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 water resources.

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:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Laura Mirsky in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Township (Milford P.O.) NJ

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 The PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is deficient and should be withdrawn.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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Laura Mirsky

Date: 9-24-2016

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Catherine Palumbo concerned citizen in this proceeding

1770 Sky Line Dr. who lives in Upper Black Eddy PA 18972.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Catherine Palumbo

Date: 9-24-2016

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Wendell Light

Date:

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

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

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

My name is ROBERT VIOLA in this proceeding

who lives in MILFORD, NJ.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Rob Viola

Date: 9-24-2016

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Maureen McFadden

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is SUSAN BERG in this proceeding

who lives in Milford New Jersey.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Susan Berg

Date: 9-24-2016

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Christina Sawyer in this proceeding

who lives in South Bound Brook, NJ.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Elizabeth A. Berg in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Kris Zemaitis in this proceeding

who lives in Rahway N.J 07065.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Kris Zemaitis

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Janis Clark

Date: 9-24-2016

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Christina Russoniello in this proceeding

who lives in Asbury, Hunterdon County NJ.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Diane Mallon (DIANE MALLON)

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Frank Maneri in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Township.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Peter Jacob in this proceeding

who lives in Union NJ.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date: 9/24/16

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is William Kopp in this proceeding

who lives in Ewiana, PA.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

William Kopp

Date: 9-24-16

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Amy Kapp

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Dan Loonsky in this proceeding

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date: 8/24/16

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Philip Rainford in this proceeding

who lives in Milford NJ 443 Church Rd 08848.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely, Philip Rainford

Date: 9/24/16

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely, Vanessa S. Rainford

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is ROLF P. MAYR in this proceeding

who lives in 2997 ROLFHAUSEN CT. VINELAND N.J. 08361

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely, Rolf P. Mayr

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Eloísa Mayr in this proceeding
who lives in Vineland N.J. 08361-3060 Rolfhausen. Ct.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.
The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Eloísa Mayr

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Lois Wismer in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ. 08848.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely, Lois Wismer

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Roy D. Green in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Twp NJ RT 627.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is CATHIE SWEENEY Concerned Citizen in this proceeding who lives in UPPER BLACK EDDY PA.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Kyle Patoylo in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Township.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Kyle Patoylo

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Jessica Pierman in this proceeding

who lives in 314 Riegelsville Rd Milford NJ 08848.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely, J Pierman

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Carol Kelly

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is JAMES BENVENUTO in this proceeding

who lives in HAMILTON, NJ, 08620.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

James Benvenuto

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Diane Jones in this proceeding

who lives in Annandale NJ.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Diane Jones

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is JAN ROWER in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Jan R

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is MARK JACOB in this proceeding

who lives in ANNANDALE.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Mark Jacob

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,
Carol Steible

Date: 9-24-16

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Conalyn Steible, Concerned Citizen in this proceeding who lives in 1602 Liberty St. Easton, PA 18042.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Conalyn Steible

Date: 9/24/16

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is DAVID HARDER in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ (565 Lymp Rd).

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Linda Harder in this proceeding

who lives in Milford. NJ 08848.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Linda Harder

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is RICHARD KRAUSE II in this proceeding

who lives in MILFORD, NJ 08848.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Richard Krause, II

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Linda Lipsky in this proceeding

who lives in Broomall PA.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is DAVID HALL in this proceeding

who lives in FLEMINGTON NJ 08822.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is ADRIAN FOULGS (CONCERNED CITIZEN) in this proceeding

who lives in MILLSTONE TWP, NJ.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date: 9/24/2016

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

SBerg

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Suzanne Macaccay, Concerned Citizen in this proceeding who lives in Milford, NJ (25 Phillips Road) 08848.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Macaccay

Date: 9-24-16

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Brenda O'Shea in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely, Brenda O'Shea

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Berg

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Michael Hillmann Concerned Citizen in this proceeding who lives in 314 ~~[illegible]~~ Fawnwood Dr. Milford, NJ 08848.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date: 9/24/16

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Rodger Ferguson, Concerned Citizen in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Township 25 Phillips Road, Milford, NJ

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Rodger A Ferguson, Jr

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Cathy Bishop in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Township NJ.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Cathy Bishop

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Joanna Lovell concerned citizen in this proceeding
who lives in Northampton County, PA 3523 Grove Ave Bethlehem, PA 18017

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Michael Nato (Concerned Citizen) in this proceeding who lives in 177 Andersen Rd Milford N.J. 08848

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth T. Molter

Date:

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

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

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Marina Bartelli

Date: 9/24/16

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Halke A. Weichler in this proceeding

who lives in Milford, NJ.

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Halke A. Weichler

Date:

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

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

a concerned citizen,

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Joyce Hosford, in this proceeding

who lives in 22 Goritz Rd, Milford, NJ 08848

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

The pipeline will cross C-1 steams 71 times. The DEIS has provided no construction plans, nor plans for minimizing impacts to riparian buffers, as requested by numerous interveners, NJ DEP and FERC.

The pipeline crosses 2 public water supply well areas. It passes within 500' of the Lambertville reservoir. The DEIS has yet to provide information on how many and which private wells are within 150 feet of the route. The DEIS is incomplete without this information.

The DEIS reports that the following effects "would be considered permanent" (p.4-62): erosion, sedimentary input to the waterbody, altered shaded habitats which could result in a decrease in fish due to increased predation, stream bank scrubbing, and conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetlands, though these impacts will be minimized by mitigation. The DEIS provides no data on how such mitigation will succeed

.

The DEIS claims that disturbed areas can be restored to pre-construction conditions regarding soil, hydrology, and vegetation, but PennEast has yet to finalize a Project-specific Wetland Restoration Plan in consultation with the USACE and state agencies, so how do we know that this is true?

The arsenic report submitted by PennEast has serious flaws as noted by Dr. Tullis Onstott, a Princeton University professor. FERC must require PennEast to redo this study to correct these flaws and determine the risks of increased arsenic in groundwater. PennEast blatantly ignores Dr. Onstott's Arsenic issues and incorrectly characterizes them as a construction-only activity. The issues identified by Dr. Onstott are on-going arsenic mobilization from the continuing operation of the pipeline which PennEast fails to recognize as a vital impact to the community and region in regards to the safety of our drinking water.

With such large data gaps, it seems absurd that this DEIS could be published for public comment. It violates NEPA for an EIS to claim that mitigation will be successful without providing supporting data or analysis. I urge FERC to withdraw this deficient DEIS and to extend the public comment period so that the public can comment on a complete DEIS.

Sincerely,

Joyce Hosford