

DEP Permit # E23-524
DEP Permit HDD Reference # PA-DE-0008-0000-RD
DEP HDD # S3-0560
Township – Edgmont & Thornbury
County – Delaware
HDD Site Name – Slitting Mill Road Crossing

1st Public Comment Period

Commentator ID #	Name and Address	Affiliation
1	Angela and Albert Juliano Slitting Mill Road Glen Mills, PA	
2	Christina Morley East Goshen Township	
3	Melissa Marshall, Esq. P.O. Box 408 1414-B Indian Creek Valley Road Melcroft, PA 15462	Mountain Watershed Association
4	Maya K. van Rossum 925 Canal Street 7 th Floor, Suite 3701 Bristol, PA 19007	Delaware Riverkeeper Network
5	Joseph Otis Minott, Esq. 135 South 19 th Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
6	Alexander G. Bomstein, Esq. 135 South 19 th Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
7	Kathryn L. Urbanowicz, Esq. 135 South 19 th Street, Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	Clean Air Council
8	Lora Snyder 1443 Gradyville Road Glen Mills, PA 19342	
9	Linda Yu Edgmont Resident	
10	Karen Katz 1487 Heather Hills Lane Glen Mills, PA 19342	

1. Comment

This letter will serve as confirmation that landowners Albert and Angela Juliano of Slitting Mill Road, Edgmont Township, Glen Mills, PA are in receipt of HDD Analysis 75-page document regarding Slitting Mill Road Crossing. I am sorry that I

am not a geologist or an engineer to understand most of the wording, but that is Sunoco's goal to undermine a resident. I urge all parties involved to condemn this project and Not grant any further permits.

I will begin with my public comments as per Karen and the not so helpful Frank of the PA DEP. Karen instructed me to call Frankie in the hopes that he could assist me with pipeline issues and/or help with this new reevaluation 75-page document and the possibility of them coming out to do a visit. Let me preface by outlining my phone conversation with Frank; whom I thought would be a kind ear. It was a quiet call, not offering a sympathetic ear whatsoever and much "I don't know and cannot answer". When asked who the four landowners were that were referenced in this letter, of which I assume it is me, he stated for security reasons they do not list names, however photographic documents show my entire plot of ground - we are within 450 feet of this horrific destruction. I guess this is a "secret" who the four landowners are. I stated that the photos were of my property and he said nothing. Additionally, he stated that there is a new company doing the work called Michels, as if this makes me feel more secure. It does not, then he states that they are much faster. So, I again feel horrible knowing faster can mean errors. Again, no sympathy just "very automated answers". He tells me he is not an engineer and does not know. What is he then and why am I calling him? He proceeds to say I must place my concerns in writing to Karen then she will email them to him, and others and they will review. Isn't this redundant? I am calling him to advise him of my concerns. After this Frankie states, I'm ending this call if I don't mind because of a meeting. Yes, I do mind. Again, he states to email everything to Karen and she forwards it all. He was short, uneducated about answers and no help! How sad to have a PA employee that is supposed to be helping residents impacted by this project be so insensitive and uncaring.

I have many concerns as a property owner here in Edgmont Township. Sunoco has tainted our landscape and has had a complete disregard for our property, yes where they have no easement and no business being on my private lane! Marc McConnell has even been out to see the site, not that this has done any good because they are still construction slobs.

1- They ravaged and left huge dirt piles with standing water all over all throughout the project, of which I have photos. The work was so devastating and dangerous, that be aware USPS which delivers my mail, would Not drive down my lane because they were worried. I then had to relocate my mailbox and those of other neighbors to the street because postman would not deliver my mail and they said we had to pick it up every day at the post office if we did not comply! This because of Sunoco. Additionally, Sunoco stated if they knocked down the mailboxes, as residents we would be responsible for the reinstallation - ridiculous work ethic!

2- During phase 1 I had to have my well tested for contamination - what anxiety with HDD methodology. Now again, if this is approved, the same exercise will have to be completed, as well as a structural engineer to come out and inspect my foundation.

Who will pay this expense? We need clean water for survival for this family of six active individuals. Do not approve this reevaluation plan for four landowners, one of which I assume is me! I do not want contaminated water and/or a breach in my aquifer.

