

PennEast Pipeline Company, LLC
One Meridian Boulevard, Suite 2C01
Wyomissing, PA 19610



August 7, 2015

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

Re: PennEast Pipeline Company, LLC, Docket No. PF15-1-000
Matrix of Responses Staff Comments on Draft Resource Reports 1, 8, 9 and 10

Dear Ms. Bose:

On October 10, 2014, the Director of the Office of Energy Projects issued a letter in the above-referenced docket approving the request of PennEast Pipeline Company, LLC ("PennEast") to commence the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Pre-filing Review Process of its proposed PennEast Pipeline Project ("Project"). On May 19, 2015 and May 29, 2015, the Commission staff provided comments on draft Resource Reports filed by PennEast in the captioned docket ("Staff Comments"). On July 31, 2015, PennEast submitted draft Resource Reports 1, 8, 9 and 10, as well as draft Appendices A, F, L and P, which addressed the Staff Comments.

Attached is a matrix identifying where information requested by the Staff Comments can be found in the Resource Reports filed on July 31, 2015.

Should you have any questions concerning this request, please contact me at (610) 406-4322.

Sincerely,

/s/ Anthony C. Cox

Anthony C. Cox
PennEast Pipeline Company, LLC,
By its Project Manager
UGI Energy Services, LLC

cc: Medha Kochhar (FERC)

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
Draft Resource Report 1 – General Project Description			
1	Section 1.2.3 Page 1-15	Include updated alignment sheets with aerial photography that was acquired first quarter of 2015.	Will be provided in September filing
2	Section 1.3.1 Page 1-15	Include a table that lists, by milepost, agricultural areas crossed that would require a 125-foot-wide construction right-of-way.	Resource Report 8, Table 8.2-2a
3	Section 1.3.1, Table 1.3-1 Page 1-16	Table 1.3-1 lists the pipeline length as 110.6 miles; however, table 1.2-1 notes that actual pipeline length would be 110.9 miles. Confirm that land use requirements presented in table 1.3-1 include the additional 0.3 mile of pipe.	Section 1.3-1, Table 1.3-1, Page 1-17 & Section 1.2-1, Table 1.2-1, Page 1-10
4	Section 1.3.1, Table 1.3-1 Page 1-16	Include land requirements for pipeyards and additional temporary work space (ATWS) in table 1.3-1.	Section 1.3-1, Table 1.3-1, Page 1-17 & Section 1.3.1.3, Table 1.3-5, Page 1-42
5	Section 1.4 Page 1-27	Include a full cumulative impacts analysis. Identify impacts by resource type and identify which projects would cause those impacts. This analysis should include past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future projects.	Section 1.4, Table 1.4-1, Table 1.4-2, Page 1-45
6	Section 1.5.2.1 Page 1-35	Confirm that PennEast would request a variance and include justification for all ATWS within 50-feet of a wetland/waterbody.	Section 1.5.2.1, Page 1-65
7	Section 1.5.2.1 Page 1-35	Confirm that PennEast will continue to consult with and follow any timing restrictions requested by the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. Explains whether the timing restrictions are consistent with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC's) Wetland and Waterbody Construction and Mitigation Procedures. If they are not consistent, request that they be reviewed as an alternative measure and include justification for their use.	Section 1.5.2.1, Page 1-65
8	Section 1.5.2.1 Page 1-35	Identify the timing restrictions set forth in New Jersey Administrative Code 7:13-10.5(d).	Section 1.5.2.1, Page 1-65
9	Section 1.5.2.2 Page 1-36	Identify the milepost (MP) locations where re-fueling would be needed within 100 feet of wetlands/waterbodies and include justification.	Section 1.5.2.2, Page 1-66
10	Section 1.5.2.4 Page 1-36	Identify the waterbodies that would likely require blasting.	Will be provided in Section 1.5 in September filing

