Sunoco eschewing best practices and endangering public safety.

Their request to the DEP – Horizontal Directional Drill Analysis Glen Riddle Road and Southeastern Pennsylvania RR Crossing. PADEP Section 105 PERMIT NO.: E23-524, PA-DE-0100.0000-RR, (SPLP HDD# S3-0620) – contains numerous errors that I am sure you observed while reading their document. For example, they mention three geophysical survey events in Attachment 3, but provide information

on one. They refer to their “24-inch line,” which I believe is nonexistent. Why is a billion-dollar corporation with a swarm of lawyers who show up for hearings unable to assemble an accurate submission to our state agencies? Do they care about accuracy? Their carelessness undermines public faith in this company’s ability to competently install and consistently maintain safe pipelines.

Sunoco’s request to use direct bore methodology to install a 48-inch pipe intended to encase both the 20-inch ME2 and 16-inch ME2X lines blatantly ignores PHMSA requirements for a 12-inch separation between pipes, and between pipes and casings. Sunoco/ETP seems to have no qualms about disregarding best practices, law, and public safety.

The citizens of Pennsylvania deserve representatives and agencies that work to protect them, their homes, and their families. Your agency statement says: “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.”

I hope that you will partner with the individuals, organizations, and state representatives who ask you to deny Sunoco’s permit in this case and that you will defend the public’s health and safety when examining the damage and threat associated with Mariner East across Pennsylvania. (433)

## **25. Comment**

The DEP should not accept Sunoco’s ill-conceived plan for its Mariner East pipeline between Riddlewood and Glen Riddle Road (DEP ID# S3-0620). There are several reasons:

1. The plan is error-ridden and incomplete. Some appendices are missing completely, and there are many errors in the text, showing the lack of care with which it was put together. How can the DEP rely on the proper execution of a plan when the plan itself is so sloppy?
2. The “direct bore” method that Sunoco proposes for the installation of two pipes in a single casing violates the federal guidelines for pipeline spacing that PHMSA creates. It is also likely to prevent the proper functioning of cathodic protection, which is the technique Sunoco uses to prevent corrosion. This method of installation invites problems in years to come.
3. Sunoco claims that the method of installation prevents inadvertent returns (IRs). But that’s not the case. For example, a recent article in an industry magazine (“The Planning and Construction of Microtunneling Projects” in *Trenchless Technology* magazine) talks about the IRs as a problem, especially where the pipe is shallow (as Sunoco is proposing in this location). This stretch of pipeline is in

an area of streams and sensitive wetlands where Sunoco has previously had very serious problems with IRs. A solid plan for dealing with them is needed, and Sunoco is not providing one.

4. Likewise, there is no plan for dealing with groundwater problems, despite the fact that Sunoco's previous efforts at this location produced uncontrollable groundwater discharges, resulting in pollution of a nearby stream. This problem is almost certain to happen again if the plan proceeds as stated.
5. Where are the alternatives? Sunoco claims there are no alternative routes for this pipeline, but in fact it is currently using an alternative route: the route of Mariner East 1. Did Sunoco even consider alternatives? If it did, it should describe them and present the reasons why they were not chosen. Similarly, there is no discussion of the alternatives to the "direct bore" technology. Why not?

These are a few of the main reason why the DEP should reject Sunoco's plan. (434)

## **26. Comment**

I wish to express my great concern regarding the plan by Sunoco (ETP Partners) to put its 16" and 20" pipelines through a 48" casing in the Riddlewood/Tunbridge area of Delaware County. This plan would violate federal safety guidelines and could lead to corrosion, leaks, and possible ruptures of these pipelines. With the pipelines so close together, the consequences of any rupture would be multiplied and could be catastrophic, not only for the immediate neighborhood but also for many surrounding townships and boroughs.

Sunoco's drilling, right beside people's homes, would pollute neighborhoods with noise, dust, and debris. Their vehicles already clog the neighborhood roads and make it difficult for people to get in and out of their homes.

Further, Sunoco has no plan in place for crossing high-quality streams and wetlands safely and without damage to these valuable and irreplaceable public resources. Sunoco has demonstrated again and again that they cannot safely and properly install this pipeline, and the result has been damage to property and the environment all along the pipeline route.

I have friends and colleagues who live immediately in this area. I am greatly concerned for their health and safety if this plan goes forward. My home is not far away, and I travel along the very busy Route 452 (Pennell Road) many times each week. This disastrous pipeline threatens our entire area, thousands and thousands of people.

Please do your job and put a halt to this dangerous new HDD plan. It is in violation of federal recommendations, and DEP should not give approval. (435)

## **27. Comment**

The DEP needs review and follow statutes and adequately regulate these types of highly volatile pipeline. And given the risks posed by these types of pipelines, then add an additional level of safety given the densely populated regions through which they travel.

I strongly urge DEP to deny Sunoco's Report for HDD PA-DE-0100.0000-RR (HDD# S3-0620). The newly proposed plan will remove sections of exceptional value wetlands, disrupt stream ecology and streambeds, and fails to comply with Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration regulations regarding clearance between pipes and underground structures. Placing the pipes in a smaller than required casing could also interfere with the safety mechanism designed to prevent corrosion (cathodic protection) and could lead to possible leaks or ruptures. This would present grave safety issues for those living near the pipelines and aquatic habitats.