3- Upon initial work phase, many vehicles were caught doing "doughnuts" in my personal driveway where there is No easement and it is private property. The out-of-state vehicles were parked on my grass, again where they Do Not belong! This is full encroachment. This is a private lane, the easement, which we did not sign is at the end of our private lane. Sunoco should have never entered into my private lane. Also, vehicles were muddy and dirty and tracked dirt on our private lane. We were told initially that Sunoco should be using the street entrance and Not the lane. Sunoco consistently used the lane entrance and to date, I do not know why when we were told by Ross Hellings, the builder, who received 200K for his by out money from Sunoco. Why was the entrance location changed without telling the homeowner - sneaky of them? My private lane is not to be used in any way by Sunoco trucks or Sunoco employees. Sunoco was put on notice for this breach as well.

4- I am under no circumstances to be blocked in my exit or entrance into my private lane. We have had to wait for construction trucks at times to move. We have agendas and schedules. And Let Me Repeat our entrance has been blocked and we have had to wait to exit. I am placing everyone on notice my son is a doctor who needs to see patients, legally our exit/entrance can Never be encroached upon. I have every right to call the PA State Troopers and have them arrested/fined. We are a family of six, heading out all times of the day. This has happened and I will not be subjected to this again. Do not grant a permit to close Slitting Mill Road as outlined in the reevaluation.

5- Inadvertent returns - there have been three messes here at my location with mud and spills. What a disgrace and danger to our water supply and environment. Are we an experiment? There has Never been a pipeline project in a densely populated residential area! Why is there now? Can you see we need assistance in shutting down this treacherous project? There are children, elderly and residents at stake here. Would you want this 450-feet from your home? Our home life is our lifeline - our family unit is dear to us and Sunoco has managed to uproot everyone negatively! Our daily activity has been scarred forever from drilling vibrations and inadvertent returns and ugly secret screens hiding all the secret activity that Sunoco does not want residents to see - it is criminal how this is done. It is even criminal that no credentials are ever shown or worn. Most of these employees are out of state from their license plates. How is a resident to identify same with no credentials proving they are pipeline employees and also have they background clearances? I guess DEP and PUC does not even know the answer. This is scary especially with young children enjoying their outside surroundings. I truly believe SAFETY is not the first priority for Sunoco or keeping residents safe as well. Their mantra is "You won't even know we are here; we will be in and out." What an outright lie to residents. We know you are here; it is terrible, and anxiety ridden. It was stated to the builder of my house

that drilling would be a few weeks from what he was told by Sunoco personnel at meetings - another great lie. Do not approve any permits for reevaluation. I cannot stand the miscommunication - it is ever-changing.

6- Steel grates were installed in November 2017 to cover an open cut on my private lane by Sunoco. These steel grates were improperly installed, a few days after installation, they were caving in. An ankle could have been broken with the way in which it was installed with a "lick and a promise". Our cars had to avoid the area, as car tires could have gotten stuck and caused tires to collapse into ditch. This was an emergency phone call. It was faulty and then had to be rectified. This was just another Danger with this project - work that was approved and yet no one, not even a supervisor or township official came out to see if it was correctly completed. Who is responsible to see that this work is completed properly? Does anyone have an answer to this question? Please see photo attached at this – you will not believe it!

7- In December 2017, a few weeks before Christmas season it was brought to our attention Without written notice that we as a family unit would have to "move out" during a pull back. Apparently "there was no time" for land project manager to advise in writing because Sunoco had to meet deadlines. I was not leaving my home two weeks before Christmas. This is a wonderful time of year, and yet there's Sunoco ruining life again. Sunoco is equaled to an invasion of privacy. We asked where our ten-day notice was in writing and were told Sunoco did not have to give notice. The agent had verbally told my husband we had to leave because it was too dangerous, and our exit/entrance would be impassable during this time because big rigs were doing pullback. Our entrance cannot be blocked in case of a medical emergency, so we had to leave - we were given no choice. What will happen now if these permits are approved? I guess that is more uprooting of daily activity, more anxiety ridden moments of living in danger and inconvenience. Do not approve these permits for this company to come in and trample all over our homes, life and rights.

