

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

Re: Docket No. CP15-558, Proposed PennEast Pipeline

27 November 2016

Dear Secretary Bose:

I have been a resident of West Amwell Township in Hunterdon County, NJ for 14 years, and my 18th century rural property will be negatively impacted by the proposed PennEast pipeline if constructed. I am a former member of the West Amwell Township Environmental Commission and have worked hard to preserve our Township's bountiful natural resources. I live in a 1748 farmhouse surrounded by fields and woods with a natural stream running through it. Almost daily, I see foxes, hawks, deer, rabbits, birds and occasionally a coyote. Original to the property is an 18th century spring house that protects that natural water source. A well supplies my water, and, as a result, I do not use any pesticides or fertilizer on my property lest I contaminate that water supply for my home, for my neighbors or the wildlife. This proposed pipeline, less than a 1/4 mile from my land, will unequivocally upset this delicate and centuries-old ecosystem.

I am providing comments on the PennEast Pipeline Project, Docket #CP15-558, specifically in response to recent filings on the docket.

Numerous federal agencies such as EPA, DOI, FWS, and NPS have raised important concerns about the negative environmental impacts of the proposed pipeline. PennEast's responses to DEIS comments, dated October 12 and October 20, do not adequately address these concerns, nor do they correct or complete missing maps and data. In my humble opinion, the EIS should not move forward until all necessary information has been included.

On November 8, FERC sent an environmental information request to PennEast: 46 critical points to be addressed in 20 days. This information request focuses on the inaccuracy of the project's mapping, the lack of an adequate alternatives analysis, the flawed cultural resource consultation process, lack of data on vegetation and wildlife, and inaccurate documentation on impacts to preserved lands. FERC must suspend the DEIS until all of this information is provided in complete form, without data gaps and future promises.

The re-routes that PennEast announced on September 23 do not reduce environmental impacts: they simply move impacts from one property to another and will create others, by extension. The revised route risks disturbing an organic farm, a reservoir that provides water to 1000s of Lambertville residents, land thoughtfully placed in conservation and established county parks in addition to private property owned by hard-working people. Said pipeline will significantly reduce property values

and thus property taxes— 75% of West Amwell Township's property taxes support Hunterdon County public schools. Conclusively, PennEast does not have the data necessary to evaluate the impacts of the route changes or to show that the route alternatives would have fewer impacts than the previous proposed route. Total impacts risk destroying communities up and down the Delaware River without proven benefit.

The new proposed Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) crossings announced on September 23 do not offer a viable solution. No geological testing has been done to prove that these HDD crossings are even feasible. HDD failures such as those that occurred on the nearby Transco Leidy line will result in significantly greater impacts. HDD also can dramatically alter hydrology and change the base flow of streams, sometimes causing them to dry up altogether, and could negatively impact private wells. Changes in stream hydrology could result in the taking of the threatened and endangered species that PennEast is claiming to protect by using HDD.

The New Jersey Rate Counsel has raised serious doubts about whether the proposed PennEast Pipeline is needed, and said the terms of the project would be unfair to the ratepayers of New Jersey, who will ultimately foot the bill. On November 14, they again posted on the docket expressing these concerns, refuting PennEast's claims that the project is needed to meet base load or would result in cost savings or enhanced reliability. The New Jersey Rate Counsel found that the 14% rate of return would be excessive and be like 'winning the lottery'. New Jersey ratepayers should not pay for an unneeded pipeline that will only profit the owner companies.

With all due respect, FERC should re-examine the no-action alternative as requested by the NJ Rate Counsel and other federal agencies. I respectfully ask that FERC to re-consider approval of the PennEast pipeline. To permit construction of the PennEast pipeline would risk serious environmental impact to natural habitats, ecosystems and the water supply. A secondary yet serious outcome, no doubt, would be a waste of taxpayer dollars on a DEIS for a pipeline that is not needed and designed to benefit the Corporations that stand to make millions at the expense of ratepayers, homeowners, and our environment.

Sincerely,