In addition, Sunoco inadequately addressed how it will deal with flooding issues and groundwater discharge while implementing this new plan. The plan also fails to explain why alternative methods for crossing sections of exceptional value wetlands are not acceptable. In addition, the new plan contains numerous errors and omissions, such as misidentifying pipeline measurements, misnaming the township in which the site is, and providing information that contradicts drawings. DEP should deny this flawed plan to ensure the safety of residents from ruptures or leaks and protection of valuable environmental resources. (436)

## **28. Comment**

This is a letter of concern regarding proposed change in plans for re-eval of HDD site of Glen Riddle Road and Southeastern PA RR Crossing, SPLP HDD# S3-0620. I am a resident of Delaware County in Edgmont PA, within close vicinity to this proposed change HDD drill plan and feel it is unacceptable due to the following reasons:

1. This plan is an incomplete submission and sub-par quality. There are marked errors noted throughout the plan. Only 1 of 3 survey reports are provided for geophysical survey on page 24 of PDF. An error on page 26 states a 24" pipe will be used. On page 4 of the PDF, the report mentions the crossing of Glen Riddle Road and Southeastern PA RR is in Upper Chichester Township. This is false! If Sunoco is unaware what township they will be working in, how can we trust all the other provided information.
2. This new plan states they will use a 48 inch casing to place the 20 inch and 16 inch pipes into with only inches in between them in a 1 shot pull through process. The pipes will be kept apart with "spider gaskets" and spacers. This few inches of space between pipes will allow for increased damage to pipe coatings and cathodic protection. PHMSA recommends minimum of 12 inches between pipes and casing for safety. This spacing of the pipes Sunoco is recommending in only to allow them

less work time and speed up their pipeline completion date. This should not be allowed to limit citizen safety for their production time.

3. Sunoco states that their abandon of HDD with direct bore method eliminates risk of IRS. This is FALSE! IRs can continue to occur with direct bore and the noise and vibration to homeowners in vicinity will be much greater than the traditional HDD.

4. The change to open cut through wetlands and major tributary stream crossings will affect and harm the many wildlife species and amphibians that are found and documented in this area (turtles, frogs, birds, etc.) during their nesting and reproducing times. The destruction of grounds in this wetland area will also cause increased risk for pollutants to find their way into the Chester Creek which supplies drinking water for a large portion of Delaware County residents.

5. This change in plan must require a DEP open comment community meeting. This plan is not a modification but a new plan.

Please enforce our PA laws to allow the residents to have a safe community and right to clean water! Please schedule a community meeting to keep this process transparent and legal. (438)

**29. Comment**

Please deny Sunoco's Report for HDD PA-DE-0100.0000-RR (HDD# S3-0620). This pipeline presents grave safety issues for those living near the pipelines as well as to aquatic habitats. The newly proposed plan removes sections of exceptional value wetlands, disrupts stream ecology and stream beds, and fails to comply with Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration regulations regarding clearance between pipes and underground structures. Sunoco's plan contains numerous errors and omissions: misidentifying pipeline measurements, misnaming the township in which the site is, and providing information that contradicts drawings. DEP must deny this flawed plan. You must fully understand and hold accountable corporations which threaten the safety of our communities. (439)

**30. Comment**

I live in one of the houses that will be effected by this proposed change. Imagine how one feels when hearing that a big machine will be pounding on a 45 inch pipe for hours each day to cram two other pipes in to the ground next to the three other operational pipelines already present in the same space. And this, from a company that doesn't even get the location right in its official paperwork to your department.

FYI, this is Middletown Township, not Upper Chichester Township.

Unfortunately, this is one small example of the carelessness with which Sunoco has handled the entire ME2 project.

The mere fact that this project has been approved is disgraceful. It is placing highly explosive gas lines into a heavily populated area for the benefit of no one but Sunoco and ETP's shareholders. The entire PA government will be at fault, starting with Governor Wolf, if people are injured in a leak. I can read regulations as well as the next person, and there is no way ME2 qualifies as a public utility.

I hope you all are ashamed of yourselves.

As to the pipeline changes -- why are you taking their word that no alternative route exists? What about the route of ME1? I don't see anything other than their claim showing that another option does not exist. Where is the evidence?

Is it allowed by the federal or state rules to have five active pipelines within the same space? If one goes, they all go, which could take out most of Middletown Township.

And what does this mean: "The HRRs are not intended to evaluate potential adverse effects of nearby man-made structures from HDD operations"? Surely those of us in the nearby structures are entitled to know about potential adverse effects?

Again, it says: SPLP is proposing to greatly reduce the risk of these events (fluid discharge and subsidence) during construction of both the 16-inch line and the 20-inch line. Shouldn't that be "eliminate," not "reduce." Sunoco has had enough sinkholes and so has Delaware County.

And, finally, how am I to know where exactly, these pipes are located once they're placed underground? I have not given the easement, and if I find out the pipes are on my property, I will demand that they be dug up and removed. I'd hate to have to poke big holes in the ground to find their whereabouts, so I want to know exactly where they are in relation to my property line.

I'm exceedingly disappointed in my state government. I expected more integrity. Silly me. (440)

### **31. Comment**

As a Middletown Township and Riddlewood subdivision resident, I am writing this morning to express my serious concerns about and strong opposition to Sunoco's new plan for construction of the S3-0620 portion of the Mariner East 2 and 2x pipelines.

