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 safety concerns with the project.

Dear Chairman Bay, Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Holland Township Citizens Against the Pipeline (HCCAP)

Cc:

President Barack Obama

U.S. Senator Robert Menendez

U.S. Senator Cory Booker

U.S. Congressman Leonard Lance

U.S. Congresswoman Bonnie Watson-Coleman

N.J. Senator Kip Batemen

N.J. Senator Shirley Turner

N.J. Assemblyman Jack Ciattarelli

N.J. Assemblyman Andrew Zwicker

N.J. Assemblyman Reed Gusciora

N.J. Assemblywoman Elizabeth Muoio

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is JAMES BENVENUTO in the preceding

who lives in HAMILTON, NJ 08620.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

James Benvenuto

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is MARK JACOB in the preceding

who lives in ALLENDALE, NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Mark Jacob

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carol Kelly in the preceding
who lives in Titusville, NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Carol Kelly

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Jessica Pierman in the preceding

who lives in 314 Riegelsville Rd Milford NJ 08848.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely, J Pierman

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Ry D. Green in the preceding

who lives in 366 Riegelsville Rd Milford NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Lois Wismer in the preceding
who lives in 114 Frenchtown Rd. Milford, NJ. 08848

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely, Lois Wismer

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Eloisa Mayr in the preceding
who lives in 2797 Roffhausen Ct. Vineland, N.J. 08361-3260.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Eloisa Mayr

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Laura Mirsky in the preceding
who lives in Holland Twp NJ (Milford).

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Laura Mirsky

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Camille Sweeney Concerned Citizen in the preceding who lives in Upper Black Eddy PA.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is DAVID PITCHER A CONCERNED CITIZEN in the preceding

who lives in 1215 RIVER ROAD, UPPER BLACK EDDY, PA 18972.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date: 8/24/16

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Philip Rainford in the preceding

who lives in 443 Church Rd Milford NJ 08848.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Dan Lounsy in the preceding

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

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date: 9-24-16

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Amy Kapp a concerned citizen in the preceding
who lives in Erwinna, PA 18920.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely, Amy Kapp

Date: 9/24/16

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is William Kopp in the preceding

who lives in Erwinna PA.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

William Kopp

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Peter Jacob in the preceding

who lives in Union, NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Frank Muzzi in the preceding

who lives in Holland Township.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is DIANE MALLON, Concerned Citizen, in the preceding
who lives in 57 Bridge Street, Milford, NJ 08848.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Diane Mallon

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Christina Russonielle in the preceding
who lives in Asbury, Hunterdon county N.J.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is E. A. Berg in the preceding
who lives in Milford, NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Janis Clark in the preceding

who lives in Holland Twp.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Janis Clark

Date: 9/24/16

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Heather Cousin, concerned resident in the preceding who lives in 31 Green St, milford NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely, Heather Cousin

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Kris Remaitis in the preceding

who lives in Rahway NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is SUSAN BERG in the preceding

who lives in Milford N.J.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Susan Berg

Date: 9-24-2016

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Catherine Palumbo concerned citizen in the preceding who lives in 1770 Sky Line Dr. UBE PA 18972.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Catherine Palumbo

Date: 9-24-2016

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Wendell Lightner

Date: 9-24-2016

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is MAUREEN MCFADDEN, CONCERNED CITIZEN in the preceding who lives in 93 HONEYSUCKLE LN., MILFORD, NJ 08848.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Maureen McFadden

Date:

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

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

My name is Robert Violet in the preceding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date: 9.24-2016

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is KATHLEEN DANIELS - concerned citizen in the preceding who lives in 280 Wodt Rd, Milford, NJ 08848.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Daniels

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Kyle Patrylo in the preceding

who lives in Holland Township.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Kyle Patrylo

Date: 9/24/16

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Vanessa S. Rainford

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Diane Jones in the preceding

who lives in Annandale NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Diane Jones

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is JAN ROWER in the preceding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carol Steible Concerned Citizen in the preceding who lives in Bloomsbury, N.J.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Carol Steible

Date: 9/24/14

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carolyn Steible, Concerned Citizen in the preceding who lives in 1602 Liberty St. Easton, PA 18042.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Steible

