



September 25, 2016

Chairman Norman Bay

Secretary Kimberly Bose

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket CP15-558 PennEast Pipeline Project - Comments in response to the DEIS addressing the lack of need for the project.

Dear Chairman Bay, Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

Holland Township Citizens Against the Pipeline (HCCAP) is a non-profit organization headquartered in Holland Township, New Jersey, representing thousands of individual concerned residents of Holland Township and our region who have a direct interest in protecting and preserving an irreplaceable community rich in farming and historic culture; preventing the destruction of endangered species' habitats and fragile watershed ecosystems; defending the Township's thriving agricultural and recreational economies; safeguarding the Township's citizens' proactive investment in conserved and preserved farms and woodlands; and opposing the PennEast Pipeline due to its irrevocable impact on the safety and integrity of the human environment. HCCAP is an Intervenor in this matter.

In our meetings and conversations with citizens in our region, we have heard many complaints about the flawed FERC public process including:

- frustrations about the functionality of the FERC website to obtain information or file comments on this docket;

- the frequent "outages" of the FERC website which result in a de facto shortening of the public's opportunity for public comment;
- the lack of FERC responses to, or DEIS acknowledgement of, significant environmental issues that have been frequently raised by citizens, municipalities and organizations either in filed comments, letters or voiced at public hearings;
- the lack of a realistic time period for citizens to analyze and respond to the complex and lengthy (1,174 pages) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) – a mere 24 days from filing to the first public hearing;
- in contrast, the great latitude and deference that FERC provides to PennEast, allowing long extensions of time for the submittal and publication of required environmental impacts information on this complex project to FERC and to the public-significant information is still unavailable to the public with only days remaining in the public comment period;
- the failure of FERC through its actions and DEIS to call PennEast to task for its frequent mistakes of fact on significant environmental information that is readily obtainable through even minimal effort such as the location of public water supplies, blasting quarries, mines, historic districts, structures and the hundreds of private wells along the pipeline route – even after these mistakes have been repeatedly corrected by public comments; and
- the intimidating, demoralizing, arms-length, NONPUBLIC hearing process that FERC chose to impose on the hundreds of concerned citizens, legislators, municipalities, and organizations who took the time and effort to develop comments on the DEIS, despite the short window provided to analyze this complex document.

HCCAP shares the strong concerns of our citizenry about the incompetence and bad faith exhibited by PennEast throughout this process and the indifference of FERC to the injustice being done here. Our homes, our historic and cultural treasures, our livelihoods and local economy, our farms, our widely utilized recreational areas, and our life-sustaining drinking water are at stake here. We are not just lot and block numbers on a desktop survey program. Our lands have been preserved and cherished by our citizens and taxpayers in the most densely populated state in the nation.

In order to ensure that you hear the voices of our citizenry, particularly those individuals without computer access, HCCAP has collected more than 1,000 letters from our community members at a recent public event held on September 4, 2016. The letters were signed by the individual signatories in the presence of HCCAP officers and collected for this submission with the signatories' permission. The signatories consist of concerned citizens, interveners, and impacted landowners. HCCAP will be submitting these letters to you and to our state and federal legislators in groups that have been topically organized for your consideration and for ease of filing for this docket.

In closing, HCCAP urges FERC to wake up to the sea change that is occurring across our nation. Communities and citizens demand that our government and its agencies protect our environment, our homes and our cultural resources, even as we seek to meet the energy needs of our country. The PennEast pipeline project is an unnecessary, duplicative project that serves no one but the shareholders of this company. We urge you to withdraw the DEIS and reconsider the "No Build" option – it is the only option that makes sense for our future.

Sincerely,

Holland Township Citizens Against the Pipeline (HCCAP )

Cc:

President Barack Obama

U.S. Senator Robert Menendez

U.S. Senator Cory Booker

U.S. Congressman Leonard Lance

U.S. Congresswoman Bonnie Watson-Coleman

N.J. Senator Kip Batemen

N.J. Senator Shirley Turner

N.J. Assemblyman Jack Ciattarelli

N.J. Assemblyman Andrew Zwicker

N.J. Assemblyman Reed Gusciora

N.J. Assemblywoman Elizabeth Muoio

Date: 9/24/16

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Heather Coush, concerned resident in this proceeding  
who lives in 31 Green St, Milford NJ

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Christina Russo in this proceeding  
who lives in Asbury, Huntington NJ.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is DIANE MALLO, concerned citizen in this proceeding  
who lives in 57 Bridge St, Milford, NJ 08848.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Diane Mallo". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "D" and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Peter Jacob in this proceeding  
who lives in Union, NJ

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Ernest Marchi in this proceeding  
who lives in HOLLAND TOWNSHIP.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
 888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
 Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is CATHIE SACCELY CONCERNED CITIZEN in this proceeding  
 who lives in UPPER BLACK EDDY DR.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date: 9/24/16

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Vanessa S. Rainford in this proceeding  
who lives in 443 Church Road Milford, NJ 08848.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.