Sunoco has consistently shown a callous disregard for public safety and attention to detail throughout the Mariner East 2 and 2x application and construction process, and this new plan is no different. First, it is sloppily written and contains many errors and omissions. For example, the plan states that the area is in Upper Chichester Township, when Upper Chichester Township is actually miles away from this site. Second, the proposed spacing of the 20-inch pipe and the 16-inch pipe within 4 inches of one another and the casing violates PHMSA requirements and represents a significant and unacceptable increase in risk to area residents. Third, the plan does

not substantial its claim that this revision in approach will reduce the risk of inadvertent returns or groundwater contamination issues with any evidence or confidence.

Protect the citizens and environment of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and reject this plan. (441)

**32. Comment**

It's time to let these men do there job and get this pipe line finished. Sunoco is doing their best to install this pipe line safely. The bureaucracy and red tape needs to stop. I don't want my tax dollars wasted to harass this company. (442)

**33. Comment**

Approving Sunoco/Energy Transfer's new proposal for drilling and installing Mariner East 2 and 2X in Middletown township, Delaware County, would negatively impact and pose grave danger to the residents and natural resources of Middletown township. First of all, this same route in Middletown and the surrounding community has already been subjected to an excessively lengthy period of Sunoco's attempts at completing HDD for Mariner East. During their previous repeated and failed attempts, our Chester Creek was negatively impacted. The same creek in which residents fish and children play. My own daughter loves playing in the creek while her brothers play Little League baseball as the creek runs right by the Aston-Middletown Little League fields. The multitude of frac-outs, so-called "inadvertent returns" that we know to be anything but inadvertent, no only impacted the creek but the Tunbridge Apartments' residents daily lives. Their community was subjected to many months of vacuum trucks operating, idling, traveling to and from their parking lot and once-grassy common area. Their homes, the sounds they heard, the air they breathed and the sights from their homes were taken over by this project of Sunoco. This experience is representative of how residents feel that this Mariner East project is being prioritized over our health and safety, our natural resources. During the last rounds of attempts, residents of Tunbridge and Riddlewood had to be compensated so they could live elsewhere as the impacts were too great to live in their homes. Yet compensation did not cover all residents experiencing these impacts and in many cases, came too late for many impacted residents who qualified for compensation.

On the north end of the HDD attempt here in Middletown, my neighborhood of Riddlewood, the drill site and route goes right through many backyards, along one of the busiest roads in Middletown and just down the street from our Glenwood Elementary. The very road along which Sunoco wants to continue their installation attempts is inhabited by families with young children, elderly residents, children with special needs and disabilities. Children along this very stretch and throughout our Riddlewood subdivision have asthma and have already been negatively impacted by the construction dust, the constant truck traffic, the idling vehicles. In fact, one family on War Trophy (the road on which many of the families would have to live with this right in their backyards) has a severely disabled teenage child and mother

with severe asthma. Also, down War Trophy is our Riddlewood Swim Club where MANY families gather throughout the summer and at other times of year to enjoy the pool, the baseball fields and hold community events. The access to the Right of Way used most during construction is one of the only entrances/exits to our Riddlewood neighborhood, not only used by residents but by our school buses multiple times per day and for bus pickups/dropoffs. The frequent vacuum truck traffic or other vehicles involved in the Mariner East construction is extremely disruptive along this stretch of road.

The route Sunoco plans to continue attempts to install these Mariner East pipelines also crosses train tracks, train tracks SEPTA is in the process of rebuilding and putting into operation again. This is a challenging time as there have already been erosion issues along this stretch and under the train tracks. And at times of heavy precipitation, there is flooding and increased erosion in the immediate vicinity of where Sunoco plans to install these pipes. This is especially concerning given Sunoco's new plans to include open-cut for this portion of the route.

Now, there are significant issues with new plans for installing the two pipelines through a 48" casing, especially in a residential community, but the new plans to include open-cut where the pipes will only be a few feet below the surface in these backyards and along the busy road of Rte 452/Pennell Rd is unconscionable. Not only does use of open-cut in such a densely populated, heavily-trafficked area leave our community at even greater risk if a leak or rupture were to occur, but also is extremely ill-advised given the amount of erosion that occurs in this area with heavy precipitation.

In fact, just about a half mile to the north in the Mariner East Right of Way on the shoulder of our busiest highway, a sinkhole measuring 12'x12'x12' developed a couple months ago after heavy rains and across the street from one active HDD site, next to our State Police Barracks, across the street from a retirement community and our YMCA and just north of Glenwood Elementary. The sinkhole developed and Sunoco filled it in before any inspection was able to occur. It was filled in before township and safety officials were notified and had time to arrive on site. And yet, drilling was allowed to continue unabated and the old 12" pipeline in the same Right of Way now carrying HVLs was allowed to remain operational. If such utter disregard for our township, our vulnerable sites and our officials occurs in the face of a potential immediate threat, how can a new plan be considered including even riskier methods?

Sunoco's application even includes errors, confusing the 16" and 20" pipes, and is inconsistent with information submitted in its permit applications.

Sunoco wants to remove sections of an exceptional value wetland, vital to our Chester Creek. Sunoco wants to put the 16" and 20" pipes through a 48" casing, leaving only 4" between the two pipes and violating federal PHMSA recommendations. This part of the proposal presents greater risk of corrosion and possible leaks and/or ruptures.

In the end, Sunoco's proposal would place every wetland, stream, property, and person along the route at risk of damage or destruction due to the pipeline drilling and new methods of operation.

Our daily lives, our air, water, wetlands, community are at stake.

