20160912-5503 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/11/2016 5:48:57 PM

Citizens Against the Pipeline

September 11, 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 about Cumulative Impacts, Geology, Lack of Need, DEIS Withdrawal, Water, No-build Alternative, Safety, Vegetation & Threatened Species, Land Use, and Noise.**

37 signed separate comments attached.

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. **The attached group of letters addresses Cumulative Impact, Geology, Lack of Need, DEIS Withdrawal, Water, No-build Alternative, Safety, Vegetation & Threatened Species, Land Use, and Noise concerns. The DEIS fails to examine the environmental impacts along the entire route with PennEast's interconnections.**

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

20160912-5503 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/11/2016 5:48:57 PM

U.S. Congresswoman Bonnie Watson-Coleman
N.J. Senator Kip Batemen
N.J. Senator Shirley Turner
N.J. Assemblyman Jack Ciattarelli
N.J. Assemblyman Andrew Zwicker
N.J. Assemblyman Reed Gusciora
N.J. Assemblywoman Elizabeth Muoio

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is John Doucette, a concerned citizen, in this proceeding

who lives in 21 Alexandria Drive, Pittstown NJ. 08867.

I am concerned that the DEIS says, "with implementation of PennEast's proposed impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation plans, and our recommendations, we conclude that overall impacts on land use and visual resources would be adequately minimized." How can FERC say this when they don't have PennEast's minimization and mitigation plans?

PennEast has yet to file:

a) the results of previously unsurveyed areas along the pipeline route and an updated list of residences and commercial structures within 50 feet of the construction right-of way;

b) for all residences identified within 25 feet of a construction work area, a final site specific construction plan that includes all of the following: a dimensioned site plan that clearly shows the location of the residence in relation to the pipeline, the boundaries of all construction work areas, the distance between the edge of construction work areas and the residence and other permanent structures, and equipment travel lanes;

c) a description of how and when landowners will be notified of construction activities;

d) documentation of landowner concurrence if a structure within the construction work area will be relocated or purchased; and

e) documentation of landowner concurrence if the construction work areas will be within 10 feet of a residence.

PennEast also has yet to file any route adjustments, workspace modifications, or mitigation measures developed through PennEast's ongoing consultations with landowners regarding the following planned and/or pending projects:

a) Fields at Trio Farms Subdivision;
b) Huntington Knolls, LLC Housing Development; and
c) Hopewell Township Emergency Services Facility.

With so many information gaps, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any impacts to land use and recreation. It is against NEPA for FERC to make/favor a decision prior to having all the information needed to make an informed decision!

I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

John Doucette

Date: 9.10.16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Stephanie Bacskai concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 23 Woodhampton Drive, Ewing, NJ 08638 / daily commute to Hunterdon County.

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

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Stephanie Bacskai

Date: 9.10.16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Stephanie Bacskai, concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 23 Woodhampton Drive, Ewing, NJ 08638 (drives daily into Hunterdon County)

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Stephanie Bacskai

Date: 9·10·14

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 Stephanie Bacskai, concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 23 Woodhampton Drive, Ewing, NJ 08638 (drives daily to Hunterdon County)

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 issues:

I am shocked that this DEIS could be released at the stage it is currently in. The DEIS has yet to provide mitigation measures for bog turtles or any of the state-listed species or state species of concern. It also has yet to ensure the Project doesn't come within at least 0.25 mile of bat hibernacula.

The DEIS fails to list or document or provide any survey information about New Jersey Plants of Special Concern. There is a very, very long list of these species in the pipelines route, and the DEIS completely ignores them, despite many comments on the docket from agencies and biologists asking for data and avoidance plans. Impacts to these plants cannot be mitigated.

"FERC requests that the FWS consider this EIS as the Biological Assessment," (ES-9) yet how can that be if this DEIS is missing survey information for 70% of the properties the pipeline will cross?