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
11	Section 1.5.2.7 Page 1-38	Include a horizontal directional drill (HDD) Contingency Plan for the Project.	Noted in Section 1.5.2.8.2 – Will be provided in September filing
12	Section 1.5.2.8 Page 1-38	Include results of the geotechnical evaluations for the Susquehanna River (MP 7.2), Lehigh River (MP22.4), Beltsville Lake (MP 43.0), and Delaware River (MP 74.8) crossings. Confirm the crossing techniques for these crossings.	Noted in Section 1.5.2.8.2 – Will be provided in September filing
13	Section 1.5.2.8 Page 1-38	Include an Unanticipated Release Plan for HDD crossings.	Noted in Section 1.5.2.8.2 – Will be provided in September filing
14	NA	Include a construction schedule. Identify all facilities and anticipated construction begin dates and duration.	Will be provided in September filing
15	Section 1.5.2.9 Page 1-39	State whether PennEast would reduce the width of the construction right-of-way in wetlands, in accordance with the FERC's Wetland and Waterbody Construction and Mitigation Procedures (Procedures). If not consistent with the FERC's Procedures, indicate how saturated and unsaturated wetlands would be crossed and how the measures would achieve a comparable level of mitigation.	Section 1.5.2.9, Page 1-70
16	Section 1.5.2.10 Page 1-39	Include a table that identifies all foreign pipeline crossings including MP, facility type, owner, and size.	Section 1.5.2.10, Page 1-70
17	Section 1.5.2.11 Page 1-39	Define the parameters for "rugged topography."	Section 1.5.2.11, Page 1-71
18	Section 1.5.4 Page 1-67	Confirm all construction personnel and inspectors would be <u>required</u> to receive training. In addition, state whether PennEast would use the FERC's third party monitoring program during construction.	Section 1.5.4, Page 1-86
19	Section 1.5.5 Page 1-67	Table 1.5-1 identifies four construction spreads. Describe the half construction spread and explain why it would be used.	Section 1.5.1, Page 1-61
20	Section 1.7, Table 1.7-1 Page 1-70	Revise table 1.7-1 to include the anticipated filing and receipt dates for all permits.	Section 1.7, Table 1.7-1, Page 1-89

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
Draft Resource Report No. 8 – Land Use, Recreation, and Aesthetics			
1	Section 8.4 Pages 8-85 to 8-86	Identify all federal properties crossed by the Project and include the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Parcel owner; b. Managing institution/individual; c. Whether parcel is leased or owned in fee; d. Crossing location (MP) e. Acreage of impact and whether impacts would be temporary or permanent; f. Avoidance and mitigation measures, if any; g. Alternatives evaluated; and, h. Documentation of consultation with appropriate agency and/or institution. 	Section 8.4.1.1, Table 8.4-1, Page 8-120
1	Section 8.2.1 and 8.2.1.1 Tables 8.2-1 and 8.2-2 Pages 8-3 to 8-7	Include extra/work staging areas, access roads, pipe and contractor yards, and aboveground facilities in tables 8.2-1 and 8.2-2.	Section 8.2.1, Table 8.2-1, 8.2-2, Page 8-3
2	Section 8.2.1.1 Page 8-5	Confirm that table 8.2-2 includes the acreage for agricultural land additional setbacks for topsoil staging areas. If not, include this as part of the acreage estimates	Section 8.2.1.1, Table 8.2-2, Page 8-6
3	Section 8.2.1.1 Page 8-5	Identify all parcels where topsoil staging would be required.	Section 8.2.1.1, Table 8.2-2a, Page 8-9
4	Section 8.2.1.2 Pages 8-8 to 8-11	Include in revised Resource Report 8 additional information on the co-location of the Project with existing rights-of-way, especially with regards to overlap of existing rights-of-way and additional right-of-way required adjacent to existing right-of-way, including ATWS, access roads, etc.	Section 8.2.1.2, Table 8.2-3, Page 8-24
5	Section 8.2.1.2 Table 8.2-3 Pages 8-9 to 8-11	Identify the width that would be used for the temporary construction right-of-way and width for the permanent right-of-way for portions of the Project that would be co-located with existing rights-of-way.	Section 8.2.1.2, Table 8.2-3, Page 8-24
6	Section 8.2.1.4 Table 8.2-5 Page 8-17	A total of 261.9 acres are identified as being within ATWS along the route. The text states that these areas will be restored to existing land use. Given that many of the impacted ATWS areas are forested, indicate whether PennEast would restore forested ATWS areas with native woody plantings and include planting plans.	Section 8.2.1.4, Page 8-37