The Department of Environmental Protection has a multitude of reasons and overwhelming evidence to disapprove this new plan of Sunoco's. In fact, consideration of all the facts involved compels the DEP to reject this application. (443)

### **34. Comment**

I am writing to express my deep concerns for Sunoco/ET's latest proposal for installing the Mariner East 2 and 2X pipelines through a portion of Middletown Township, Delaware County (S3-0620).

As you know, Sunoco failed miserably with their original attempt to install the pipes using an HDD method. Their new proposed plan is no less riddled with concerns and (potentially serious) issues.

Firstly, why would the DEP allow a direct bore approach in a wetland area? That alone should be reason enough to deny permits.

Secondly, this method will result in the pipes being so close together that it is a PHMSA violation.

Also, the proposal is sloppy and contains errors and omissions. For example, on page 11 of the section entitled "HDD Hydrogeologic Reevaluation Report" (page 24 of the PDF), it is stated that "the reports for the three geophysical survey events are provided in Attachment C". But only one of the three is there. How can the DEP properly evaluate that?

Sunoco also incorrectly refers to this area as Upper Chichester Township. Do they even know where they are installing this?

Finally, (although I could go on) this area will undoubtedly continue to experience regular inadvertent returns from this work, just as it did with HDD. This area is just not meant to be disturbed from both an environmental and personal safety standpoint. I also fear for any wells that exist in this area.

I moved my family out of this area a year ago simply because this project is reckless and unsafe. Don't allow this to continue. The residents of this area don't deserve it. No one does. Step up, stand up, DEP! (444)

**35. Comment**

As a Middletown resident who lives near this area, as well as having my elderly mother in Tunbridge apartments directly next to ME2, I encourage you to deny the new plans for this area.

ETP never considered another route, even though that was suggested to them. They should have stuck to the path of ME1, it has never been explained why they came through Middletown instead of following the ME1 path through Aston.

The side by side pipelines will have a mere 4'' between them, far less than federal regulations suggest.

The application is full of errors, how can that be acceptable in a project with such dangers involved.

We do not want a repeat of the ETP Revolution explosion that occurred in Western Pennsylvania. It's well past time to put a stop to this project and hold ETP accountable. (414)

**36. Comment**

I am writing to express my opposition to any horizontal directional drilling or open trench along Glen Riddle Road for the Mariner East pipelines.

The number of drilling fluid spills (more than 90!) and sinkholes that have already occurred is staggering. It's clear that the karst land in this area makes drilling and digging an unsafe risk to residents.

Corporate profits should never be placed over residential safety. We need to be able to trust that the government and DEP will perform the important duty outlined in the PA Constitution of protecting the safety and health of residents, which also means protecting our environment, air and water. Energy Transfer Partners and Sunoco have shown us over and over that this is about the money, not about the good of our state and the public's health and welfare.

Thank you for the chance to express my opinion. (445)

**37. Comment**

I strongly urge DEP to deny Sunoco's Report for HDD PA-DE-0100.0000-RR (HDD# S3-0620). The newly proposed plan will remove sections of exceptional value wetlands, disrupt stream ecology and streambeds, and fails to comply with Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration regulations regarding clearance between pipes and underground structures. Placing the pipes in a smaller-than-required casing could also interfere with the safety mechanism designed to prevent corrosion (cathodic protection), and could lead to possible leaks or ruptures. This would present grave safety issues for those living near the pipelines and aquatic habitats.

In addition, Sunoco inadequately addressed how it will deal with flooding issues and groundwater discharge while implementing this new plan. The plan also fails to explain why alternative methods for crossing sections of exceptional value wetlands are not being used.

Finally, the new plan contains numerous errors and omissions, such as misidentifying pipeline measurements, misnaming the township in which the site is located, and providing information that contradicts drawings. DEP should deny this flawed plan, and focus on ensuring the safety of residents from ruptures or leaks and protection of valuable environmental resources.

We live in a nearby township (Chester Heights) and drive through Middletown frequently, so we and our infant daughter would be at high risk every time we travel near the route of this pipeline. This proposed plan would increase that risk even further, by placing the pipelines too close together, magnifying the impact if one of them were to leak and explode. That is absolutely unacceptable! (446)

### **38. Comment**

I have read Sunoco's proposed plans for the ME2 and 2X and there are several errors and omissions such as page 11 of the section entitled "HDD Hydrogeologic Reevaluation Report" (page 24 of the PDF), it is stated that "the reports for the three geophysical survey events are provided in Attachment C". Two of them are missing. There is also mention of a 24 inch pipeline several pages later. Is there another pipeline or is that an error?

Also, this report proposes the using "direct bore" or "microtunneling" to put a 48" pipe which will be the casing for both the 20-inch and the 16-inch pipe. However, according to the PHMSA (the federal Pipeline Hazardous Material Safety Administration) it requires at least 12 inches between the pipes and between them and the casing. Sunoco is only allowing 4 inches in between. Therefore, the proposed spacing is illegal. If there is a leak in this casing, it would raise the dangers to a higher risk to the area because it would affect both pipelines tightly encased.

Another point is the casing can interfere with the use of cathodic protection, the standard technique that pipeline companies (including Sunoco) use to prevent corrosion. Cathodic protection depends on a flow of electrical current through the soil to the entire surface of the pipe. The casing is likely to prevent that current from reaching much of the pipe. Still, water will surely get inside the casing, creating the potential for rust. How will Sunoco prevent rust from forming and ultimately causing leaks, if cathodic protection can't be used? There is no answer in the report.

