

# Comment-Response Document April 18, 2025 Site Characterization Work Plan eFACTS PF No. 881609; eFACTS Activity No. 60986 Twin Oaks – Newark 14"-Diameter Pipeline <u>Upper Makefield Township, Bucks County</u>

Sunoco Pipeline LP ("SPLP") provides this comment-response document for the public comments that SPLP received for the Site Characterization Work Plan ("SCWP") that SPLP submitted to the Department on April 18, 2025, in accordance with paragraph 2.b.i of the Department's March 6, 2025 Administrative Order (the "Order").

SPLP received only one set of public comments on the SCWP in the form of a letter from Berger Montague (the "Berger Letter") that SPLP received from the Department via email on May 18, 2025. As a reminder, Berger Montague represents and has commenced litigation against SPLP on behalf of certain residents in Upper Makefield Township. While the Department's May 18<sup>th</sup> email to SPLP directs us to address these comments, SPLP disputes the premise of many comments and assertions made in the Berger Letter. We further note that SPLP reserves the right to contest all aspects of the Berger Letter including the propriety of plaintiffs' counsel involved in active litigation against SPLP submitting comments on the SCWP. Nevertheless, SPLP is providing a response to each of the comments provided in the Berger Letter which are included verbatim below:

Commenter	Public Comment	SPLP Response
Berger	1) Recovery and Monitoring Wells	SPLP will not provide a point-by-point response to this
Montague	Sunoco represented in its April 16, 2025, Letter to the	portion of the Berger Montague letter, which is not an
	DEP that:	appropriate comment or directly relevant to the scientific or
		technical considerations contained in the SCWP for which
	SPLP's diligent efforts to locate and install	public comment may be appropriate.
	additional recovery and/or monitoring wells have	
	been hampered by the filing of private litigation on	Nevertheless, it is important to note that SPLP strongly
	behalf of certain residents in the Mt. Eyre	disagrees with Berger Montague's characterization of
	neighborhood, and by the public disclosure of	SPLP's repeated (but to date unsuccessful) efforts to secure
	potential locations of recovery and/or monitoring	access to the private property of Berger Montague's clients

wells in the neighborhood. Indeed, SPLP had	for the purpose of installing recovery and/or monitoring
prepared detailed drilling plans and specifications	wells as a part of SPLP's ongoing investigation,
for the installation of additional recovery/monitoring	remediation, and response efforts. The letter also appears
wells to be located on private property along	intended to create a false narrative in the public record about
Glenwood Drive, and was in the process of obtaining	SPLP's response to the release. To ensure the public record
site access to promptly install the well(s), when those	is clear and accurate, SPLP notes that it offered Berger
efforts were thwarted as a result of the public	Montague's clients compensation for recovery well
disclosure of the potential locations.	installation that was significantly more generous than what
	SPLP ultimately agreed to with the Township, offers that
Sunoco's position above is false. Indeed, all our clients	Berger Montague rejected on behalf of their clients.
desire the full and complete remediation of Sunoco's	
release of jet fuel into the local environment, including	In addition, counsel for SPLP has provided Berger
the optimal placement of monitoring and recovery wells.	Montague with available information regarding proposed
Sunoco, however, has treated our clients wrongly and has	recovery well installation locations, and explained that
withheld basic information that has been requested.	SPLP cannot provide comprehensive information about how
	the wells will be potentially utilized until after they are
During the May 6, 2025, Upper Makefield Township	installed, for the reasons previously provided in SPLP's
Board of Supervisors Meeting, the residents at 121	April 16, 2025 Response to Letter of Deficiency for the
Glenwood Drive clarified (as has been their position) that	Interim Remedial Action Plan – which plan the Department
if Sunoco offers reasonable terms and simply answers	subsequently approved by letter dated May 9, 2025.
basic questions, they have been willing to immediately	
have recovery wells placed and operated on their	Furthermore, the redactions made to certain figures
property. The owners even offered to put the issue of	appended to the SCWP are necessary to ensure
compensation aside for the time being to allow this to	confidentiality of information regarding private property,
take place. We ask that you please review the video of	which the Department typically does not, and should not,
the owner of 121 Glenwood Drive at [hyperlink] <sup>1</sup>	release publicly.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "<u>https://videoplayer.telvue.com/player/vNOrn\_m5Xk9aa\_rCiIUhvShuRa9opWn3/playlists/11153/media/950390</u> starting at 1:38:28."