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
7	Section 8.2.2.1 Page 8-68	Include the location of the preferred compressor station site along with environmental information on the resources that would be affected by construction and operation of the preferred site.	Section 8.2.2.1, Page 8-88
8	Section 8.2.2 Table 8.2-7 Page 8-69	Identify the MP of the Compressor Station Option 2.	Section 8.2.2.1, Page 8-88
9	Section 8.3 Page 8-71	Include additional information on any new residential or commercial development planned to occur within 0.25 mile of the Project based on consultation with local and county government planning officials. Be sure to include potential new developments identified in scoping comments filed with FERC such as comments from: the Township of Bethlehem (Barry Roth) about the potential development of a park between William Penn and Freemansburg Avenue in Bethlehem, New Jersey; RJA Investment Fund VIII, LP owner Jonathan Feinberg, Thomas C. Kidd, and Harry Salavantis (Susquehanna Estates) about proposed subdivisions; and Philip Geibel about a planned affordable housing development project (Huntington Knolls, LLC).	Section 8.3.1, Table 8.3-2, Page 8-97
10	Section 8.3.1 Page 8-71	For the planned residential development identified within 0.25 mile of the Project (Blue Ridge Real Estate), indicate in draft Resource Report 8 and 10 if PennEast has looked into an alternate route to avoid this development. Revise the Resource Report to include additional information on consultation and coordination with Blue Ridge Real Estate Inc. for properties crossed between MPs 25.7 and 28.2 where development is proposed to occur. Identify steps to minimize impacts on planned development.	Section 8.3.1, Page 8-92
11	Section 8.3.1 Page 8-71	Include a summary of pipeline route variations incorporated into the preferred route to avoid planned residential and commercial developments. Ensure this summary is consistent with draft Resource Report 10.	Section 8.3-1, Table 8.3-1, Page 8-95
12	Section 8.3.1 Page 8-71	Include additional information on coordination with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation to identify which roads are planned for enhancement under the 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Plan, and the timing of the proposed improvements. Describe measures that PennEast would use to minimize impacts on construction activities and improvements under this plan.	Section 8.3-1, Page 8-92

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
13	Section 8.3.2 Page 8-72	Indicate whether PennEast has identified any residence located within 25 feet of the construction right-of-way or extra work/staging areas. If so, include site-specific construction plans for those residences. Also, indicate any High Occupancy Areas in the vicinity of the planned Project.	Noted in Section 8.3.2 – Will be provided in September filing
14	NA	Some areas in draft Resource Report 8 state that residences within 25 feet of the construction right-of-way would be identified and site specific construction plans would be developed. Other sections of draft Resource Report 8 say the same thing but for residences within 50 feet of the construction right-of-way/ Indicate whether PennEast plans to identify both residences (25 feet and 50 feet) and their site specific construction plans. If not, clarify this discrepancy.	Section 8.3.2, Page 8-116
15	Section 8.3.3 Page 8-82	State the advance notification that would be provided to the owners of existing residential, commercial, and industrial properties prior to construction.	Section 8.3.3, Page 8-116
16	Section 8.3.4 Page 8-82	Confirm that PennEast would follow the restoration activities described in FERC's Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan (Plan) and Procedures to restore all agricultural land to pre-existing conditions.	Section 8.3-4, Page 8-117
17	Section 8.3.4 Pages 8-82 to 8-83	Include PennEast's responses to landowner concerns about the Project in agricultural areas including the use of heavy agricultural equipment within or across the permanent right-of-way, depth of pipeline burial, disrupted access to land due to the pipeline construction and operation isolating portions of a farm, restoration of fencing, impacts on cattle farming, and impacts on horses.	Section 8.3-4, Page 8-117
18	Section 8.3.4.2 Page 8-83	Identify the types of specialty crops grown in the project area and any known locations, by milepost, where they would be crossed by the pipeline. Identify specialized construction or restoration techniques would be used in these areas. Similarly, identify any organic farms that would be crossed and the additional or specialized construction or restoration techniques that would be used in these areas.	Section 8.3.4.2, Table 8.3-4, Page 8-118
19	Section 8.3.4.3 Page 8-84	There were several comments filed from affected landowners stating the planned pipeline would cross organic farm fields. Revise this section of draft Resource Report 8 to address those comments.	Section 8.3.4.3, Page 8-119

