September 28, 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 cumulative impacts.

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: 9-24-2016

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Catherine Palumbo concerned citizen in this proceeding

who lives in 1770 Skyline Dr. Ube PA 18977.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Catherine Palumbo

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

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.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

SBerg

Date: 9-24-16

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Brenda O'Shea in this proceeding

who lives in Milford NJ.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Brenda O'Shea

Date:

Secretary Bose
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Jennifer Berg, a concerned citizen in this proceeding

who lives in 28 Polktown Road, Hampton NJ 08827.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn. I am concerned about the following cultural resource issues:

- Historic Districts
  - The pipeline crosses 6 Nationally Recognized Historic Districts: Pursley's Ferry Historic District, Amsterdam Historic District, Covered Bridge Historic District, Rosemont Rural Agricultural District, Sergeantsville Historic District, Pleasant Valley Historic District totaling over 3,961 acres.
  - It also crosses 6 potential historic districts: Horseshoe Bend District Edward Foxhouse and Farm, Sandy Ridge District, Alexauken District, Old York Road Rural Historic District, and Goat Hill District.
  - The DEIS claims that the pipeline would have minimal effect on historic districts because it is below ground, but this is not true. These historic districts' viewsheds will be disrupted by the construction and maintenance of the pipeline. Trees will be felled and the historic integrity and continuous historic landscape of these areas will be marred.
- The DEIS neglects to look at the cultural resources impacted by the proposed pipeline as a continuous historic landscape, where stone walls, field, and wind breaks as well as threatened and endangered plants tell the story of human habitation in this river valley over the past 10,000 years.
- The proposed pipeline crosses many areas which are significant to the history of the Revolutionary War, yet this is not addressed in the DEIS. There should be a separate section in the DEIS which documents the impact of the proposed pipeline route in the context of the Revolutionary War.
- The DEIS doesn't address issues flagged by the latest letter from NJ SHPO, some of which are listed below:
- Lack of Investigation/Information
  - PennEast has only surveyed 32% of the pipeline route; the remaining 68% could be historically significant
  - In fact, SHPO suggests that PennEast missed important lithic scatter sites because they have only surveyed 32% of properties.
- Lack of Public Engagement
  - SHPO has emphasized the importance of public engagement in identifying potential historically significant sites yet very little of this is seen in the DEIS. Many local historians and archaeologists have posted concerns on the Docket which the DEIS has yet to address.
- Questionable Survey Methods
  - Not a single argillite artifact was found during PennEast's inspections though argillite is so prolific in this area and other signs of Native American activity were found there.
- Areas of Native American significance
  - The DEIS says that it has not yet heard any responses back from the 15 Native American but many tribes have posted documents to the docket which the DEIS does not address.
  - According the SHPO, PennEast also failed to show that they had consulted and were familiar with the most recent literature on Native American activity in the area.

I urge FERC to withdraw this DEIS and to give the public at least 90 days for commenting after the DEIS is complete.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Berg

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Berg

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Macaoay

Date: 9/24/16

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Lodge A. Ferguson, Jr Concerned Citizen in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Twp, 25 Phillips Rd, Milford, NJ

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Lodge A Ferguson, Jr

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Christine Cousins concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 314 Fawnwood Dr Milford NJ 08848.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Michael Hillmann - concerned citizen in this proceeding

who lives in 314 Fairwood Dr Milford NJ 08848.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Michael Nto Concerned Citz in this proceeding

who lives in 177 Anderson Rd Milford NJ 08848

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carl Molter, registered intervenor in this proceeding

who lives in 532 Ellis Road, Milford NJ 08848.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Carl Molter

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth T. Molter

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Marisa Bartelli, concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 1187 Croton Road, Quakertown, PA 18951.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Marisa Bartelli

Date: 9/24/15

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Helen A. Weidner in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Helen A. Weidner

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Susan Berg in this proceeding

who lives in Milford N.J..