As far as this solving inadvertent returns, there was a recent article in the trade journal Trenchless Technology entitled "The Planning and Construction of Microtunneling Projects". In its discussion of drilling depth, the article states, "where there is shallow cover it becomes much more likely for the slurry pressure to overcome the

overburden pressure resulting in hydraulic fracturing of the ground”. It talks about the problems when this type of construction is attempted with the pipe less than ten feet below the surface. But that is the approximate depth of much of the route where direct bore is being proposed.

The report claims that with direct bore, “there is less probability of a groundwater discharge than with convention HDD drilling.” Sunoco had massive problems in controlling groundwater discharge in its previous HDD attempt, resulting in pollution to streams and wetlands and perhaps undetected damage to aquifers. Direct bore may have “less probability” of groundwater problems, but they are still likely, given their scale in the previous attempt. How will they be dealt with? The report says only “the contractor should plan to manage a groundwater discharge, if it occurs.” Sunoco must be forced to give better answers have better responsibility than their claim.

The report dismisses the idea that there could be an alternative route for this pipeline, saying “[Sunoco] evaluated other routes around the rea but reasonable alternatives are not existent due to the density of roads and developments....” In fact, however, Sunoco actually has an operating pipeline (Mariner East 1) running in a separate, parallel easement a short distance away. Was that route ever considered? Apparently it was not, which may mean that no real effort was made to explore alternatives.

There is also no discussion of alternatives to open trenching for crossing the wetlands and streams at the southern end of this stretch of pipeline. Why not? Why did Sunoco choose direct bore at some locations but not others? This needs an explanation, but none is given.

It is the DEP's duty to correct these mistakes and to hold Sunoco accountable - they are putting these pipelines to make millions with blatant disregard for a highly populated area and the dangers they are putting all these people in.

Thank you for reading this and taking action. (447)

### **39. Comment**

It is extremely disheartening that the public is called upon repeatedly to provide input on this ill-conceived project while there is a supposed halt to permits and despite the egregious malfeasance of this operator. This latest submission is no improvement on their previous work and does nothing to inspire public confidence.

First of all, it is very sloppy, with numerous errors and omissions throughout. For example, on page 11 of the section entitled “HDD Hydrogeologic Reevaluation Report” (page 24 of the PDF), it is stated that “the reports for the three geophysical survey events are provided in Attachment C”. But only one of the three is there. The DEP cannot evaluate (and should not accept) an incomplete submission. And what are we supposed to think of the mention of a “24-inch line” two pages later. Is that just a typo? On page 4 of the pdf the report mentions that “the crossing of Glen

Riddle Road and Southeastern Pennsylvania RR is in Upper Chichester Township". In fact, it is miles away from the nearest point in Upper Chichester Township.

The report claims that "this method [direct bore] also eliminates the risk of IRs". IRs (inadvertent returns, or "frac-outs") plagued Sunoco's previous attempt to install pipe via horizontal directional drilling (HDD) at this location. But they are not "eliminated" by the direct bore technique. In fact, they are common. There was a recent article in the trade journal Trenchless Technology entitled "The Planning and Construction of Microtunneling Projects". In its discussion of drilling depth, the article states, "where there is shallow cover it becomes much more likely for the slurry pressure to overcome the overburden pressure resulting in hydraulic fracturing of the ground". It talks about the problems when this type of construction is attempted with the pipe less than ten feet below the surface. But that is the approximate depth of much of the route where direct bore is being proposed. An inadvertent return occurred in East Goshen on 5/31 and Sunoco has not been able to resolve it four days later.

The report claims that with direct bore, "there is less probability of a groundwater discharge than with convention HDD drilling." Sunoco had massive problems in controlling groundwater discharge in its previous HDD attempt, resulting in pollution to streams and wetlands and perhaps undetected damage to aquifers. Direct bore may have "less probability" of groundwater problems, but they are still likely, given their scale in the previous attempt. There is little more critical than the integrity of drinking water and streams and wetlands. The people of the Commonwealth deserve better than "less probability."

I urge you to deny this latest, inadequate submission from Sunoco. (448)

#### **40. Comment**

I recently received a tour of the part of the Mariner East installation area. It was troubling to see the impact these communities are going through already, and that will only get worse. Many people told me of safety concerns with these pipelines as they are very close to residential homes, schools, senior facilities, and community centers. We recently placed my father in an assisted living facility and I shudder to think what the staff there would do in an emergency requiring moving their residents quickly to a safe, distant location from any rupture/leak.

I don't understand in Pennsylvania why we bend and ignore so many rules and common sense to make way for these pipelines. These pipelines generally aren't serving Pennsylvanians and when they are there is still the risk and environmental impact involved that make them not make sense. Please do your job in protecting current and future Pennsylvanians from the negative impact of this and similar projects. I can't help asking myself why these and other communities' safety and concerns are being ignored in favor of large companies that only have profit in mind, not the future of the land or the communities they operate in.

I strongly urge DEP to deny Sunoco's Report for HDD PA-DE-0100.0000-RR (HDD# S3-0620). The newly proposed plan will remove sections of exceptional value wetlands, disrupt stream ecology and streambeds, and fails to comply with Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration regulations regarding clearance between pipes and underground structures. Placing the pipes in a smaller than required casing could also interfere with the safety mechanism designed to prevent corrosion (cathodic protection) and could lead to possible leaks or ruptures. This would present grave safety issues for those living near the pipelines and aquatic habitats.

