

**DEP Permit # E65-973**  
**DEP Permit HDD Reference # PA-WM1-0088.0000-RR**  
**DEP HDD # S1B-0250**  
**Township – Penn Borough, Jeannette, Hempfield**  
**County - Westmoreland**  
**HDD Site Name – Norfolk Southern Railroad Crossing**

**3<sup>rd</sup> Public Comment Period**

<b>Commentator ID #</b>	<b>Name and Address</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
1	Melissa Marshall, Esq. P.O. Box 408 1414-B Indian Creek Valley Road Melcroft, PA 15462	Mountain Watershed Association
2	Aaron J. Stemplewicz, Esq. 925 Canal Street 7 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite 3701 Bristol, PA 19007	Delaware Riverkeeper Network
3	Joseph Otis Minott, Esq. 135 South 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
4	Alexander G. Bomstein, Esq. 135 South 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
5	Kathryn L. Urbanowicz, Esq. 135 South 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
6	Monica Sekela	

**1. Comment**

On March 1, 2018, Sunoco submitted a letter to the Department in response to the Department’s requests for additional information regarding horizontal directional drilling (“HDD”) Site PA-WM1-0088.0000-RR. 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”), we respectfully submit these comments in reply.

Thank you for holding Sunoco accountable to the re-evaluation requirements of the Order. The HDD re-evaluation process ordered by the Environmental Hearing Board is critical to protecting drinking water supplies and natural resources across Pennsylvania. Appellants sincerely appreciate that the Department is treating this process with commensurate seriousness and sense of purpose.

Appellants respond to particular points with reference to the point designations used in the Department's letter of January 29, 2018, and Sunoco's March 1 response.

Point No. 2.c.

In attempting to downplay the risk to two water wells confirmed by landowners to be located within 450 feet of the HDD profile, Sunoco writes “[h]owever, both well are located topographically upslope of the north HDD entry/exit location, and are not perpendicular to any point of the HDD underground profile.” This statement does not provide any assurance. A comparison of the altitude of the top of the well compared to the drill pit is not the relevant consideration except with respect to concerns over surface water contamination. An understanding of the potential for contamination from the HDD through geologic features, as opposed to through surface features, requires consideration of what happens at depth. The two wells within 450 feet of the HDD profile have a depth to their bottoms of 183 feet and roughly 150 feet, respectively. This is far greater than the mild upslope location of the tops of the wells, which is less than 40 feet above the HDD entry/exit location based on examination of a topographical map of the area. Compare the center of the attached map with Sunoco's Attachment 2, “Water Supply Illustration.” In other words, there is no reason to believe based on the topography that these wells are not at hydrogeologic risk from the HDD. The further statement that the wells “are not perpendicular to any point of the HDD underground profile” is geometrically incoherent. The relevant point is that the wells are close to the drilling and are at risk.

Point No. 4.

Sunoco fails to “provide justification, sealed by a Pennsylvania Professional Geologist, that wells outside of 150 feet of the profile will not be impacted.” It fails to do so because its claim is false and unsupportable.

Sunoco instead suggests that its compliance with the February 8 Consent Order and Agreement should quell any concerns with water contamination because nearby landowners will be offered a temporary water supply.

Damage to a resident's private water supply is illegal and actionable trespass to property and nuisance, as well as a violation of environmental protection laws. The provision of a temporary water supply before contaminating someone's well is like offering someone aspirin after beating them up—it's the least you can do, but by no means makes the offense acceptable. The Department must prevent harm, not merely try to dampen it. The Department should not authorize HDD operations which are at high risk of causing an illegal trespass and contamination of water wells. Rather, the Department should demand an actual evaluation of risk, and if the risk is too high, a change in plans.

Additionally, Appellants continue to be concerned about the nearby abandoned mine land and high variability of rock strength at the location, which heighten the risk to water supplies of Jeanette-area residents.

Thank you for considering these comments. Please keep us apprised of your next steps on this HDD Site. (1-5)

Letter – [Clean Air Council – 3-6-18 – Norfolk Southern Railroad Crossing](#)

**2. Comment**

SUNOCO MUST BE STOPPED!! How is this legal, acceptable? Sunoco doesn't care about our homes, lives, children, neighborhoods. LIVES AT RISK!! Homes destroyed ... Please please. Put yourself in our places..... Mariner East I and II exist and are operational for profit for Sunoco. Not for local jobs... Please ... They must be shut down! (6)