8- Governor Wolf publicly ruled out stopping the pipelines and I have no idea why! He has not endured any of the horrors of this project. Sunoco still insisting this pipeline is safe while they continue to have IRs and incur fines for spilling into waterways. I believe the PUC should halt this project. Sunoco has failed to help the public understand how to ensure that we will be safe from a leak or severe explosion. And how can I forget their only mantra, "run upwind." I'm sickened by this fact. Can you advise how my 90-year old parents who visit often will be able to do this? I do not think they will be calling an uber! This project has been plagued with so many environmental, technical and legal issues since the start. Where does it end? The pipeline was temporarily shut down once by PA Enviro Hearing Board and twice by PUC - do the right action and condemn it for the life and safety of the people. Judge Barnes did the right thing before, I urge the same action once again! There are now currently two sinkholes in Sleighton Park, where children and families play - do you want this for families? Who is held accountable - apparently no one. Residents in other areas with a huge sinkhole already had to move out as homes were bought by Sunoco because of the huge sinkhole. No one ever wants to leave their beautiful

homes/investment. Why does this project get the green light and able to restart? Who in their right, safe mind says Yes? Sunoco has admitted in 2019 that yes it made many Mistakes during construction methods and stated it would be corrected. How can it be corrected if the improper work is still being committed? How can this project meet all state and federal regulation requirements. There is so much wrong going on and yet all the wrong gets approved - it is a crime to residents to have to endure all of this and be Guinea pigs since a pipeline has never been installed a densely populated area!

I believe we are put at risk every day this project continues. The highly volatile liquids that could end life as we know it, are every day on our minds. Suppose when we go to bed at night there is an explosion or a leak - what would we do, what would emergency personnel do if even a car of cell phone could cause an explosion? Too many questions and no educated or safe answers.

Do you know that Sunoco is using repurposed lines that are corroded - they should be shut down. PUC's finding stated that a leak of NGL's from ME1 in Berkshire County in 2017 was caused by corrosion - that is cause for deep safety concern. This was a pipeline from the 1930's. An additionally, a 12 inch like leaked 33,000 gallons of gasoline into a Philadelphia creek near Philadelphia. This was a finding by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. Records even showed the line installed in 1937 had leaked two times before. The data is here - use it and learn by it and shut down this project for the good and safety of the people.

I am tired, beat up and broken down and am finished being polite and patient. This affects my life, safety and family unit. These pipelines should not be constructed in densely populated neighborhoods in any of our townships including Edgmont Township. Sunoco has not been accountable and there is no plan to "get out of harms way" if there is an explosion. Living life on the line is dangerous, anxiety ridden, unhealthy and unsafe. Please, I implore all to condemn this project, take the positive action to shut it down immediately – Halt It! There is present danger if there is an explosion - I am in a blast zone being within 450-feet. The NGL's are colorless and odorless - we as people will never know what our future holds living on the line with no early warning evacuation plan on the part of Sunoco. Please respect that homes, families and livelihoods were here before the destructive pipeline work by Sunoco. Thank you for the opportunity to be a part of the comments. (1)

Attachments – [Angela Juliano](#)

2. Comment

Geology

The writer of the report makes reference to this area having bedrock that is a unit of Baltimore Gneiss. No maps or reports are supplied that illustrate and confirm the presence of “Baltimore Gneiss”.

Root Cause Analysis

Once again, as in previous HDD Re-Evaluation reports submitted by this operator, the Root Cause Analysis combines multiple Inadvertent Return events into a single summary report which is both insufficient and lacking in detail. The DEP must insist that the operator separate each individual IR event and provide details that include date, exact not approximate location, and an individual Root Cause finding for each event. Each event should be individually labeled. In the case of this location there should be three Root Cause Analysis reports, not one.

Fracture Trace Analysis

It is noted in the First Report that fracture trace analysis was performed to identify potential zones of bedrock weakness along drill paths. The method used was high altitude aerial photography from September 1937.

Later in the attached GES report, under the section titled “Summary of the Geophysical Study” it is stated that Tetra Tech performed a geophysical survey for the HDD S3-0560 alignment in January 2019, using both seismic refraction and multichannel analysis of seismic waves (MASW) surveys along six spreads coincident to the alignment. This activity appears to be consistent with the more extensive geologic studies that were required by the DEP in the December 5, 2018, letters that were issued for multiple sites (Bow Tree/Strasburg, Middletown Valley Road, Edgmont Gradyville) which were subject to court-required Re-Evaluation Reporting. While not directly related to this Slitting Mill site, it should be noted in the public record that geologic survey results for the other sites have not been made publicly available on the DEP website nor any correspondence to confirm if they were or were not completed.