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Susan Berg

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is E A Berg in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

E A Berg

Date: 9-24-2016

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

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.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Wendell Lightner

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and ~~Members~~ of FERC:

My name is Robert Viola in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Rus Remaitis in this proceeding

who lives in Rahway NJ.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date: 9/24/16

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Heather Cousin

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Janis Clark in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Twp.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Janis Clark

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is KATHLEEN Daniels, concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 280 Woolf Rd, Milford, NJ 08848.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Christina Russoniello in this proceeding

who lives in Asbury, Hunterdon county NJ.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Diane Mallon, Concerned Citizen in this proceeding who lives in 57 Bridge Street, Milford, NJ 08848

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Diane Mallon

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Peter Jacob in this proceeding

who lives in Doin NJ.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Peter Jacob

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Frank Marchi in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Township.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date: 9-24-16

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Amy Kapp a concerned citizen in this proceeding

who lives in _____.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Amy Kapp

Date: 9/24/16

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is William Tapp in this proceeding

who lives in Erwinna, PA.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

William Tapp

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is DAN LOUNSY in this proceeding

who lives in 36 FAIRVIEW AVE. MILFORD, NJ 08848.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date: 8/24/16

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Philip Lunsford in this proceeding

who lives in 443 Church Rd Milford NJ 08848.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date: 9/24/16

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

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.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Vanessa S. Rainford

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Cathie Sweeney Concerned Citizen in this proceeding

who lives in Upper Black Eddy Pa.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Cumulative Impact

Date: 9/24/16

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is William Tapp in this proceeding

who lives in Erwinna, PA.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Laura Mirsky in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Twp (Milford) NJ.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Laura Mirsky

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Kyle Patapio in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Township.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Kyle Patapio

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Lois Wismer in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ. 08848.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely, Lois Wismer

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Ray D. Drew in this proceeding

who lives in 366 Ridgebsville RD Milford NJ 5.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Jessica Pierman in this proceeding

who lives in 314 Ringoes Rd Milford NJ 08848.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

J Pierman

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is JAMES BENVENUTO in this proceeding

who lives in HAMILTON, NT 08620.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

James Benvenuto

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carol Kelly in this proceeding

who lives in Wash. Xing Penn Rd Titusville, NJ

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Carol Kelly

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is MARK JACOB in this proceeding

who lives in ANNANDALE, NJ.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Mark Jacob

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is _____ in this proceeding

who lives in _____.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is JAN ROWE in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date: 9-24-14

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carolyn Steible / Concerned Citizen in this proceeding

who lives in 1602 Liberty St. Easton, PA 18042.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carol Steible in this proceeding

who lives in Bloomsbury, NJ.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Carol Steible

Carol Steible

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Linda Harder in this proceeding

who lives in Milford NJ 08848.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Linda Harder

Date: 9.24.16

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is DAVID HARDER in this proceeding

who lives in MILFORD, NJ 08948.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,



Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is RICHARD KRAUSE, II in this proceeding

who lives in MILFORD, NJ 08848.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Richard Krause, II

Date:

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426
Dear Secretary Bose,

Re: Docket CP15-558-000 – Proposed PennEast Pipeline Project

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Linda Lipsky in this proceeding

who lives in Broomall PA.

Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the PennEast project states that PennEast would tie into Spectra Energy's Algonquin-Incremental-Market ("AIM") project via an interconnection. Spectra Energy is also a partner in this proposed PennEast project. The almost illegible maps talk about the Gilbert interconnect.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for this PennEast project, as presented, fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route when PennEast interconnects with the Gilbert I upgrade and the AIM project. The segmentation of these projects is wrong, as FERC already knows this entire line would be one and would share common owners.

By reviewing PennEast as a separate project from the AIM pipeline and failing to include impacts from the Gilbert I upgrade, FERC is knowingly permitting segmentation of the projects. This is in direct contradiction to the NEPA requirements.

Therefore, I call upon FERC to withdraw the DEIS for the proposed PennEast project until such time as the environmental impacts along the entire PennEast/Gilbert I/AIM pipeline are reviewed in light of the interconnections that would make them one system. To fail to do so is to fail to comply with NEPA standards.

Sincerely,

Linda Lipsky