The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,  


Date: 8/24/16

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Philip B. Lawrence in this proceeding  
who lives in 492 Church Rd Mill Pond NJ 08848

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is DAVID PITCHER, A GULFSTREAM CITIZEN in this proceeding  
who lives in 1215 RIVER ROAD, UPPER MERION, PA 18972.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Kyle Patrylo in this proceeding  
who lives in Holland Township.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is \_\_\_\_\_ in this proceeding  
who lives in \_\_\_\_\_.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

Date:

9/24/12

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
 888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
 Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is William Trapp in this proceeding  
 who lives in Edwin, PA

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Dan Looney in this proceeding  
who lives in 36 Parkview Ave. Milford, NJ 08048.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date: 9-24-14

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
 888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
 Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Amy Kapp a concerned citizen in this proceeding  
 who lives in Erwinna, PA across from Fresh town N.J.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Laurea Minsky in this proceeding  
who lives in Hollered Twp (Milford) NJ.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Lois Wismer in this proceeding  
who lives in Milford, NJ. 08848.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

*Lois Wismer*

Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Jessica Pierman in this proceeding  
who lives in 34 Riegelsville Rd Milford NJ 08848.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is JAMES BENVENUTO in this proceeding  
who lives in HAMILTON, NJ, 08620.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

*James Benvenuto*

Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carol Kelly in this proceeding  
who lives in Wash. Xing Penn Rd Titusville, N.J.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

*Carol Kelly*

Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is MARK JACOB in this proceeding  
who lives in ARKVA DALE, NJ.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Ray A. Graw in this proceeding  
who lives in 306 Riegelsville Rd Milford NJ.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is JON ROWER in this proceeding  
who lives in Milford, NJ.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date: 9-24-14

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
 888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
 Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Conalyn Steible, Concerned citizen in this proceeding  
 who lives in 1402 Liberty St. Easton, PA 18042.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carol Steible Concerned Citizen in this proceeding  
who lives in Bloomstbury, N.J. 08809.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

*Carol Steible*  
Carol Steible

Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Deane Cobb in this proceeding

who lives in Granville, OH.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

Deane Cobb

Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
 888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
 Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Linda Harder in this proceeding  
 who lives in Milford, NJ 08848.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

*Linda Harder*

Date: 9.24.16

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is DAVID HARDY in this proceeding  
who lives in Milford, NJ 08048.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is RICHARD KRAUSE, H in this proceeding  
who lives in MILFORD, NJ 08848.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Linda Lipsky in this proceeding  
who lives in Broomall PA.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Sarah Berg, a concerned citizen in this proceeding  
who lives in 28 Polktown Road, Hampton, NJ 08827.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Brenda O'Shea in this proceeding  
who lives in Milford, NJ.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

  
9-24-14

Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Suzanne Macraay, Concerned Citizen in this proceeding  
who lives in 25 Phillips Road, Milford NJ.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Christine Casin - concerned citizen in this proceeding  
who lives in 34 Fawnwood Dr. Milford NJ 08848.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Michael Hillmann Concerned Citizen in this proceeding  
who lives in 314 ~~1111~~ fawnwood Dr. Milford, NJ 08848

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is DAVID HALL in this proceeding  
who lives in FLEMINGTON NJ.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Cathy Bishop in this proceeding  
who lives in Mulford NJ.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Michael Plate Concerned Citizen in this proceeding

who lives in 177 Anderson Rd Milford NJ 08848

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
 888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
 Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carl Molter, registered interconnector in this proceeding  
 who lives in 532 Ellis Road, Milford, NJ 08048

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Elizabeth T. Molter, registered intervener in this proceeding  
who lives in 532 Ellis Rd, Milford, NJ 08848

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

9/24/16

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Rodger Ferguson, Concerned Citizen in this proceedingwho lives in Holland Twp, 25 Phillips Rd, M. Ford, NJ

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Rodger A. Ferguson, Jr.

Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Marina Bartelli concerned citizen in this proceeding  
who lives in 1187 Croton Road, Quakertown, NJ 08868.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Joanna Loren - A concerned citizen in this proceeding  
who lives in 5523 Grace Ave Bethlehem, PA 18017.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date: 9/24/16

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
 888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
 Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Haller A. Weicher in this proceeding  
 who lives in Milford, NJ

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

a concerned  
citizen,

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Joyce Hosford, in this proceeding  
who lives in 22 Milford, NJ, 08848.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

Joyce Hosford

Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Robert Viola in this proceeding  
who lives in Milford, NJ

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Janis Clark in this proceeding  
who lives in Holland Twp

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date: 9-24-2016

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
 888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
 Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is KATHERINE J. DAWICKS BORZONIA CT in this proceeding  
 who lives in 280 WOLF RD. MILFORD, CT 06455.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date: 9-24-2016

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
 888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
 Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is MAUREEN McFADDEN, CONCERNED in this proceeding  
 who lives in 93 HONEYSUCKLE LA., MILFORD NJ 08848.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.


The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely, 

Date:

9-24-2016

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Wendell Lightner, concerned citizen in this proceeding  
who lives in 262 Federal Twist Rd., Stockton, NJ 08559

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date: 9-24-2016

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
 888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
 Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Catherine Palumbo concerned citizen in this proceeding  
 who lives in 1770 8th Line Dr. WBE PA (8972)

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Susan Berg in this proceeding  
who lives in Milford N.J.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.


While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Ed Berg in this proceeding  
who lives in Rutherford, NJ

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,



Date:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Keith Lemaitre in this proceeding  
who lives in Rahway NJ.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