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
20	Section 8.4.1.1 and Section 8.4.1.2 Pages 8-85 to 8-88	Identify measures that would be used to minimize disturbance to the recreational areas and visitors at Francis E. Walter Dam, Beltzville State Park, Frances Slocum State Park, Hickory Run State Park, and Delaware Canal State Park, including the feasibility of timing construction during off-peak season to reduce impacts to recreational users. How have recommendations based on consultation with USACE and PADCNR been incorporated into these plans?	Section 8.4.1.1, Page 8-120 & Section 8.4.1.2, Page 8-122
21	Section 8.4.1.1 Page 8-86	Include a site-specific crossing plan developed in coordination with the National Park Service and other stakeholders for the crossing of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail at MP 49.8 in Northampton County, PA.	Section 8.4.1.1, Page 8-120
22	Section 8.4.1.2 Page 8-88	Identify measures that PennEast would implement to minimize disturbance to the recreational areas and visitors at Pennsylvania State Game Lands and Pennsylvania State Forest Lands, where several acres would be affected by construction and several acres would be in the permanent right-of-way.	Section 8.4.1.2, Page 8-122
23	Section 8.4.1.2 Table 8.4-1 Pages 8-89 to 8-98	<p>Describe details and include documentation of PennEast's consultation with New Jersey Green Acres Program and other local and state agencies responsible for managing conserved land parcels that would be crossed by the Project, including but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural Lands Trust; - The Nature Conservancy; - New Jersey State Agriculture Development Committee; - Hunterdon Land Trust Alliance; - Delaware and Raritan Canal Commission; - Hunterdon County Agricultural Development Committee; - New Jersey Conservation Foundation; - Delaware and Raritan Greenway, Inc.; and - Friends of Hopewell Valley Open Space, Inc. 	Noted in Section 8.4– Will be provided in September filing

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
24	Section 8.4.2.1 Page 8-99	<p>PennEast states that no recreational or other designated special use areas would be crossed by the Project facilities. Indicate whether there are designated special use areas would be within 0.25 mile of the Project facilities? If so, identify each special use area by the closest approximate MP to any project facility, and identify their approximate distance and direction from proposed facilities. Also, identify any proposed measures to minimize impacts on the special use areas.</p> <p>We received several comments referring to schools and churches located near the proposed centerline (South Hunterdon High School, Dallas Township schools, Wyoming Borough schools, Moore Township Elementary School, George Wolf Elementary School, and the Lower Nazareth Elementary School; Christian Apostolic Church of Hillsdale in Wilkes-Barre, PA; Saint Lawrence Church in Riegelsville, PA). If the school and/or churches or other designated special use areas are located within 0.25 mile of the planned Project facilities, include additional details on mitigation measures to minimize disruption of school- and church-related activities, including bus routes.</p>	Section 8.4.2.1, Table 8.4-3, Page 8-133
25	Section 8.4.2.5 Page 8-100	Define "Project area" and "vicinity of the Project" as used in section 8.4.2.5. Is this within a certain distance of the Project facilities?	Section 8.4.2.5, Page 8-138
26	Section 8.4.2.5 Table 8.4-3 Page 8-101 to 8-102	PennEast identified 17 locations with potential contamination and hazardous waste in the vicinity of the Project. Identify any mitigation measures that would be used during construction to minimize impact from construction through the hazardous waste sites identified in table 8.4-3. In addition, indicate the disposal procedure for the hazardous waste and the state agencies involved with the process. Also include documentation with appropriate federal and state agencies.	Section 8.4.2.5, Table 8.4-4, Page 8-138
27	Section 8.7 Page 8-107	Include documentation that demonstrates that applications for rights-of-way or other proposed land use have been or soon would be filed with federal land-managing agencies with jurisdiction over land that would be affected by the Project.	Noted in Section 8.7– Will be provided in September filing