Date: 9/24/16

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is DAVID HARDER in the preceding

who lives in Milford, NJ 08848.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Linda Harder in the preceding

who lives in Milford NJ 08848.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Linda Harder

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is RICHARD KRAUSE, II in the preceding

who lives in MILFORD, NJ 08848.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely, Richard Krause, II

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is DAVID HALL in the preceding

who lives in FLEMINGTON NJ 08822.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Linda Lipsky in the preceding
who lives in Broomall PA.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Linda Lipsky

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Rebecca Mathis, concerned citizen in the preceding

who lives in 1475 Mount Holly Rd. Unit O-10, Edgewater Park, NJ 08010

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Mathis

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Sarah Berg, concerned citizen, in the preceding
who lives in 28 Polktown Road, Hampton, NJ 08827.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

SBerg

Date: 9-24-16

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Brenda O'Shea in the preceding
who lives in Milford, NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Brenda O'Shea

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Macaoay

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Berg

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Christine Cousin concerned citizen in the preceding
who lives in 314 Fawnwood Dr Milford NJ 08848.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Michael Hillmann Concerned Citizen in the preceding
who lives in 314 Pawnwood Dr. Milford, NJ 08848.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date: 9/24/16

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Rodger A Ferguson Jr Concerned Citizen in the preceding
who lives in Holland Twp, 25 Phillips Rd Milford, NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Rodger A Ferguson Jr

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Carl Molter, registered intervenor in the preceding
who lives in 532 Ellis Road, Milford, NJ 08848

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Carl Molter

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Michael Mata Concerned Citz in the preceding
who lives in 177 Andersen Rd Milford NJ 08848

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth T. Molter

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Marina Bartelli

Date: 9/24/16

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Hallee A. Weichner in the preceding
who lives in Milford, NJ.

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Hallee A. W

Date:

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Joanne Lovell in the preceding
who lives in Northampton County 5523 Grove Ave Bethlehem PA 18017

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

a concerned citizen

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Joyce Hosford, in the preceding
who lives in 22 Gority Rd, Milford, NJ 08848

In reading the DEIS filed on this docket, I feel that the issues of safety were given nowhere near due consideration. I saw an article from the August 11, 2016 edition of The Washington Post, under the headline "Huge fire and explosion levels Md. apartment complex; two dead, more than 30 injured".

The article details how almost two miles away, the occupants at a fire station could apparently feel the blast. County Council member Tom Hucker described what sounded "like a sonic boom" that prompted him to go immediately to the complex. He said he saw blue flames, which he also said typically indicate gas molecules are present. "I'm not a chemist, but we all know what gas flames look like," he said.
Apparently one resident was taking out his trash and smelled gas and heard the hiss of gas right before the explosion occurred. They felt the blast two miles away, and heard what sounded like a sonic boom.

While this Washington Gas company distribution line to the building would have been much smaller than the 36" transmission pipeline with over 1425 psi that PennEast proposes, it still caused death, injury and property damage. How is it possible that the DEIS for this PennEast project fails to address the fact that the PennEast project manager company, UGI, has been cited for safety failures, and Spectra has been cited for failing to conduct required routine testing. Why is FERC even permitting this to go forward, knowing the past under performance of these companies regarding safety?

PennEast's proposed pipeline would be a class 2 pipeline rather than class 4, even though New Jersey standards mandate class 4. But because PennEast wants to save the $20 million that a class 4 would add to the project costs, and because federal regulations supersede state regulations, our safety is less secure with this FERC reviewed project.

Why wasn't the strongest pipeline mandated for this project? And why wasn't there a real safety discussion addressed in the paltry four paragraph long "No Action" option in the DEIS? Why wasn't there due consideration given to the fact that this project places people's lives in jeopardy, day in and day out. The answer is simple - because the public's safety is not as high a priority as the member company's profits.

And since the FERC is funded by the very industry it is supposed to regulate, there is no way that our safety will ever mean more than corporate fiduciary duty to shareholders and the FERC's budgetary concerns.

This is why the DEIS must be withdrawn and a full exploration of the "No Action option" conducted, weighing the safety of residents now without this pipeline versus the peril they will face day in and day out if this pipeline is built.

Sincerely,

Joyce Hosford