It is not fair that the EIS was published prematurely because it prevents the public from commenting on the missing mitigation plans such as:

- a NJ No-Net Loss Reforestation Act Plan for the parcels identified in table 4.5.1-2
- an Invasive Species Management Plan
- a Migratory Bird Conservation Plan

How can we be given a September 12th deadline for comments when we don't have all the information we need to be reviewing? I urge FERC to withdraw this DEIS and to give the public at least 90 days for commenting after the DEIS is complete.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Bacskai

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is JOHN POUCETTE, a concerned citizen in this proceeding

who lives in 21 ALEXANDRIA DRIVE, PITTSTOWN NJ. 08867

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

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

John Poucette

Date: 9-10-16

Kimberley Bose, Secretary
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 ROBLYN RAWLINGS, intervenor in this proceeding who lives in 32 OLD RIVER RD, MILFORD, NJ 08848.

I urge FERC to reconsider your issuance of this DEIS at this time and withdraw the DEIS. FERC has a responsibility to receive all the necessary factual data to evaluate this project before reaching any conclusions about its viability or advisability. We have extensively detailed the massive impacts this project will have in our communities, our water supply, our environment, our economy and our region, through testimony at FERC scoping hearings, FERC Open Houses and thousands of comments to FERC.

Currently, PennEast has failed to provide all the required environmental data for its application. Therefore, the DEIS is premature. In addition to withdrawing the DEIS, I urge you to extend the public comment period so the public has ample opportunity to review and comment on the data once it is provided by PennEast.

I respectfully and vehemently ask that FERC withdraw its Draft EIS, demand the actual field survey data in all required areas and actually listen to the many diverse yet unified voices impacted by this destructive project.

Sincerely,

Date: 9-10-16

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 Roslyn Rawlins, intervenor in this proceeding who lives in 32 Old River Road, Milford, NJ 08848

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). I urge FERC to reconsider your issuance of this DEIS at this time and withdraw the DEIS. Under NEPA, a DEIS is required to seriously consider the "No Action Alternative."

The "No Action Alternative" considers the baseline state of what would happen if the project were not constructed. This alternative is supposed to be considered seriously and comprehensively. However, in the PennEast DEIS issued by FERC, the "No Action Alternative" is a bare four paragraphs in length. Within those four paragraphs, there is only a single citation made. That citation is to a list of shippers on the project. There is no mention that the majority of shippers are affiliates of the owners, and that FERC has ruled in past proceedings that affiliate shippers carry less weight than contracts with unrelated entities that serve as arms-length transactions.

There is no mention that they are lacking survey permission in over 70% of the route within NJ, and that there are strong indications that a certificate would in fact require eminent domain condemnation proceedings to be brought against 70% of the landowners in NJ or more.

And that extensive use of eminent domain is yet another factor in the NEPA weighing that FERC performs, and should have heavy weight in considering a "No Action Alternative."

There are numerous assertions throughout the "No Action Alternative" that are backed up with no data or citations. The sections on regional pricing impacts, reliability, and renewables are all based on assertions with no actual citations made at all.

Currently, the DEIS is not compliant with the requirements of NEPA and therefore, the DEIS must be withdrawn.

I respectfully and vehemently ask that FERC withdraw its Draft EIS and demand that a serious evaluation and comprehensive consideration of the "No Action Alternative" be conducted.

Sincerely,

Roslyn Rawlins

Date: 9.10.16

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Steph Bacskai, concerned citizen in the preceding
23 Woodhampton Drive
who lives in Ewing, NJ 08638 (daily commute to Hunterdon County).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Stephanie Bacskai

Date: 9.10.14

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Stephanie Bacskai, concerned citizen, in this proceeding who lives in 23 Woodhampton Drive, Ewing, NJ 08638 (daily commute to Hunterdon County)

I am concerned about the impact the pipeline will have on noise. The DEIS says that, "based on the analyses conducted, the proposed mitigation measures, and our recommendations, we concluded that construction and operation of the Project would not result in significant noise impacts on residents and the surrounding environment." However, FERC is still missing a lot of information from PennEast such as,

-"a HDD noise mitigation plan to reduce the projected noise level attributable to the proposed drilling operations at the 18 NSAs with predicted noise levels above 55 dBA Ldn."

-"mitigation measures to minimize noise levels associated with emergency or maintenance MLV blowdown events."