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
28	Section 8.5 Pages 8-105 to 8-106	Include additional details on visual impacts to the Jack Frost Ski Resort and Jack Frost National Golf Club in Blakeslee, PA (approximate MP 25.5), especially with regards to the proposed location of the compressor station. The distance from Jack Frost Ski Resort in draft Resource Report 8 appears inaccurate. Distance should be provided from the closest property boundary of the Resort and Golf Course, not from the center and/or mailing address.	Will be provided in September filing
29	Section 8.6 Page 8-106	Include a revegetation plan developed in coordination with local, state, and federal agencies and landowners that includes an explanation of locations where vegetation would be planted to serve as a visual screen along roadways, trails and in residential areas as needed.	Will be provided in September filing
30	Section 8.4.1.4 Page 8-89	<p>Include the distance from the Project and potential impacts on the following conservation areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bald Pate Park (Mercer County, NJ); - Washington Crossing Park (Mercer County, NJ); - Mercer Meadows (Mercer County, NJ); - Mercer County Park (Mercer County, NJ); - Muddy Run Preserve (Kingwood Township, NJ); - Boulder Field Natural Area and Mud Swamp Natural Area, both located within Hickory Run State Park (Carbon County, PA); - Louise W. Moore County Park (Northampton County, PA); and - Rockhopper Trail (West Amwell Township, NJ). 	Section 8.4.2.1, Table 8.4-3, Page 8-134
31	Section 8.5.1 Page 8-105	Indicate the acreage of Prime Farmland that would be affected by the planned Project and how PennEast would minimize impacts on Prime Farmland during construction and restoration of the Project.	Section 8.5.1, Page 8-144
32	NA	Respond to concerns with regards to potential impacts on property value and insurance due to construction and operation of the planned Project.	Will be addressed in September filing of RR5

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
33	NA	Include an Agricultural Impact Minimization Plan prepared in consultation with the New Jersey Department of Agriculture and other resource management agencies as appropriate. The plan should identify measures that would avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate impacts on agricultural lands from construction and operation of the planned Project, and should identify compensation procedures.	Noted in Section 8.3.4 – Will be provided in September filing
Draft Resource Report 9 – Air and Noise Quality			
1	Section 9.1.2, Tables 9.1-3a through c, pp. 9-10 to 9-11	Include detailed emission calculations used to prepare the values presented in tables 9.1-3a, 9.1-3b, and 9.1-3c. In particular, provide calculations clearly indicating how fugitive natural gas leakage and total greenhouse gas emissions were determined. In addition, revise table 9.1-3 b to include the fugitive emissions from the pipeline in PA and NJ.	Appendix L3
2	Section 9.1.3, p. 9-12	Include Appendix 9A that contains information on construction equipment, as referenced in section 9.1.3 of Draft Resource Report 9.	Appendix 9A is now identified as L2
3	NA	Include Appendix L-1, Plan Approval Application for the Compressor Station, when available.	Will be provided in September filing
4	NA	Include a fugitive dust control plan.	Appendix L5
5	NA	Include Appendix L-3, Operational Emissions, when available.	Appendix L3
6	NA	Add a comprehensive list of acronyms and abbreviations to Draft Resource Report 9.	Resource Report 1
7	NA	Add a section in Draft Resource Report 9 discussing climate change impacts from the Project.	Will be provided in September filing
8	Section 9.1.1.1, Table 9.1-1, p. 9-3	Note on table 9.1-1, that the 1997 8-hour ozone standard is revoked, effective April 6, 2015. (See the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) notice in the Federal Register, 80 FR 12263, March 6, 2015.) Revise the text in Draft Resource Report 9 to reflect this change.	Report text and tables do not include the revoked 1997 ozone standard

