

From: [Jeff England](#)
To: [Paul Pogorzelski](#)
Subject: Nomenclature Clarification
Date: Wednesday, January 21, 2015 11:41:56 AM

Paul,

Per our earlier discussion, I would like to offer a clarification on the language that was included in our January 16, 2015 filing to the FERC which updated our “preferred alternative route.” As part of our due diligence in evaluating the route of the proposed pipeline we are evaluating many alternatives based on various considerations, including stakeholder comments/concerns. As we work through the process, we refer to the various routes as “alternatives,” which are subsequently filed with Resource Report 10 with the FERC for their consideration. That being said, there is only ever one and only one “preferred alternative” at any given time and any alternatives prior to that are filed away as something that we evaluated internally, but do not recommend. PennEast is currently focusing its resources on continuing to evaluate and refine the route filed with the FERC on January 16th as that is our “preferred alternative” at this time.

I hope this serves to alleviate some confusion.

Thanks,
Jeff

[Jeffrey D. England](#)
Project Manager
PennEast Pipeline Company, LLC