-"a complete noise analysis of the Project metering (interconnect) stations using the best available typical design or vendor specification with regards to impacts on the closest identified residences/NSA."

How can FERC make an informed decision without any of this data? How can they just say that with FERC's recommendations and mitigation measures, there will be no significant impact even though FERC has yet to receive any complete document from PennEast which outlines mitigation measures for noise levels?

FERC says, "PennEast shall file a noise survey with the Secretary no later than 60 days after placing the Kidder Compressor Station in service." It then goes on to says that if the noise levels from the Kidder Compressor Station do not meet the correct standards, PennEast shall report and implement mitigation measures within one year of the in-service date and then PennEast also then is given another 60 days to show FERC that it has in fact corrected the noise levels! How can FERC conclude that there will be no significant impacts when people may have to endure noise levels above 55 dBA Ldn for a whole year? This timeline seems awfully lengthy, especially when considered in conjunction with other time limits, such as the short 45-day period that the public has to comment on the DEIS.

Why won't PennEast know the noise levels of the Kidder Compressor Station before it is in service? Why would FERC allow the Kidder Compressor Station to be built with the potential to have noise levels above 55 dBA Ldn and still claim that the pipeline will have no significant noise impacts?

With so many information gaps, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any significant noise or air quality impacts.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Bacskai

Date: 9.10.16

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 Stephanie Bacskai, concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 23 Woodhampton Drive Ewing, NJ 08638 (drives daily to Hunderon County)

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). I urge FERC to reconsider your issuance of this DEIS at this time and withdraw the DEIS. Under NEPA, a DEIS is required to seriously consider the "No Action Alternative."

The "No Action Alternative" considers the baseline state of what would happen if the project were not constructed. This alternative is supposed to be considered seriously and comprehensively. However, in the PennEast DEIS issued by FERC, the "No Action Alternative" is a bare four paragraphs in length. Within those four paragraphs, there is only a single citation made. That citation is to a list of shippers on the project. There is no mention that the majority of shippers are affiliates of the owners, and that FERC has ruled in past proceedings that affiliate shippers carry less weight than contracts with unrelated entities that serve as arms-length transactions.

There is no mention that they are lacking survey permission in over 70% of the route within NJ, and that there are strong indications that a certificate would in fact require eminent domain condemnation proceedings to be brought against 70% of the landowners in NJ or more.

And that extensive use of eminent domain is yet another factor in the NEPA weighing that FERC performs, and should have heavy weight in considering a "No Action Alternative."

There are numerous assertions throughout the "No Action Alternative" that are backed up with no data or citations. The sections on regional pricing impacts, reliability, and renewables are all based on assertions with no actual citations made at all.

Currently, the DEIS is not compliant with the requirements of NEPA and therefore, the DEIS must be withdrawn.

I respectfully and vehemently ask that FERC withdraw its Draft EIS and demand that a serious evaluation and comprehensive consideration of the "No Action Alternative" be conducted.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Bacskai

Date: 9.10.16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Stephanie Bacskai concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 23 Woodhampton Drive, Ewing, NJ 08638 (daily commute to Hunterdon County).

I am concerned that the DEIS says, "with implementation of PennEast's proposed impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation plans, and our recommendations, we conclude that overall impacts on land use and visual resources would be adequately minimized." How can FERC say this when they don't have PennEast's minimization and mitigation plans?

PennEast has yet to file:

a) the results of previously unsurveyed areas along the pipeline route and an updated list of residences and commercial structures within 50 feet of the construction right-of way;

b) for all residences identified within 25 feet of a construction work area, a final site specific construction plan that includes all of the following: a dimensioned site plan that clearly shows the location of the residence in relation to the pipeline, the boundaries of all construction work areas, the distance between the edge of construction work areas and the residence and other permanent structures, and equipment travel lanes;

c) a description of how and when landowners will be notified of construction activities;

d) documentation of landowner concurrence if a structure within the construction work area will be relocated or purchased; and

e) documentation of landowner concurrence if the construction work areas will be within 10 feet of a residence.