In addition, Sunoco inadequately addressed how it will deal with flooding issues and groundwater discharge while implementing this new plan. The plan also fails to explain why alternative methods for crossing sections of exceptional value wetlands are not acceptable. In addition, the new plan contains numerous errors and omissions, such as misidentifying pipeline measurements, misnaming the township in which the site is, and providing information that contradicts drawings. DEP should deny this flawed plan to ensure the safety of residents from ruptures or leaks and protection of valuable environmental resources. (449)

#### **41. Comment**

We live at 233 Martins Lane Media, PA 19063. Our property is very close to the proposed pipe line. We are really concerned about Sunoco's new HDD plan. Based on their past performance and mistakes we believe that PA DEP approving this plan in its current form would pose grave danger to the residents and the natural resources of Middletown Township. Sunoco's dangerous new HDD Plan is in violation of Federal recommendations and should not be approved by DEP. (450)

#### **42. Comment**

Pursuant to the Corrected Stipulated Order entered on EHB Docket No. 2017-009-L on August 10, 2017 ("Order"), and on behalf of Clean Air Council, Mountain Watershed Association, Inc., and the Delaware Riverkeeper Network ("Appellants"), please accept these comments on Sunoco Pipeline L.P.'s ("Sunoco") re-evaluation report ("Report") for the horizontal directional drilling ("HDD") indicated by drawing number PA-DE-0100.0000-RR (the "HDD Site").

Most importantly, the Department should be aware that Sunoco's proposed re-evaluated plans for the Site illegally cluster together pipes that federal law requires be separated for safety reasons. For that reason alone, this proposal cannot be approved as is.

#### **1. Sunoco's plans for use of direct pipe and cased auger bore with a single, too- small casing pipe present serious safety risks.**

Sunoco proposes to use the "direct pipe" installation method instead of HDD. See <https://www.trenchlesspedia.com/the-direct-pipe-method-combining-the-benefits-of->

hdd-and- microtunneling/2/4153. From the perspective of avoiding inadvertent returns and difficult bedrock, this has significant advantages.

However, Sunoco's proposed use of a casing pipe with a 48-inch interior diameter would violate PHMSA safety regulations and pose a grave danger to those living near the ends of the direct pipe zones.

Direct pipe requires a larger pipe than the 16" and 20" themselves, since it sends cuttings and slurry back through the interior of the pipe along an apparatus. Sunoco is planning on installing a 48" interior diameter pipe through direct pipe and then snaking in the 16" and the 20". The cross-section would look something like this:

There is no way to arrange these three pipes so that they are not within at most four inches of each other at any given point. Given Sunoco's description that the carrier pipes would be suspended within a spider gasket, they will necessarily be closer than 12 inches apart.

The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) requires more than that level of clearance:

§ 195.250 Clearance between pipe and underground structures.

Any pipe installed underground must have at least 12 inches (305 millimeters) of clearance between the outside of the pipe and the extremity of any other underground structure, except that for drainage tile the minimum clearance may be less than 12 inches (305 millimeters) but not less than 2 inches (51 millimeters). However, where 12 inches (305 millimeters) of clearance is impracticable, the clearance may be reduced if adequate provisions are made for corrosion control.

49 CFR § 195.250 (available at <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/49/195.250>).

It would not be impracticable to install the two pipes separately. That is exactly how Sunoco has planned to install the pipes in every other location. Using the same sized casing pipe would leave enough clearance to comply with the federal safety regulations.

Nonetheless, a compliant pipe diameter is not what is planned here. This presents safety issues including corrosion and cathodic protection. The carrier pipes within the casing pipe tend to be more prone to condensation or water infiltration, causing corrosion, and the closeness between the pipes can interfere with the cathodic protection system. See, e.g., Materials Performance, "Challenges of Installing a New Pipeline," March 29, 2018, available at <http://www.materialsperformance.com/articles/cathodic-protection/2018/04/challenges-of-installing-a-new-pipeline>. This does not mean that casings are always to be avoided, but Sunoco's plan to bundle the two carrier pipes

within one casing over long distances in a residential neighborhood where the pipes could be laid separately appears foolhardy. Also, assuming a rupture did occur, the gas would likely collect in the casing pipe and funnel out at the entry or exit of the direct bore. For the segment under the railroad, that would be in a residential neighborhood on one end and at the other end in the middle of the high-density Tunbridge Apartment complex.

Not only is the direct pipe proposal in violation of federal safety law, but it also contradicts the permit applications. The Department relied on Sunoco's commitment to abide by 49 CFR §195.250 on pages 14 to 15 and page 20 of the Project Description. See

[http://files.dep.state.pa.us/ProgramIntegration/PA%20Pipeline%20Portal/MarinerEastII/Delaware/09%20-%20Project%20Descr/PPP-Project%20Description\\_for\\_105%20APP%20120216%20FINAL.pdf](http://files.dep.state.pa.us/ProgramIntegration/PA%20Pipeline%20Portal/MarinerEastII/Delaware/09%20-%20Project%20Descr/PPP-Project%20Description_for_105%20APP%20120216%20FINAL.pdf).

Sunoco's plans for the cased auger bore crossing Glen Riddle Road are the same: one 48-inch interior diameter casing pipe holding both carrier pipes. This presents the same problems. There is no need to deviate from the standard separate crossings for each pipe, and doing so breaks the law, violates the permits, and puts neighbors at grave risk.