The more extensive geophysical surveys completed at Slitting Mill revealed partial data due to a variety of factors including landscaping and a driveway. The refraction data did not reach the deeper portions of the profile “due to encountering bedrock” but also possibly because the seismic refraction technique involves the estimation of the P-wave acoustical velocity of the earth’s near-surface soils to depths typically less than 100 feet.

There appears to be no discussion of 3D ERI or microgravity testing that was done at the Slitting Mill site.

The MASW survey found potential fracture or fault zones which did not correlate to the two mapped fracture traces that cross the alignment.

Recommendation

The DEP should require the operator to submit multiple fracture trace analysis reports of the area using different methods to increase repeatability and possibly reveal additional data not uncovered using the aerial and MASW techniques. I submit a report of Case Studies presented by SAIC on the reliability of single vs multiple sources in Fracture Trace Analysis. The findings show that “Analysis based on a single attribute, or a combination of attributes as a stand-alone criterion for assessment can be seriously misleading.” Further the report goes on to demonstrate that:

With fewer data sources for analysis there is less repeatability.
With one data source repeatability was ~20 percent (Case 1).
With two data sources repeatability was ~45 percent (Case 3).
With numerous data sources repeatability was ~80 percent (Case 2).

Source:

https://mde.state.md.us/programs/water/water_supply/Source_Water_Assessment_Program/Documents/www.mde.state.md.us/assets/document/watersupply/2008symposium/M-0205-Weikel.pdf

It is clear from their own reports and correspondence submitted as part of the HDD Re-Evaluation process, that the Operator has been developing plans and drilling in complex areas using incomplete and insufficient geologic data. They have adopted a policy of drilling blindly and filling voids and subsidence as they go. This approach is not standard, and there is ample evidence in the public forum to demonstrate that good industry practice is to utilize multiple investigative study techniques prior to construction to determine the geological composition of an area. In fact it is imperative to utilize multiple sources in order to verify and replicate test results. The very fact that this Operator has firmly and repeatedly resisted efforts by the DEP to perform more extensive geologic testing at problematic sites is an indicator that the DEP should be more strict and more stringent in its oversight of drilling activities at each and every site under Re-Evaluation reporting. The approach of resisting the more extensive preliminary geological testing that is needed at these complex sites could very well be the cause of landowner well contamination, aquifer loss, subsidence, and road damage we are seeing throughout the Commonwealth. It is imperative that the DEP enforce the testing requirements that were issued in December 2018 and which Sunoco agreed to in October 2018 at multiple sites.

Finally, for placement into the public record, I urge the DEP to require that HDD Re-Evaluation Reports only be accepted if they are signed and sealed by a Pennsylvania licensed engineer or geologist who will attest to the content of the entire report, not just a portion thereof. It is not acceptable that the written plans for a project of this complex nature, affecting the property, drinking water, and safety of so many Pennsylvanians is being submitted by an individual who holds no professional

license whatsoever. If the operator cannot find one single PA licensed engineer or geologist who will attest to the content of the HDD plans being submitted for this project then that should be a giant red flag. If the operator does not comply with this requirement, reject the report in its entirety. This is Pennsylvania. Sunoco/ET has been given the privilege of doing business here. The PA DEP makes the rules. (2)

3. 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 indicated by drawing number PA-DE-0008.0000-RD.

1. Sunoco does not disclose whether the new plans are for an intercept drill, the type of drill the caused serious problems and borehole abandonment during installation of the 16-inch line.

The proposed profile will pass through Baltimore Gneiss, a formation known for heterogeneous rock that can lead to difficulties in drilling and steering. Indeed, the HRR at Section 3.1 describes how Sunoco initially planned to install the 16-inch line after drilling an intercept-drilled borehole. However, the bores from opposing ends did not connect, and then the drilling caused IRs. “Due to alignment issues, both bores were abandoned and beginning on November 7, 2017, a new continuous and complete pilot was drilled the full length of the planned HDD.”