PennEast also has yet to file any route adjustments, workspace modifications, or mitigation measures developed through PennEast's ongoing consultations with landowners regarding the following planned and/or pending projects:

a) Fields at Trio Farms Subdivision;
b) Huntington Knolls, LLC Housing Development; and
c) Hopewell Township Emergency Services Facility.

With so many information gaps, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any impacts to land use and recreation. It is against NEPA for FERC to make/favor a decision prior to having all the information needed to make an informed decision!

I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Bacskai

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Robyn Rawlins, intervenor in this proceeding who lives in 32 Old River Rd, Milford, NJ 08848

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Robyn Rawlins

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Roblyn Rawlins, intervenor in this proceeding who lives in 32 Old River Rd, Milford, NJ 08848.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Date: 9-10-16

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is ROBLYN RAWLINS intervener in this proceeding

who lives in 32 OLD RIVER RD, MILFORD, NJ 08848.

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Date: 9-10-16

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 ROBLYN RAWLINS intervenor in this proceeding

who lives in 32 OLD RIVER ROAD, HOLLAND TOWNSHIP, NEW JERSEY 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,

Roblyn Rawlins

Date: 9-10-16

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 Robert Rawlins, Intervenor in this proceeding

who lives in ~~[illegible]~~ 32 Old River 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 issues:

I am shocked that this DEIS could be released at the stage it is currently in. The DEIS has yet to provide mitigation measures for bog turtles or any of the state-listed species or state species of concern. It also has yet to ensure the Project doesn't come within at least 0.25 mile of bat hibernacula.

The DEIS fails to list or document or provide any survey information about New Jersey Plants of Special Concern. There is a very, very long list of these species in the pipelines route, and the DEIS completely ignores them, despite many comments on the docket from agencies and biologists asking for data and avoidance plans. Impacts to these plants cannot be mitigated.

"FERC requests that the FWS consider this EIS as the Biological Assessment," (ES-9) yet how can that be if this DEIS is missing survey information for 70% of the properties the pipeline will cross?

It is not fair that the EIS was published prematurely because it prevents the public from commenting on the missing mitigation plans such as:

- a NJ No-Net Loss Reforestation Act Plan for the parcels identified in table 4.5.1-2
- an Invasive Species Management Plan
- a Migratory Bird Conservation Plan

How can we be given a September 12th deadline for comments when we don't have all the information we need to be reviewing? I urge FERC to withdraw this DEIS and to give the public at least 90 days for commenting after the DEIS is complete.

Sincerely,

Date: 9-10-16

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Roslyn Rawlins, intervenor in the preceding

who lives in 32 Old River Road, Milford, NJ 08848

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Robyn Rawlins, intervenor in this proceeding who lives in 32 Old River Road, Milford, NJ 08848.

I am concerned about the impact the pipeline will have on noise. The DEIS says that, "based on the analyses conducted, the proposed mitigation measures, and our recommendations, we concluded that construction and operation of the Project would not result in significant noise impacts on residents and the surrounding environment." However, FERC is still missing a lot of information from PennEast such as,

-"a HDD noise mitigation plan to reduce the projected noise level attributable to the proposed drilling operations at the 18 NSAs with predicted noise levels above 55 dBA Ldn."

-"mitigation measures to minimize noise levels associated with emergency or maintenance MLV blowdown events."

-"a complete noise analysis of the Project metering (interconnect) stations using the best available typical design or vendor specification with regards to impacts on the closest identified residences/NSA."

How can FERC make an informed decision without any of this data? How can they just say that with FERC's recommendations and mitigation measures, there will be no significant impact even though FERC has yet to receive any complete document from PennEast which outlines mitigation measures for noise levels?

FERC says, "PennEast shall file a noise survey with the Secretary no later than 60 days after placing the Kidder Compressor Station in service." It then goes on to says that if the noise levels from the Kidder Compressor Station do not meet the correct standards, PennEast shall report and implement mitigation measures within one year of the in-service date and then PennEast also then is given another 60 days to show FERC that it has in fact corrected the noise levels! How can FERC conclude that there will be no significant impacts when people may have to endure noise levels above 55 dBA Ldn for a whole year? This timeline seems awfully lengthy, especially when considered in conjunction with other time limits, such as the short 45-day period that the public has to comment on the DEIS.