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
9	Section 9.1.1.1, Tables 9.1-1 and 9.1-2, pp. 9-3 to 9-4	In draft Resource Report 9, delete all references to the revoked 1979 1-hour ozone and 1997 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in tables 9.1-1 and 9.1-2. However, keep this text as a footnote indicating that the 1997 standard is revoked. Once a standard is revoked, any nonattainment status designated under that standard also ceases to exist. The only remaining nonattainment areas in table 9.1-2 should be those for the 1997 PM2.5, 2006 PM2.5, and the 2008 8-hour ozone standards. However, as noted, for the purpose of NSR applicability, areas within the ozone transport region are still subject to treatment as though they were moderate ozone nonattainment areas. Therefore, keep the footnote in table 9.1-2 regarding ozone transport regions.	References in text and tables to the revoked 1997 ozone standard have been removed
10	Section 9.1.5.2, p. 9-15	Note that with respect to general conformity, areas that were designated as nonattainment for the revoked 1979 1-hour and 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS, are no longer nonattainment for the purposes of general conformity with respect to these pollutants, or maintenance areas with respect to these revoked standards. (The EPA notice at 80 FR 12263 specifically indicates that when a specific NAAQS is revoked, general conformity requirements end with respect to that standard.). Revise the text in Draft Resource Report 9 to reflect this.	Section 9.1.5, Page 9-16
11	Section 9.1.5, pp. 9-14 to 9-15	Revise the discussion in section 9.1.5 to indicate the specific areas still subject to general conformity. General conformity does not apply to the revoked ozone NAAQS, and does not apply to ozone transport regions unless such an area is also currently designated as nonattainment or maintenance for a criteria pollutant.	Section 9.1.5, Page 9-16
12	Section 9.1.5, Table 9.1-5, p. 9-15	Update table 9.1-5 as necessary to reflect only those construction emissions that would occur in areas specifically designated as nonattainment or maintenance for either PM2.5 or for the 2008 8-hour ozone standard.	Table 9.1-5, Page 9-17
13	Section 9.1.5, Table 9.1.5, pp. 9-14 to 9-15	Revise section 9.1.5 and table 9.1-5 as necessary to quantify the construction emissions by the calendar year in which they occur. The general conformity thresholds in 40 CFR 93.153(b)(1) and (2) only apply on a per-calendar-year basis.	Emissions assumed to occur over one calendar year

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
14	Appendix L-2	<p>Regarding Appendix L-2 Construction Emissions, for comparison to general conformity thresholds, construction emissions should be totaled separately by calendar year for each nonattainment or maintenance area. Therefore, the anticipated start date, end date, and duration of each construction task needs to be accounted for in the emission calculations. (If all construction is anticipated to occur in a single calendar year, no change to the emission totals is needed but this should be clarified in conformity discussion and in Appendix L-2.).</p>	<p>There is minimal construction activity to prepare the pipeyards in one year, and then all remaining construction emissions occur in the next calendar year. The detailed activity data to separate these years is not available at this stage of design, and separating the pipeyard emissions will not change the conclusion.</p>
15	Appendix L-2	<p>Regarding Appendix L-2 Construction Emissions, it is stated on page 9-13 the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. emission factors for non-road equipment were obtained from EPA's NONROAD model 2008, which is the current EPA model for non-road equipment. However, some of the nonroad emissions footnotes in Appendix L-2 refer to EPA guidance published in 2004 and 2005. Revise the factors used for nonroad emissions in Appendix L-2, compare them against the current NONROAD2008 factors, and update as necessary. b. emission factors for on road vehicles were obtained using EPA's MOVES2010b model. For general conformity purposes, mobile source emissions need to use the most current EPA model. For on road sources, this is MOVES2014. However, EPA has issued a two-year grace period, and MOVES2010b is still valid for general conformity use until October 2016. Since it is early to predict the project's schedule and when construction would commence, revise Appendix L-2 to include the construction emissions for on road vehicles using MOVES2010b model and MOVES2014 model. 	<p>Construction Emissions throughout L2 have been revised to use MOVES2014 emission factors for 2016 for both on-road and off-road equipment.</p>

