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 geology and abandoned uranium mine.

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: 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 Rainford in this proceeding who lives in 443 Church Rd Milford NJ 08848

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Kyle Patrylo

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.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Vanessa S. Rainford

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 Shirley Concerned Cit. in this proceeding who lives in Upper Black Eddy Pa

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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 PICKER, A CONCERNED CITIZEN in this proceeding who lives in
1215 RIVER ROAD, UPPER BLACK EDDY, PA 18972
.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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 Laura Mirsky in this proceeding who lives in Holland Twp (Milford) NJ.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Laura Mirsky

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.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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 Roy d. Green in this proceeding who lives in Riegelsville RD. Milford NJ

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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 Jessica Pierman in this proceeding who lives in 314 Riegelsville Rd Milford NJ 08848.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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 MARK JACOB in this proceeding who lives in ANNANDALE, NJ.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Mark Jacob

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 _____.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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 JAN ROWE in this proceeding who lives in

Milford, NJ

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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

Easton, PA

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Conalyn 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 Carol Steible Concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in
Bloomsbury, N.J. 08804

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

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 Linda Harder in this proceeding who lives in Milford. NJ 08848.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Linda Harder

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 David Harper in this proceeding who lives in Milford, NJ 08848.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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, II in this proceeding who lives in

MILFORD, NJ 08848

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Richard Krause, II

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

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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 256 Polktown Road, Hampton, NJ 08827

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

SBerg

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 Brenda O'Shea in this proceeding who lives in Milford.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in ~~Milford~~ Holland Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Brenda O'Shea

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 Jennifer Berg, a concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 28 Polktown Rd, Hampton NJ 08827.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Berg

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 Macsay, Concerned Citizen in this proceeding who lives in 20 Phillips Road, Milford NJ.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Macsay

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 Cassin - concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 314 Fawnwood Dr. Milford NJ 08848.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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 Michael Hillmann - Concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 314 Fawnwood Dr. Milford NJ 08848.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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 Nota Concerned Citz in this proceeding who lives in 177 Andersen Rd Milford N.J. 08848

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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 intervenor in this proceeding who lives in 532 Ellis Rd, Milford, NJ 08848.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth T. Molter

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 intervenor in this proceeding who lives in 532 Ellis Road, Milford, NJ 08848.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Carl L. Molter

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.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Marina Bartelli

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 Helen A. Welcher in this proceeding who lives in Milford, NJ.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Helen A. Welcher

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 Vick in this proceeding who lives in Milford NJ.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Robert Vick

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, NJ.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Carol Kelly

Date: 9-24-2012

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 Skyline Dr - UBEPA 18972.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Cath Palumbo

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.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Wendell Lightner

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.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Susan Berg

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 E. A. Berg in this proceeding who lives in Milford, NJ.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

EA Berg

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 _____

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Heather Cousin

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 Holland Twp. Janis Clark in this proceeding who lives in Holland Twp.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Janis Clark

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 Russonielle in this proceeding who lives in Asbury, Hunterdon County NJ.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

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 Mallon, concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 57 Bridge Street, Milford, NJ 08848.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Diane Mallon

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

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Peter

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 Frank Manconi in this proceeding who lives in Holland Township

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date: 9-29-16

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 Amy Kapp, a Concerned Citizen in this proceeding who lives in 126 Headquarters Rd Gwinna, PA 18920.

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely, Amy Kapp

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 William Kapp in this proceeding who lives in Erwinna, PA

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

William Kapp

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 386 FAIRVIEW AVE, MILFORD, NJ 08848

I am concerned that the DEIS "conclude[s] that the Project would not have significant impacts on geologic resources," because of the following:
PennEast has yet to survey 70% of the pipeline route. Therefore, how can it possibly know of and provide mitigation measures for all of the various abandoned mines the pipeline will cross?

The DEIS says that the "there are no mines or quarries located within 0.25 mile of the Project in New Jersey," but it also says that FERC is, "recommending that PennEast provide the results of its ongoing evaluation of working and abandoned mines near the proposed crossing of the Susquehanna River." How can FERC say such definitive statements when they do not have all of the information required to make an informed decision?

Also, the DEIS does not mention the abandoned Uranium mine in Milford Township. How can we know how many other abandoned mines they are missing?

Along with abandoned mine surveys, FERC is still missing information for "site-specific evaluations of landslide risks." Not only have these areas not been fully surveyed, but also PennEast has yet to file, "final pipeline routing/mitigation measures through geologically hazardous areas, a final landslide inventory, specific landslide mitigation measures with locations, and a post-constructions landslide monitoring plan."
FERC says, "PennEast conducted a leachability evaluation of rock samples collected along the proposed pipeline route[, and] based on the results of this study we conclude that no mitigation measures related to arsenic mobilization are necessary during Project construction and operation." However, Tullis C. Onstott, Professor of Geosciences at Princeton University, posted a report to the docket which found that there would be a significant amount of leached arsenic as a result of pipeline construction. PennEast and FERC have yet to respond to this!

With so many information gaps and contested data, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any geological impacts.
I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,