Why won't PennEast know the noise levels of the Kidder Compressor Station before it is in service? Why would FERC allow the Kidder Compressor Station to be built with the potential to have noise levels above 55 dBA Ldn and still claim that the pipeline will have no significant noise impacts?

With so many information gaps, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any significant noise or air quality impacts.

Sincerely,

Robyn Rawlins

Date: 9-10-16

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Jill Boethig, concerned citizen in this proceeding

who lives in 11 Upper Oak Lane, Milford, NJ 08848

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Jill Boethig

Date: 9-10-16

Kimberley Bose, Secretary
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 Jill Boethig, concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 11 Upper Oak Lane, Milford, NJ 08848.

I urge FERC to reconsider your issuance of this DEIS at this time and withdraw the DEIS. FERC has a responsibility to receive all the necessary factual data to evaluate this project before reaching any conclusions about its viability or advisability. We have extensively detailed the massive impacts this project will have in our communities, our water supply, our environment, our economy and our region, through testimony at FERC scoping hearings, FERC Open Houses and thousands of comments to FERC.

Currently, PennEast has failed to provide all the required environmental data for its application. Therefore, the DEIS is premature. In addition to withdrawing the DEIS, I urge you to extend the public comment period so the public has ample opportunity to review and comment on the data once it is provided by PennEast.

I respectfully and vehemently ask that FERC withdraw its Draft EIS, demand the actual field survey data in all required areas and actually listen to the many diverse yet unified voices impacted by this destructive project.

Sincerely,

Jill Boethig

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Jill Boethig, concerned citizen in this proceeding

who lives in 11 Upper Oak Lane, Milford, NJ 08848

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

Jill Boethig

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Robert Rawlins, intervenor in this proceeding

who lives in 32 Old River Rd, Milford, NJ 08848.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) on page 4-156 under paragraph 4.8.2.1 talks about Employment and the Economy, and says "Several potential natural gas consumers, including Elizabeth Gas, South Jersey Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, and Enerplus, expressed their support for the PennEast Project during public scoping, some noting that the Project would provide greater natural supply reliability and flexibility, reduce price volatility, and result in significant gas cost savings.

But this references companies whose shareholders will financially benefit from this project. Enerplus was established in 1986 and its corporate profile page says "Enerplus is a responsible developer of high quality crude oil and natural gas assets in Canada and the United States, focused on providing both growth and income to its shareholders." Of course Enerplus is supporting this project – the whole project itself is for the financial benefit of the gas companies and their shareholders.

The loophole in the FERC process that permits these companies to claim themselves as their own "customers" to try and persuade FERC that this is somehow public necessity does not take into account the fact that the true end users – the home owners and small business operators – will be asked to bear the costs of any new infrastructure. In addition, they have already received price reductions in their gas bills, which simply proves that price volatility doesn't exist for the general public.

While Spectra Energy was not mentioned as a company that expressed support for this proposed project, we know that they too will benefit greatly by virtue of their partial ownership of this project, and the fact that this PennEast project will interconnect with Spectra's AIM line to go to New England. That hold no direct financial benefit for the landowners in Pennsylvania and New Jersey whose property could be taken to support this corporate land grab.

Page 4-156 also says "Local chambers of commerce also indicated their support for the Project during public scoping, noting the benefits of improved natural gas supply and the short-term economic benefits of Project construction."

Where is the mention of the fact that every single municipality in New Jersey filed a Resolution against this project, in large measure because of the ecological damage and financial detriment it would impose on their municipal budgets? Those Resolutions were filed early on, because we all knew this corporate land grab was not going to benefit us or our towns. Where is the in depth review of the many comments presented during the scoping sessions regarding these economic concerns?

This DEIS seems to have been prepared from boiler plate language and opinions that only support this proposed unnecessary and devastating project. FERC has not performed to its own regulations, and if for no other reason, this DEIS should be immediately withdrawn. Once the FERC has all the information that PennEast has yet to submit and FERC has actually included all dissenting information in a true and fair analysis, a revised DEIS should be submitted for public comment. The public should then be given one hundred twenty (120) days to review and comment.