Despite this troubled history, Sunoco fails to disclose whether its new plans are for an intercept drill. If they are, special precautions should be taken to ensure more boreholes are not created that cause spills, need to be abandoned, double the needed drilling, and needlessly riddle the subsurface with more cavities. Indications are that the plans might be for an intercept drill. The Profile View refers to the as-built 16-inch HDD termini as “entry” and “exit” separately, but the 20-inch termini as “entry/exit.” These tea leaves are not enough. Sunoco needs to be clear about its plans and then what it intends to do to mitigate the risk. The Report lacks clarity.

2. Sunoco has not accounted for steering challenges associated with local geology.

Regardless of whether the new plans are for an intercept drill, issues concerning steering are still likely to arise. At other HDD sites where Baltimore Gneiss was encountered, Sunoco’s geologists made specific recommendations for how best to proceed, including recommendations regarding drilling rate and pressure, and to use a diamond bit. The Department should ensure that an appropriate plan is in place to avoid and mitigate steering difficulties here.

Steering issues would be particularly concerning due to the wells very close to the alignment, including one only 10 feet away. When a well is this close, additional concerns arise. Appellants presume 10 feet distant means 10 feet from the centerline, i.e. within the permanent easement bounds. What additional measures will Sunoco take to protect this well from aboveground interference relating to the pipeline construction and maintenance?

Also, given the steering issues, there should be thought given to ensuring that the HDD does not intersect and blow up one of the two existing Sunoco pipelines that run parallel to the alignment. The Report does not discuss them. There is no indication of what depth they are buried to. There is no indication whether they are operational. It could be disastrous if Sunoco drills into an existing operational line.

3. Sunoco appears to be misinterpreting the geophysical surveying results and not incorporating them into its plans.

Sunoco may be misinterpreting the geophysical surveying results. It writes “The MASW survey identified low velocity zones indicating potential fracture or fault zones at approximately stations 6+50 and 12+87.” Station 12+87 corresponds with the eastern terminus of the easternmost Spread 6 of the geophysical survey. Station 6+50 corresponds with the eastern terminus of the middle Spread 3 of the geophysical survey. A comparison of the summary narrative of the geophysical report with its Appendix-1, however, demonstrates that each identifies only one low velocity zone: the narrative speaks of a low velocity zone “at the southeastern end of the HDD” without listing a station, and the Appendix-1 identifies a low velocity zone at the eastern terminus of Spread 3. Appellants’ best guess is that the narrator of the report results misread the eastern terminus of Spread 3 as the eastern terminus of the HDD; thus there is probably only one low velocity zone, which is in the middle of the HDD, not the eastern end. The geophysics report should be amended for clarity.

Sunoco then likely misread the report to be speaking of two separate low velocity zones. It correlates the phantom low velocity zone at the eastern end of the HDD with the IRs it experienced there, writing “These two IRs are in the same general location as the low velocity zone identified at Station 12+87.” Sunoco’s analysis should be amended in light of this mix-up.

Furthermore, it is not apparent from the Report that Sunoco took the geophysical survey results into account in redesigning its HDD plans for the Site. This is error and the Department should require Sunoco to correct it.

4. The plans should be revised to clearly delineate high risk areas and bedrock.

The results of the geophysical surveys indicate a low velocity area that presents a risk of inadvertent returns and LOCs. These results should be juxtaposed with a

cross-sectional view of the proposed 20-inch line so the highest risk areas can be readily identified. In order for everyone working the site to make the best use of the information gathered in the geophysical surveys, this information should be incorporated into the technical drawings that will actually be used on site. Sunoco states it will share the results of the fracture trace analysis with the crew, but the geophysical survey data is more robust and accurate. Sunoco should make a specific response plan now instead of waiting for IRs to unfold. In addition, the cross-sectional view of the planned 20-inch profile should include the approximate bedrock depth. The Plans and Profiles in Attachment A to the Report do not currently show depth of bedrock.

5. Water well protection planning and data is absent from the Report.

As noted above, these are several water wells very close in to the alignment. The HRR says that the water supply owners were offered testing for their wells and their wells were “tested,” but it provides no details, including about timing. Thus the public and the Department are in no position to determine whether Sunoco has or will comply with the water well testing requirements of the Order. Nor does the Report provide a plan for protecting these wells. The Report will not be complete until those risks are fully addressed and a plan to protect the wells is in place.

