

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 blasting.

Dear Chairman Bay, Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Holland Township Citizens Against the Pipeline (HCCAP)

Cc:

President Barack Obama

U.S. Senator Robert Menendez

U.S. Senator Cory Booker

U.S. Congressman Leonard Lance

U.S. Congresswoman Bonnie Watson-Coleman

N.J. Senator Kip Batemen

N.J. Senator Shirley Turner

N.J. Assemblyman Jack Ciattarelli

N.J. Assemblyman Andrew Zwicker

N.J. Assemblyman Reed Gusciora

N.J. Assemblywoman Elizabeth Muoio

Date: 9-24-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is JAMES BENVENUTO in this proceeding

who lives in HAMILTON, NJ 08620.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

James Benvenuto

Date:

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carol Kelly in this proceeding

who lives in Titusville, NJ.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Carol Kelly

Date:

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is MARK JACOBS in this proceeding

who lives in ANNANDALE, NJ.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Mark Jacobs

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 commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 ROWER in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carol Steible Concerned Citizen in this proceeding who lives in Bloomsbury NJ. 08804.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Carol Steible

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 Coralyn Steible, Conservancy Citizen in this proceeding who lives in Easton, PA.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Linda Harder in this proceeding

who lives in Milford NJ 08848.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely, Linda Harder

Date: 9.24.16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is David Hasser in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ 08848.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 OShea in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely, Brenda OShea

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 Macaoay, Concerned Citizen in this proceeding who lives in 25 [illegible] Phillips Road, Milford NJ.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely, Suzanne Macaoay

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 commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 Roger Ferguson, Concerned Citizen in this proceeding who lives in Holland Twp, 25 Phillips Rd, Milford, NJ.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

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

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 Citizen in this proceeding

who lives in 177 Anderson Rd Milford NJ 08848

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Mat

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 commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 Marina Bartelli, concerned citizen in this proceeding

who lives in 1187 Croton Road, Quakertown, NJ 08868

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 Hallee A. Welchler in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Hallee A. Welchler

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 Rosca Vion in this proceeding

who lives in Milford NJ.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Date: 9-24-2016

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Wendell Lightner

Date: 9-24-2016

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Catherine Palumbo concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 1770 Skyline Dr. Ulst PA 18977.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Cath Palumbo

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 commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

E. A. 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 Kris Demitri in this proceeding

who lives in Rahway NJ.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely, Heather Corsin

Date:

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Janis Clark in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Twp.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 Christina Russoniello in this proceeding who lives in Ashley, Hunterdon NJ 08802.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 St, Milford, NJ 08848.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 Amy Kapp, a concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 126 Headquarters Rd Erwinna, PA 18920.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely, Amy 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 Frank Marini in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Township.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 William Topp in this proceeding

who lives in Ewing, PA.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

William Topp

Date:

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Dan Looney in this proceeding

who lives in 36 Fairview Ave. Milford, NJ 08848.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Date: 8/24/16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Philip B Crawford in this proceeding
who lives in 443 Church Rd Milford NJ 08848.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 Patylo in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Township.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,



Date:
9/24/16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 DAVID FITCHER, A CONCERNED CITIZEN in this proceeding who lives in 215 RIVER ROAD, UPPER BLACK EDDY, PA 18972.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Cathie Sweeney Concerned Citizen in this proceeding who lives in Upper Black Eddy Pa.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,

Cathie Sweeney

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 (NJ).

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 R d. Grew in this proceeding
who lives in 366 Riegelsville Rd Milford NJ.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

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 commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

The Draft Environmental Impact Study ("DEIS") for the proposed PennEast ("PE") pipeline project states, on page ES-4 of the Executive Summary under the heading GEOLOGY: "WE CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON GEOLOGIC RESOURCES." [emphasis added].

Then it says "In addition, with the implementation of PennEast's proposed mitigation measures as well as its Blasting Plan, Karst Mitigation Plan, and E&SCP, and our recommendations, the geologic risk to Project facilities would be minimized."

But in another place in the Executive Summary FERC recommends PE file its Karst Mitigation Plan. FERC is not even requiring it to be done, but is just recommending PE file it, without giving a time for that Karst Mitigation Plan to be provided.

Finally, in their conclusion, FERC appears to rely on the Plans they haven't even seen yet to suggest the project would not have a significant impact on geologic resources.

How can FERC make that determination without having seen what PE is going to file? How can the public comment on something it hasn't seen yet?

These kinds of omissions from the docket, together with FERC's pre-determination and the suggestion that whatever PE files wouldn't change how FERC has already decided are a breach of the NEPA standards and FERC's own regulations.

I call on the FERC to withdraw this DEIS until PennEast files all the missing information referenced therein, especially information having to do with the areas that PennEast intends to blast. Without this information, FERC cannot adequately address the possible implications and cannot make a determination risk to their project or, more importantly, to the public. Given that people's safety and constitutional rights to their property are at stake, we must be presented with a complete Draft Environmental Impact Study.

Sincerely,