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
16	Appendix L-2	On page 31 in the construction emission calculations, the Project Element Subtotals for the Kidder Compressor Station appears to be mislabeled—they use the same headings as the four pipeline construction spreads. Clarify this discrepancy and correct as needed.	Project Element Subtotals in Table L2-7 have been relabeled.
17	NA	Include a discussion addressing comments received from the public to date on air quality and noise, or indicate where these comments have been addressed in Draft Resource Report 9 or when will they be addressed.	Table will be provided in September filing
18	NA	<p>We received several comments from the public regarding potential climate change. Revise Draft Resource Report 9 to address the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. concerns that actual pipeline leakage rates are higher than those estimated by current methods, including a claim that 6-10 percent of total gas volume is lost from existing Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration gas pipeline systems as leakage. b. whether or not PennEast proposes to meet the new EPA standards for methane and volatile organic compounds emissions expected to be proposed in summer 2015. c. concern that removal of trees along the pipeline route would result in permanent loss of carbon dioxide removal capacity from those plants, and should be compensated for elsewhere. d. concerns that natural gas production actually would result in greater greenhouse gas emissions than coal or oil use, when methane leakage from well sites and pipelines are considered. e. concern that cheap supplies of natural gas would slow the transition to renewable and non-fossil energy sources. 	<p>A, B -Section 9.1.2, Table 9.1-3b & Section 9.1.1.3</p> <p>C, D, E Will be provided in September filing</p>

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
19	NA	<p>Include in Draft Resource Report 9 responses to comments regarding other potential environmental/health effects from methane leakage, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. concern that pipeline fugitive leaks can contaminate groundwater and drinking water wells; b. concern that methane leaks contribute to ground-level ozone; c. concern that methane leakage into soil can displace oxygen and impair plant growth on cropland; and d. concern that methane could accumulate inside nearby homes in detectable quantities as a result of fugitive leaks. 	<p>A, C, D: Will be provided in September filing)</p> <p>B: Section 9.1.2, Table 9.1-3b, Page 9-10</p>
20	NA	<p>Include a discussion in Draft Resource Report 9 responding to comments expressing concern that Marcellus Shale gas has high radon content, that pipe trench excavation would release radon and/or dust emissions containing radioactive materials, and that natural gas leaks would release radon into the air, into homes, and into drinking water supplies.</p>	<p>Not addressed in RR9. Will be provided in September filing</p>
21	NA	<p>Include a discussion in Draft Resource Report 9 responding to comments expressing concern that pipe trench excavation would cut through arsenic-rich Triassic shales of the Passaic and Lockatong formations, and that methane leaks in subsurface soil would allow arsenic compounds to be converted into water-soluble forms by bacteria.</p>	<p>Not addressed in RR9 Will be provided in September filing</p>
22	NA	<p>Include a discussion in Draft Resource Report 9 responding to comments expressing concern about potential impact on nearby residences, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. concerns that compressor station venting can release HAP compounds and noxious odors that can cause severe health problems for people living nearby; and b. concern that one large compressor station, instead of the three smaller ones originally planned, would concentrate the negative health impacts in a single community. 	<p>Not specifically addressed in RR9, except to state that the compressor station will meet all applicable regulatory requirements. Additional details will be provided in September filing</p>
23	Section 9.2.3, p. 9-20	<p>Identify any applicable state or local noise regulations that would be applicable to the Project.</p>	<p>Section 9.2.3, Page 9-27</p>