The Department should ensure that Sunoco does not begin drilling until that testing is complete. The Department should also ensure water testing results are included in the Report. At this point, no well testing data for any of the wells has been disclosed in the reevaluation process. In previous Reports, when pushed by the Department, Sunoco has provided summary test result tables, but has also included inaccurate generalizations about readings for relevant test parameters. For accountability, the results themselves, or summary tables, should be incorporated here.

6. The Report lacks several other needed items.

Besides the deficiencies identified above, the Report lacks a few more needed items.

First, while Sunoco says that “Three (3) IRs occurred during construction of the 16-inch line,” it later admits that that does not include “a few small upland IRs.” The total number of IRs that occurred at the Site is thus undisclosed, and data about the additional IRs that are merely grouped together is absent.

Second, HRR Section 3.1 states: “A pathway created by abandoning the initial pilot hole and pilot intercept may have contributed to IR-3.” The Report does not indicate that Sunoco has a plan for avoiding another IR through this pathway. The Department should require some sort of plan to mitigate this known risk.

Finally, Sunoco plans to bore directly below buildings in the path of the alignment. Besides preventing visual inspection of the surface above the pipeline, this heightens the risk that IRs or product spills would end up in the structure itself. Sunoco should

have a plan in place to deal with that risk. An IR occurring within the structure will not be detectable by patrolling the area. Has Sunoco discussed this risk with the landowner and put in place any system to monitor for incidents appearing within the building? If so, that is not apparent from the Report. The Department should require Sunoco to commit to some plausible monitoring and mitigation plan.

Thank you for considering these comments. Please keep us apprised of your next steps on the HDD Site. (3-7)

Letter – [Clean Air Council](#)

4. Comment

I am an Edgmont resident in the neighborhood of this proposed drill site, and have severe reservations about restarting HDD drilling here, based on the following observations:

There is past history of 3 IR's of industrial waste at this site during HDD construction of the 16-inch pipe. This re-eval is now for installing 20-inch pipe in this same location. The bedrock formation in this area is prime for IR's and more than likely will occur again.

This area serves as a local groundwater recharge zone. Once an IR occurs, the suck trucks will once again be removing our valuable well water aquifer resources like the other 2 drill areas in Edgmont, where this is currently taking place.

This area has a geology fracture trace that extends to Meadow Lane area, which is a site of an extensive previous Sunoco pipeline spill where petrochemicals are still found in soil and groundwater. The residents cannot risk pollution to their wells from these petrochemicals, since the HDD process will spread these petrochemicals into the groundwater and our aquifers. Edgmont has experienced 3 other known large pipeline spills from Sunoco, and our community well water resources are already severely impacted! We can Not afford any more drilling contamination in our aquifers! One Edgmont resident's well is only 29 feet from HDD site, 4 wells are within 100-feet, and 14-wells are within 450-feet. This is unacceptable for maintaining our constitutional right to clean water in our private well water sources! Providing "water buffalos" like a 3rd world country does not seem to be a valid option. No public water is available in the area, once our wells are contaminated!

On final note, I am not really sure why DEP requires these permits, since it appears Sunoco can change the HDD drill and pipeline construction at any time without new permits. Our other HDD drill site in Edgmont on Valley Road (S3-0580) I have now been told will be 2 pipes, the 16 and 20 inch in One 42 inch borehole with only inches in between the pipes with "foam" "spider" separators, instead of the 2 holes, 1 for each pipe, with 10 or more inches apart approved by your permit. How is this possible to totally change construction plans from the approved permit plan? A continued concerned resident. (8, 9)

5. Comment

I write to express my concern regarding the reevaluation of the Slitting Mills HDD location referenced above. I am an Edgmont Township resident and as such, my family and I have been impacted for years now by this project. The "You'll never know we are here" motto of Sunoco is certainly an excellent example of fake news and false advertising, most importantly, of fraudulent claims and misleading homeowners.

Our community, our neighborhood and our family has been negatively impacted by poor work ethics, bullying by Sunoco workers, lies by the land agents, and overall mismanagement of this very poorly designed and implemented project. Consider the excessive number of fines levied against them over the past several years for which they were fined a mere pittance.

Our community has experienced well contamination due to known carcinogens, sink holes, contamination of our wetlands and waterways.

Please consider taking your job serious, cease caving to political pressure and payoffs and do what you can to protect the residents of Pennsylvania and our natural resources. Please deny the permits pertaining to HDD site 560. (10)