Sincerely,

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is ROBERT RAWLINS, intervenor in this proceeding who lives in 32 OLD RIVER ROAD, MILFORD, NJ 08848.

I am concerned that the DEIS says, "with implementation of PennEast's proposed impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation plans, and our recommendations, we conclude that overall impacts on land use and visual resources would be adequately minimized." How can FERC say this when they don't have PennEast's minimization and mitigation plans?

PennEast has yet to file:

a) the results of previously unsurveyed areas along the pipeline route and an updated list of residences and commercial structures within 50 feet of the construction right-of way;

b) for all residences identified within 25 feet of a construction work area, a final site specific construction plan that includes all of the following: a dimensioned site plan that clearly shows the location of the residence in relation to the pipeline, the boundaries of all construction work areas, the distance between the edge of construction work areas and the residence and other permanent structures, and equipment travel lanes;

c) a description of how and when landowners will be notified of construction activities;

d) documentation of landowner concurrence if a structure within the construction work area will be relocated or purchased; and

e) documentation of landowner concurrence if the construction work areas will be within 10 feet of a residence.

PennEast also has yet to file any route adjustments, workspace modifications, or mitigation measures developed through PennEast's ongoing consultations with landowners regarding the following planned and/or pending projects:

a) Fields at Trio Farms Subdivision;
b) Huntington Knolls, LLC Housing Development; and
c) Hopewell Township Emergency Services Facility.

With so many information gaps, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any impacts to land use and recreation. It is against NEPA for FERC to make/favor a decision prior to having all the information needed to make an informed decision!

I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Robert Rawlins

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is ROBLYN RAWLINS, intervenor in this proceeding who lives in 32 OLD RIVER RD, MILFORD, NJ 08848.

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

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Robyn Rawlins

Date: 9-10-16

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 Jill Boethig, concerned citizen, in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Township - 11 Upper Oak Lane
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 issues:

I am shocked that this DEIS could be released at the stage it is currently in. The DEIS has yet to provide mitigation measures for bog turtles or any of the state-listed species or state species of concern. It also has yet to ensure the Project doesn't come within at least 0.25 mile of bat hibernacula.

The DEIS fails to list or document or provide any survey information about New Jersey Plants of Special Concern. There is a very, very long list of these species in the pipelines route, and the DEIS completely ignores them, despite many comments on the docket from agencies and biologists asking for data and avoidance plans. Impacts to these plants cannot be mitigated.

"FERC requests that the FWS consider this EIS as the Biological Assessment," (ES-9) yet how can that be if this DEIS is missing survey information for 70% of the properties the pipeline will cross?

It is not fair that the EIS was published prematurely because it prevents the public from commenting on the missing mitigation plans such as:

- a NJ No-Net Loss Reforestation Act Plan for the parcels identified in table 4.5.1-2
- an Invasive Species Management Plan
- a Migratory Bird Conservation Plan

How can we be given a September 12th deadline for comments when we don't have all the information we need to be reviewing? I urge FERC to withdraw this DEIS and to give the public at least 90 days for commenting after the DEIS is complete.

Sincerely,

Jill Boethig

Date: 9-10-16

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

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Jill Boethig, concerned citizen in the preceding
who lives in 11 Upper Oak Lane, Milford, N.J. 08848

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Jill Boethig

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Jill Boethig, concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in Holland Township - 11 Upper Oak Lane, Milford NJ 08848

I am concerned about the impact the pipeline will have on noise. The DEIS says that, "based on the analyses conducted, the proposed mitigation measures, and our recommendations, we concluded that construction and operation of the Project would not result in significant noise impacts on residents and the surrounding environment." However, FERC is still missing a lot of information from PennEast such as,

-"a HDD noise mitigation plan to reduce the projected noise level attributable to the proposed drilling operations at the 18 NSAs with predicted noise levels above 55 dBA Ldn."

-"mitigation measures to minimize noise levels associated with emergency or maintenance MLV blowdown events."

-"a complete noise analysis of the Project metering (interconnect) stations using the best available typical design or vendor specification with regards to impacts on the closest identified residences/NSA."