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
24	Section 9.2.2, p. 9-20	Include in Draft Resource Report 9 information on and quantify the existing noise levels at noise-sensitive areas (NSAs) and at other areas covered by relevant state and local noise ordinances.	Section 9.2.2, Page 9-21
25	Section 9.2.5.2	Identify any nearby NSA by distance and direction from the proposed compressor unit building/enclosure. NSAs within Snow Ridge Village such as the Jack Frost National Golf Course should be included in the analysis and consideration should be given to potential noise impacts at Hickory Run State Park, Beltzville State Park, and Carbon County Watershed.	Section 9.2.2.3, Page 9-24
26	Section 9.2.5.2	Evaluate potential noise impacts associated with Project operations including the proposed compressor station at nearby NSAs. Include step-by-step supporting calculations or a description of the modeling program used to analyze noise levels, the input and raw output data, and all assumptions made when running the model, as well as the far-field sound level data for maximum facility operations (if available) and source data.	Section 9.2.4, Page 9-28
27	Section 9.2.5.2	For the planned compressor station, include sound pressure levels for compressor station components such as unmuffled engine inlets and exhausts, engine casings, and cooling equipment; dynamic insertion loss for all mufflers; sound transmission loss for all compressor building components including walls, roof, doors, windows and ventilation openings; sound attenuation from the station to nearby NSAs. The manufacturer's name, the model number, the performance rating; and a description of each noise source and noise control component to be employed at the proposed compressor station.	Will be provided in September filing
28	Section 9.2.5, Section 9.2.6	Identify measures and manufacturer's specifications for equipment proposed for the compressor station to mitigate operational noise impacts.	Section 9.2.6, Page 9-43
29	Section 9.2.5, Section 9.2.6	Demonstrate how the Project would comply with the applicable 55 decibels on the A-weighted scale (dBA) day-night sound level (Ldn) FERC noise criterion and any other applicable state or local noise requirements at nearby NSAs during Project operation. For the new compressor station, an evaluation of potential vibration impacts at NSAs should also be included.	Section 9.2.4.1.1, Page 9-36 and Section 9.2.5.1, Page 9-43

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
30	Section 9.2.5.3	Include in Draft Resource Report 9 noise analysis from blasting activities during construction, and venting from Project facilities during operation.	Will be provided in September filing
31	NA	Include in Draft Resource Report 9 a discussion of noise impacts due to construction activities and horizontal directional drilling (HDD), and include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a map of all NSAs within ½ mile of the HDD activities, including entry and exit pits; b. ambient and estimated noise from HDD activities within ½ mile of the NSAs and include all supporting calculations; and c. list and describe all noise generating equipment, and noise mitigation measures PennEast would implement to mitigate noise from HDD activities. 	Section 9.2.4.1.2.2, Page 9-33 and Section 9.2.4.4.2, Page 9-40
32	NA	Describe potential noise impacts to wildlife during Project construction and operation.	Section 9.2.4.3, Page 9-38
Draft Resource Report 10 – Alternatives			
1	Section 10.3.1.6 Figure 10.3-5 Page 10-41	Include an environmental and engineering comparison of the segment of the preferred route between approximate MPs 75 and 97 with the corresponding segment of the Original Route. Include a figure showing the preferred route and the corresponding segment of the Original route including MP markers on the preferred route.	Section 10.3.1.7, Table 10.3-10, Figure 10.3-4, Page 10-42
2	Section 10.3.1.6 Figure 10.3-5 Page 10-41	Include an environmental and engineering comparison of the section of the preferred route between approximate MPs 97 and 110 with the corresponding segment of the Original Route. Include a figure showing the preferred route and the corresponding segment of the Original Route including MP markers on the preferred route.	Section 10.3.1.7, Table 10.3.11, Figure 10.3-5, Page 10-42
3	Section 10.3.2 Page 10-46	For reroutes identified in table 10.3-9, include an environmental and engineering comparison with the corresponding segment of the current preferred route. Include a figure showing the major reroute and corresponding segment of preferred route.	Section 10.3.2, Tables 10.3-13 through 10.3-17, Figures 10.3-13 through 10.3-17, Page 10-61

Comment Number	Section & Page Number	Comment	Response: Section & Page Number
4	Section 10.3.3 Page 10-56	PennEast states that one alternate compressor station site is being evaluated, plus additional tracts are being screened for potential use for the compressor station site between MPs 25.2 and 27.5. Include maps showing the location of each alternate site, including the possible station boundary within each property. Include an environmental and engineering comparison of each alternate site to the planned site, including tables comparing environmental impacts.	Noted in Section 10.3.3 to be included in September filing
5	Appendix P	For those route variations that have been incorporated into the preferred route, switch the "current route" and "variation" labels, as appropriate, so that a comparison can be made between the preferred route as described in draft Resource Report 1, and the corresponding segment of the route variation. Be sure that all tables and figures include and compare the same preferred route as described in draft Resource Report 1. For each figure include MP markers along the preferred pipeline route. Also, for each route variation include text that summarizes the environmental and engineering impacts of the preferred route with the corresponding segment of the route variation.	Section 10.3.2, Page 10-61, Appendix P