Similarly, our clients at 128 Walker Road have	Nevertheless, the revised SCWP submitted to the
information, such as where on the property any	depicts the locations of the four (4) recovery wells that have
recovery/monitoring well would be located, and what	been installed to date, as well as the proposed locations of
type of well it would be, so that they can respond to	monitoring wells in the neighborhood, which are currently
Sunoco. We have emphasized these basic requests	located within the public roadway The locations of the
repeatedly to Sunoco, but, to date, Sunoco has refused to	proposed monitoring wens are preminary and subject to
provide such information.	obtained
Relatedly Sunoco has requested from the DFP "in light	obtained.
of the actions to attempt to prevent the installation of	
additional wells that has already occurred," – which is	
untrue – that it should not be required to initially disclose	
the locations of its proposed monitoring wells to the public.	
As indicated above, the premise of this request is false	
The public has not foreclosed any installations and it is	
preposterous and nonsensical that Sunoco has taken this	
position that providing basic information to the people	
who live in the affected neighborhood would be	
detrimental. As such, we respectfully request and urge	
the DEP to ensure that Sunoco makes public any	
proposed well locations—a request that would not hinder	
their placement but facilitate it in a more expeditious	
manner. Sunoco's false narrative about property owners	
should not allow it to conceal what should be public	
intormation.	
We also question why Sunoco has kept figures (such as	
Figure 8) of the SCWP confidential. We ask that the DEP	

	immediately require Sunoco to disclose all figures so that the public can provide complete and adequately informed input into Sunoco's proposed plans for their neighborhood. Again, no one is interested in slowing the recovery efforts down – just the opposite – but the public is entitled to Sunoco providing complete information.	
Berger Montague	2) Site Characterization Another primary concern is that Sunoco conduct a site characterization and remediation as quickly, safely, and thoroughly as possible. However, we write to express concern in connection with the SCWP proposed by Sunoco and, specifically, how Sunoco plans to geologically characterize the site and delineate the extent of LNAPL and contaminated groundwater. In that regard, and at this juncture, we have two specific concerns as follows:	SPLP acknowledges the Berger Montague comment and notes that SPLP is in the process of conducting site characterization and interim remedial response efforts in a prompt, efficient, and throughout manner, in accordance with the Department's Technical Guidance Manual and related regulations under the Act 2 program. SPLP disagrees that its "plans to geologically characterize the site and delineate the extent of LNAPL and contaminated groundwater" are insufficient or otherwise not in conformance with the Department's Technical Guidance Manual and related regulations under the Act 2 program.
Berger Montague	<u>A. Use of electrical resistivity.</u> Between February 20 and March 7, 2025, Sunoco's consultant completed five electrical resistivity imaging (ERI) lines. One reported objective was to identify fractures/fracture zones within the bedrock. Near-vertical "inferred fractures" were interpreted by Sunoco from the ER data. These interpreted fractures were purportedly used to help select the location of a recovery well at 108 Spencer Drive, a property that was purchased by Sunoco. The validity of the inferred fractures is highly questionable. Interpretation of fractures within bedrock	SPLP acknowledges the Berger Montague comment and respectfully disagrees with the assertions that SPLP's Electric Resistivity ("ERI") work was improperly performed, interpreted, or relied upon. SPLP further notes the overlap between the Berger Montague comment at comment K from the Department's May 13, 2025 letter on the SCWP, and SPLP has made revisions to the SCWP in response to that comment. In addition, SPLP's consultants ensured that all interference, including potential utility interference was accounted for in its ERI work. More specifically, several contractors have