The Department should not authorize this re-evaluation proposal, which is dangerous, clearly illegal, and would violate the permits.

## **2. The Report contains many errors and omissions.**

Appellants have concerns about the quality and depth of analysis that went into the Report, given the numerous errors and omissions. Appellants are concerned that the Department and the public may not be able to rely on the information in the Report. These errors and omissions include:

- In Attachment A, Plan and Profiles, Sunoco claims to be comparing the "Direct Bores and Auger Bore Plan and Profiles" with the "permitted" versions of the plans and profiles. But that's not what Sunoco compares its new plans to. The included versions of the "permitted" plans were never permitted and are missing information contained in the permitted plans. What was included is dated May 10, 2016 and given the revision no. EP1. The permitted version is dated September 30, 2016, was "revised per PADEP comments received 09-06-16," contains geotechnical boring information, adjacent building information, right-of-way markings, depth to bedrock, and other useful information lacking in the version of the plans in the Report. See <http://files.dep.state.pa.us/ProgramIntegration/PA%20Pipeline%20Portal/MarinerEastII/Delaware/07%20-%20Site%20Plans/Tab%207B%20HDDs/PA-DE-0100.0000-RRa.pdf>. It is unclear why Sunoco is using for comparison an outdated set of plans. The plans for the new proposal lack the adjacent building information, depth to bedrock, and, curiously geotechnical bore

SB-04. All of this information would be useful for evaluating the safety and impact of the revised proposal.

- Section 1.0 of the Hydrogeologic Re-evaluation Report (HRR) misidentifies the subject of the re-evaluation, stating “This HRR is for the 20-inch pipe installation.” The HRR should be for both the 16- and the 20-inch pipes. Similarly, Section 3.1 of the HRR refers--presumably erroneously--to a 24-inch line.
- The direct pipe drawing showing the Glen Riddle Road crossing shows the 16-inch and 20-inch pipes crossing the road at least ten feet apart, contradicting the auger bore (cased) drawing, which shows both pipes passing through one casing pipe.
- The Hydrogeologic Report states that “Well WL-09202017-608-01 is located relatively far from the HDD alignment (3392 feet)” but this must be in error, because it falls within the 450 foot radius from the alignment. Figure 4 within that report lists 392 feet. This is more likely accurate.
- Sunoco cannot even get the name of the township of the Site right. Sunoco calls it Upper Chichester Township, though it is Middletown Township, which is separated from Upper Chichester by Aston Township. Sunoco also refers to Glen Riddle Road as “Glenn Riddle Road” in several locations.

Likely there are other errors that Appellants have not caught.

Among the more important errors in the Report is Sunoco’s understatement of the problems at this Site by describing only “several IRs in which drilling fluids entered Waters of the Commonwealth,” and claiming the IRs were “contained and cleaned up.” Sunoco’s attempted and ultimately failed installation of its Mariner East pipes at this Site lasted well over a year and caused nearby residents massive headaches in the form of constant noise, IRs, subsidence, stream contamination, and constant construction activity. The HRR reveals that the “several IRs” mentioned in the Report included “Several upland and water resource IRs, groundwater discharges, and two land subsidence features.” Several of the IRs appeared directly within Chester Creek and were carried away with the water downstream rather than being cleaned up. The Department had to issue several NOV’s documenting many IRs for just the one location over the course of the drilling.

### **3. The Alternatives Analysis is inadequate.**

There at least two major problems with the Report’s Alternatives Analysis. First, alternative routes exist which Sunoco is currently using, but which the Report does not mention. Second, the Report lacks discussion of the impacts of the various

alternatives and does not consider alternatives for avoidance of the stream and Exceptional Value wetland besides open trench.

The Re-Route Analysis contains a major oversight. Sunoco writes,

SPLP evaluated other routes around the area but reasonable alternatives are not existent due to the density of roads and developments surrounding the existing route. Residential and commercial development dominates the landscape for miles to the east and west of the existing SPLP easement with no other identifiable existing utility easements that could be considered as alternatives.

In fact, Sunoco is currently using a workaround path for Mariner East 2, which is in service. Section 3.1 of the HRR acknowledges this: “This allowed start of service for one of the two planned ME II pipelines in Spread 6, using a section of an existing 12-inch pipeline that connects to the valve station.” Sunoco also has an alternative right-of-way it owns which houses the Mariner East 1 pipeline.

Why are these alternatives not acceptable? Sunoco does not mention or consider them.

Moreover, there is no discussion of an alternative for routing through the southern portion of the Site besides open trenching. There is a very sensitive stretch containing an Exceptional Value wetland, a reach of a stream largely parallel to the right-of-way, and an aboveground structure. It is unclear why Sunoco would conclude that open trench is most appropriate here simply because HDD has failed. Sunoco has chosen to use direct pipe for other portions, and it would appear natural to do so under these features as well. Regardless, the Report contains no consideration of alternatives.

There is no aerial site plan provided for the proposal to use open trench to cross the Waters of the Commonwealth toward the southern end of the Site, either. Sunoco writes, “To address the additional impacts associated with these proposed changes in construction methods, a Chapter 102 & Chapter 105 permit modification package has been submitted to PADEP for review.” Presumably this information will be located in those packages, but it should also be located here to enable evaluation of alternatives. Likewise, there should be some discussion of alternatives and impacts for the temporary access road that Sunoco proposes off of War Trophy Lane, which is nowhere discussed in the Report.