How can FERC make an informed decision without any of this data? How can they just say that with FERC's recommendations and mitigation measures, there will be no significant impact even though FERC has yet to receive any complete document from PennEast which outlines mitigation measures for noise levels?

FERC says, "PennEast shall file a noise survey with the Secretary no later than 60 days after placing the Kidder Compressor Station in service." It then goes on to says that if the noise levels from the Kidder Compressor Station do not meet the correct standards, PennEast shall report and implement mitigation measures within one year of the in-service date and then PennEast also then is given another 60 days to show FERC that it has in fact corrected the noise levels! How can FERC conclude that there will be no significant impacts when people may have to endure noise levels above 55 dBA Ldn for a whole year? This timeline seems awfully lengthy, especially when considered in conjunction with other time limits, such as the short 45-day period that the public has to comment on the DEIS.

Why won't PennEast know the noise levels of the Kidder Compressor Station before it is in service? Why would FERC allow the Kidder Compressor Station to be built with the potential to have noise levels above 55 dBA Ldn and still claim that the pipeline will have no significant noise impacts?

With so many information gaps, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any significant noise or air quality impacts.

Sincerely,

Jill Boethig

Date: 9-10-16

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 Jill Boethig, concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 11 Upper Oak Lane, Milford, NJ 08848.

I am commenting on the PennEast Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). I urge FERC to reconsider your issuance of this DEIS at this time and withdraw the DEIS. Under NEPA, a DEIS is required to seriously consider the "No Action Alternative."

The "No Action Alternative" considers the baseline state of what would happen if the project were not constructed. This alternative is supposed to be considered seriously and comprehensively. However, in the PennEast DEIS issued by FERC, the "No Action Alternative" is a bare four paragraphs in length. Within those four paragraphs, there is only a single citation made. That citation is to a list of shippers on the project. There is no mention that the majority of shippers are affiliates of the owners, and that FERC has ruled in past proceedings that affiliate shippers carry less weight than contracts with unrelated entities that serve as arms-length transactions.

There is no mention that they are lacking survey permission in over 70% of the route within NJ, and that there are strong indications that a certificate would in fact require eminent domain condemnation proceedings to be brought against 70% of the landowners in NJ or more.

And that extensive use of eminent domain is yet another factor in the NEPA weighing that FERC performs, and should have heavy weight in considering a "No Action Alternative."

There are numerous assertions throughout the "No Action Alternative" that are backed up with no data or citations. The sections on regional pricing impacts, reliability, and renewables are all based on assertions with no actual citations made at all.

Currently, the DEIS is not compliant with the requirements of NEPA and therefore, the DEIS must be withdrawn.

I respectfully and vehemently ask that FERC withdraw its Draft EIS and demand that a serious evaluation and comprehensive consideration of the "No Action Alternative" be conducted.

Sincerely,

Jill Boethig

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Jill Boethig, concerned citizen in this proceeding

who lives in 11 Upper Oak Lane, Milford, NJ 08848.

I am concerned that the DEIS says, "with implementation of PennEast's proposed impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation plans, and our recommendations, we conclude that overall impacts on land use and visual resources would be adequately minimized." How can FERC say this when they don't have PennEast's minimization and mitigation plans?

PennEast has yet to file:

a) the results of previously unsurveyed areas along the pipeline route and an updated list of residences and commercial structures within 50 feet of the construction right-of way;

b) for all residences identified within 25 feet of a construction work area, a final site specific construction plan that includes all of the following: a dimensioned site plan that clearly shows the location of the residence in relation to the pipeline, the boundaries of all construction work areas, the distance between the edge of construction work areas and the residence and other permanent structures, and equipment travel lanes;

c) a description of how and when landowners will be notified of construction activities;

d) documentation of landowner concurrence if a structure within the construction work area will be relocated or purchased; and

e) documentation of landowner concurrence if the construction work areas will be within 10 feet of a residence.

PennEast also has yet to file any route adjustments, workspace modifications, or mitigation measures developed through PennEast's ongoing consultations with landowners regarding the following planned and/or pending projects:

a) Fields at Trio Farms Subdivision;
b) Huntington Knolls, LLC Housing Development; and
c) Hopewell Township Emergency Services Facility.