	from ERI models are commonly based on low resistivity features in the bedrock (because fractures within bedrock typically contain more water than surrounding rock and, therefore, conduct electricity relatively better). Interpreting low resistivity zones in bedrock as fractures may be appropriate if data quality is good and there is no infrastructure (such as buried metallic pipes) distorting the data. However, as is common in urban or suburban settings, the ERI models collected in the Mt. Eyre Manor neighborhood show numerous "low resistivity anomalies" that are consistent with the anomalies produced by buried metallic pipes or electrically grounded equipment/powerlines. Based on the limited data that we have seen, a number of these anomalies have wrongly been interpreted as inferred fractures based on utility interference. For example, a low resistivity feature is found beneath every single road crossing in the five models. Since asphalt roads should produce a high resistivity anomaly, the sources of the low resistivity features may likely be infrastructure, such as utilities running beneath or beside the roadways. A number of these low-resistivity features at roadways were likely interpreted as "inferred fractures."	completed subsurface utility engineering surveys on the roadways and selected properties in the Mt. Eyre Manor neighborhood. These surveys demonstrate that there are few metallic utilities that could interfere with a resistivity survey. There are no gas, sewer, or water mains, and active communications cables are fiber optic. Water lines on the properties have been found to be black plastic. There are underground electrical lines that run 10 to 15 feet from the edges of roadways, but the resistivity survey lines are oriented almost perpendicular to these electric lines – minimizing their influence on the field resistivity readings. Of the 29 resistivity anomalies identified by the ERI survey, only 6 could be considered to be close to subsurface utilities. The remaining 23 anomalies are not in proximity to subsurface utilities. Interpretive linear connection of these anomalies to produce inferred fracture traces resulted in features that do not follow the alignment of subsurface utilities as would be expected if they were truly influenced by those utilities.
Berger Montagua	Figure 1. ERI Profile 1 taken from Figure 2 of the Electrical Resistivity Imaging Papart by PETTEW, with	See response above regarding the ERI survey data analysis.
womague	red text and arrows added for explanation. Likely areas	In addition, while the published geologic reference literature
	of utility interference in the models beneath Walker and	for the area and geological formation describes near-vertical
	Spencer Roads were interpreted as "inferred fractures	fractures in the local geology, the field data obtained to date
	(pink dashed lines) in the report. The left side of the	indicates the bedding dips approximately 10 degrees to the
	figure shows the start of the large, low-resistivity feature	northwest. This bedding dip means that a stratigraphic bed

which is present in all five (5) resistivity lines. An inferred fracture interpreted at Distance 100 feet is potentially due to a change in geology (e.g. higher clay content) rather than an actual fracture.	with enhanced clay content would not appear as a near- vertical feature. Instead, a near-vertical low resistivity feature is indicative of a weathering of feldspars or accumulation of clay particles along a water-bearing fracture, which is consistent with the analysis of the ERI data.
Initial packer testing results also suggest the ERI results may not have been useful in identifying an appropriate location for the 108 Spencer recovery well. According to the "Recovery Well Installation Workplan" for 108 Spencer Road, "Electrical Resistivity Imaging (ERI) data was used to adjust the location of the proposed recovery well to better align with bedrock structural features identified by the recently completed ERI survey." The previous paragraph, however, suggested "limited to no hydraulic communication or effect is expected in the neighboring supply wells resulting from the proposed drilling activities at 108 Spencer Road" based on packer	The precise placement of RW-1 at 108 Spencer was constrained by site features. Ultraviolet ("UV") logging of the RW-1 borehole does show fluorescence consistent with the released jet fuel product from the base of casing of RW- 1 to a depth of 66 feet, despite the fact that RW-1 is not currently producing recoverable jet fuel product and does not currently appear to have a strong hydrogeologic connection to the nearby residential well. The effectiveness of RW-1 to recover jet fuel product will be further evaluated once the well is operational and interacting with the local hydrogeologic conditions.
<ul> <li>testing." These two statements appear to conflict. Interpretations from the ERI data imply connections to "structural features" (e.g., fractures), but packer testing suggests there appears to be limited or no hydraulic connection among fractures near 108 Spencer Road. Based on the packer testing results, the inferred fractures interpreted from the ERI data were not predictive of hydraulic connectivity around 108 Spencer Road.</li> <li>In short, the SCWP places significant reliance on ERI, including both the initial ERI Survey discussed above,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The ERI survey is one step in an iterative scientific process to evaluate geological and hydrogeological conditions in the Mt. Eyre Manor neighborhood. The scientific processes that have been utilized to develop a conceptual hydrogeologic site model include: <ol> <li>A review of published geologic reference literature;</li> <li>A review and analysis of remote sensing/aerial photographic/LiDAR topographic photolinears to evaluate the dominant joint/fracture pattern of the aquifer;</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