Sunoco claims that the use of direct pipe or “microtunneling” will “minimize” the risk of IRs. The HRR goes even further in Section 1.0, saying “direct bore pipe installations eliminate the risk of IRs through total control of the drilling fluid pathway.” That does not appear to be the case. Microtunneling still uses drilling fluids at the cutting face. As one article on the technology notes, “Where there is shallow cover it becomes much more likely for the slurry pressure to overcome the

overburden pressure resulting in hydraulic fracturing of the ground. Or, on the flip side, too little pressure is applied causing a sink hole.” Most of the route of the planned microtunneling would have a shallow cover. Sunoco should have disclosed and weighed the risk of IRs or sinkholes from its new proposal in its alternatives analysis rather than simply claiming there is none.

Without having information on resource impacts and discussion of alternatives, no alternative analysis can be complete.

#### **4. Sunoco should not install the pipes through the stream and Exceptional Value wetland by open trench.**

Building upon the discussion above, the Report’s explanation for the direct bore locations is simply that “The construction specialists who operate this boring equipment identified two segment of this alignment to employ the direct pipe bore method of construction. These include a section of the alignment where residences are too close to the existing easement to provide workspace for open trench construction, second area with residences in near proximity, and the crossing of a railroad.” Why are these appropriate for direct pipe but others not? There is no explanation.

Sunoco claims that it has “developed an alternate installation method that minimizes impacts to Waters of the Commonwealth” by open trenching through Exceptional Value wetlands. It is hard to see how that could be construed as minimizing impacts. Especially given Energy Transfer’s recent history of wholesale elimination of streams and wetlands it told the Department it would restore, the Department should be very cautious in scrutinizing its plans for this rare habitat in suburban Delaware County. See Order re ETC Northeast Pipeline LLC -- Revolution Pipeline, dated May 14, 2019, available at [http://files.dep.state.pa.us/ProgramIntegration/PA%20Pipeline%20Portal/RevolutionPipeline/Compliance%20and%20Enforcement%20Information/May\\_14\\_2019\\_Stream\\_and\\_Wetland\\_Order.pdf](http://files.dep.state.pa.us/ProgramIntegration/PA%20Pipeline%20Portal/RevolutionPipeline/Compliance%20and%20Enforcement%20Information/May_14_2019_Stream_and_Wetland_Order.pdf).

The sensitive resources in the southern portion of the Site can and should be avoided, not trenched through, unless there is a science-based reason that avoidance methods would be impossible. Sunoco has not made that case.

#### **5. Despite a clear need, Sunoco has not presented any groundwater discharge plan, let alone a plausible one.**

The Report writes, “The geology at this location presents no risks to the construction methods planned in replacement of the HDDs.” It presents no explanation for that conclusion. The HRR comes to a different conclusion. Section 2.3.3 of the HRR discusses the risk of groundwater discharge from the direct pipe bore that would traverse the slope downward toward Chester Creek. “Given this geometry, there is a

potential to create a groundwater discharge at the southeast end of the bore. However, because the direct pipe method pulls a large diameter pipe string as the cutting head advances and the annulus between this pipe and borehole is small, there is less probability of a groundwater discharge, than with conventional HDD drilling where a large annulus is created between the borehole and drill string.” This comment is comparative. There is a 100% probability that the conventional HDD would cause a groundwater discharge, as it happened, lasted a long time, and involved large quantities of water that Sunoco was unable to contain and which made its way into the woods and Waters of the Commonwealth. Delaware Riverkeeper Network biologist visited the site during the troubles caused by the discharge and reported on them in an affidavit accompanied by Site photographs available here: <http://ehb.courtapps.com/efile/documentViewer.php?documentID=38258>.

Simply reducing to chance of groundwater discharge to something less than 100% is not comforting. If Sunoco wants to use direct pipe down the slope, it needs to have a plausible plan for preventing groundwater discharge and spills into the creeks and wetland. The HRR agrees in Section 4.1: “the contractor should plan to manage a groundwater discharge, if it occurs.” Hoping for the best, or planning to use the failed containment options it employed for the HDD are not acceptable options.

## **6. Geophysical analysis**

Sunoco included in the Report one of the three reports of the geophysical surveys it conducted at the Site. As the first page of the attached Quantum Geophysics December 14, 2018 report explains, “Earlier investigations are described in reports dated June 14, 2018 and September 10, 2018.” Given that these reports are also for the Site, there should be no reason for the Report to lack them. In fact, the author of the HRR seems to have believed that all three reports would be attached, writing in Section 2.4 that “The reports for the three geophysical survey events are provided in Attachment C.” The HRR goes on to discuss them at a summary level.

It is possible that some of the information from the earlier reports has been incorporated into the December report, but that is not clear.

Paragraph 5.i. of the Order states: “The Report shall document in detail the information considered for the re-evaluation of the design of the HDD at that site.” Because the HRR considered these reports, and they appear to contain useful information, they should be included within the Report.

Thank you for considering these comments. Please keep us apprised of your next steps on the HDD Site. (451-455)

Letter – [Clean Air Council – 6-3-19 – Glen Riddle Road, Southeastern Pennsylvania RR Crossing](#)

**43. Comment**

I feel that this is a dangerous plan. I believe this plan could lead to corrosion and possible leaks and or/ruptures of the pipeline. Also every wetlands, stream, and property along the new route is at risk of being damaged due to the pipeline drilling and it's potential to do Damage. (456)