With so many information gaps, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any impacts to land use and recreation. It is against NEPA for FERC to make/favor a decision prior to having all the information needed to make an informed decision!

I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Jill Boethig

Date: 9-11-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Jill Boethig, concerned citizen in this proceeding

who lives in 11 Upper Oak Lane, Milford, NJ 08848

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

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Jill Boethig

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Jill Boethig, concerned citizen in this proceeding who lives in 11 Upper Oak Lane, Milford, NJ 08848

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Jill Boethig

Date:
Sept. 10, 2016

Kimberley Bose, Secretary
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 Keady, Intervenor in this proceeding who lives in 130 Shire Rd., Milford (Holland Twp.) NJ 08848.

I urge FERC to reconsider your issuance of this DEIS at this time and withdraw the DEIS. FERC has a responsibility to receive all the necessary factual data to evaluate this project before reaching any conclusions about its viability or advisability. We have extensively detailed the massive impacts this project will have in our communities, our water supply, our environment, our economy and our region, through testimony at FERC scoping hearings, FERC Open Houses and thousands of comments to FERC.

Currently, PennEast has failed to provide all the required environmental data for its application. Therefore, the DEIS is premature. In addition to withdrawing the DEIS, I urge you to extend the public comment period so the public has ample opportunity to review and comment on the data once it is provided by PennEast.

I respectfully and vehemently ask that FERC withdraw its Draft EIS, demand the actual field survey data in all required areas and actually listen to the many diverse yet unified voices impacted by this destructive project.

Sincerely,

Michael Keady

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is John Doucette, a concerned citizen, in this proceeding who lives in 21 Alexandria Drive, Pittstown NJ 08867.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

John Doucette

Date: 9-10-16

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 Jill Boethig, concerned citizen in this proceeding

who lives in Holland Township - 11 Upper Oak Lane 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,

Jill Boethig

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Kathleen Sciarello, intervenor in this proceeding who lives in 97 Crab Apple Hill Rd Milford NJ.

I am concerned that the DEIS says, "with implementation of PennEast's proposed impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation plans, and our recommendations, we conclude that overall impacts on land use and visual resources would be adequately minimized." How can FERC say this when they don't have PennEast's minimization and mitigation plans?

PennEast has yet to file:

a) the results of previously unsurveyed areas along the pipeline route and an updated list of residences and commercial structures within 50 feet of the construction right-of way;

b) for all residences identified within 25 feet of a construction work area, a final site specific construction plan that includes all of the following: a dimensioned site plan that clearly shows the location of the residence in relation to the pipeline, the boundaries of all construction work areas, the distance between the edge of construction work areas and the residence and other permanent structures, and equipment travel lanes;

c) a description of how and when landowners will be notified of construction activities;

d) documentation of landowner concurrence if a structure within the construction work area will be relocated or purchased; and

e) documentation of landowner concurrence if the construction work areas will be within 10 feet of a residence.

PennEast also has yet to file any route adjustments, workspace modifications, or mitigation measures developed through PennEast's ongoing consultations with landowners regarding the following planned and/or pending projects:

a) Fields at Trio Farms Subdivision;
b) Huntington Knolls, LLC Housing Development; and
c) Hopewell Township Emergency Services Facility.

With so many information gaps, I don't see how FERC can conclude that this pipeline won't have any impacts to land use and recreation. It is against NEPA for FERC to make/favor a decision prior to having all the information needed to make an informed decision!

I respectfully call upon FERC to respond to my comments, and to suspend the review of this fraudulent DEIS.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Sciarello

Date: 9-10-16

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

RE: PennEast Pipeline (CP15-558-000)

Dear Secretary Bose and Members of FERC:

My name is Kathleen Sciarello, intervenor in this proceeding who lives in 97 Crab Apple Hill Rd. Milford NJ.

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

I am concerned about the following geologic issues:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Kathleen Sciarello

20160912-5503 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/11/2016 5:48:57 PM

Document Content(s)

HCCAP_PennEast_DEIS_Comments_9-11-16_part_5.DOC.....1-3

CP15-558 _Holland_part_5_37_letters.PDF.....4-39