	1	
	DEP ensure that appropriate data support any ERI used, and that Sunoco ensures that all interference, including utility interference, be fully and properly accounted for.	<ul> <li>3) Completion of borehole geophysical logging and imaging to confirm the inferred joint/fracture orientations;</li> <li>4) Completion of ERI surveys laid-out perpendicular to the dominant joint/fracture strike;</li> <li>5) Completion of UV geophysical logging of the boreholes of wells to trace the presence of fluorescence indicative of jet fuel product; and,</li> <li>6) Completion of seismic refraction profiles in the same locations as the ERI profiles.</li> <li>Furthermore, three additional recovery wells (RW-2, RW-3, and RW-4) have been installed in locations that were selected based on the data described above, and two of the three are currently producing and recovering jet fuel product.</li> </ul>
Berger Montague	<ul> <li><u>B. Well Depth</u> Sunoco's Recovery Well Installation Work Plans (March 14, 2025, and May 6, 2025) and the SCWP indicate that monitoring/recovery wells will only be installed to depths of approximately 70-75 feet below ground surface (bgs). We maintain that the depths of these proposed wells are inadequate to either monitor or recover contaminated groundwater beneath the Mt. Eyre Manor neighborhood for the following reasons:</li> <li>Publicly available records of residential wells (https://gis.dcnr.pa.gov/pageode/) show that some wells in the Mt. Eyre Manor neighborhood reach depths exceeding 500 feet. Additionally, reacords show that drawdowns during specific</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>SPLP acknowledges the comment and respectfully disagrees that the recovery wells that have been installed to date (RW-1, RW-2, RW-3 and RW-4) are not constructed to proper depths. SPLP further notes that no monitoring wells have been installed to date since planning activities for the installation of monitoring wells are still ongoing.</li> <li>Moreover, UV logging of the boreholes of the recovery wells has demonstrated fluorescence that is consistent with the released jet fuel product at a maximum depth of 70 feet, confirming that a 75-foot depth recovery and/or monitoring well is appropriate. In addition, SPLP notes that the UV logging of the domestic well at 108 Spencer Road went to</li> </ul>

 consists testing of wells in the Mt. Free Manag	200 fast and found no notantial meduat related response
capacity testing of wells in the Mi. Eyre Manor	300 feet, and found no potential product-related response
here Durandeering much as these here the netential	deeper than 75 leet.
bgs. Drawdowns such as these have the potential	The processity of processory on monitoring wells to
to move NAPL from shallow to deeper depuis	The necessity of recovery of monitoring wens to
within fractured bedrock.	characterize or recover dissolved phase product that may
• A PADEP Field Narrative Form from March 14,	potentially be present in deeper strata will be evaluated
2025, stated that GES observed a petroleum odor	pursuant to the SC wP.
from water in a bedrock fracture between 237 and	
247 feet bgs at 108 Spencer Road.	with respect to the portion of the comment alleging a
• To our knowledge, NAPL has been discovered in	potential for NAPL to be drawn-down during residential
at least five supply wells in the Mt. Eyre Manor	wen use, the commenter's use of the term NAPL is
neighborhood: two wells near the identified leak	interstation potentially misleading. More specifically, the
(121 Glenwood, 128 Walker) and three wells over	Decourse the product is present as LNAPL, father than DNAPL.
1000 feet to the northeast of the identified leak	because the product is present as LINAPL it will noat off the
(105 Spencer, 107 Spencer, and 108 Spencer),	down Eurthermore as noted above the domestic well at
suggesting the potential for an uncharacterized	108 Spanger was LIV lagged to 200? with no fluorescence
NAPL transport pathway.	helow 73'
The notential for motor level drawdowns in wells proston	below 75.
then 200 fast the charmation of natural sum odors at 240	
than 500 feet, the observation of petroleum odors at $\sim$ 240 feet double and the observation of free NADL detections	
hetware the two identified NAPL areas suggests	
possible pathway for NAPL to migrate along relatively	
deep fractures. By only installing shallow wells. Suppose	
limits the ability to effectively delineate and recover	
deeper contaminated groundwater Additionally the	
shallow wells will not provide aquifer information	
necessary to understand the fate and transport of leak	
related constituents in the subsurface.	